

## **APPENDIX J2 – RESPONSES TO DRAFT EIS COMMENTS**

This Appendix J2 includes responses to Draft EIS comments, organized as follows:

- J2.1, Tribe and Agency Comments
- J2.2, Organization Comments
- J2.3, Business Comments
- J2.4, Petitions and Petition Comments
- J2.5, Individual Comments

## J2.1 TRIBE AND AGENCY COMMENTS

This section includes an index of tribes and agencies that submitted comments during the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Draft EIS comment period (Table J2.1-1) and the text of all of those comments paired with responses (Table J2.1-2). The comment text in Table J2.1-2 omits addresses, headings, salutations, signatures, footers, images and supplemental attachments that do not contain substantive comments. For the full content of each comment in its original format, see Appendix J3, Original Copies of Draft EIS Comments. Many responses refer to master responses, which are provided in Appendix J1, Introduction to Draft EIS Comments and Responses, and to other parts of this Final EIS, including numbered sections and tables.

**Table J2.1-1. Index of Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name
T1	The Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon	Cheryle Kennedy
A1	U.S. Department of the Interior	Allison O'Brien
A2	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Jill A Nogi
A3	U.S. National Park Service	Heather Ramsay
A4–A111	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)	Rian Windsheimer and unknown authors
A112–A128	Clean Water Services (CWS)	Anne McDonald
A129	City of Lake Oswego	Scott Siegel
A130–A155	Portland Bureau of Development Services (BDS)	Hillary Adam, Stephanie Beckman, Ethan Brown and Benjamin Nielsen
A156–A164	Portland Bureau of Environmental Services (BES)	Fred MacGregor and Reuben Snyder
A165–A174	Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS)	Eric Engstrom
A175–A194	Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT)	John Gillam, Taylor Phillips and Lewis Wardrip
A195–A206	Portland Housing Bureau (PHB)	Jill Chen
A207–A224	Portland Parks and Recreation (PP&R)	Janelle St. Pierre, Tate White and Brett Horner
A225–A226	Portland Water Bureau (PWB)	Cherri Warnke
A227–A290	City of Tigard	Kenny Asher, Dylan Dekay-Bemis, Tegan Enloe, Lori Faha, Sean Farrelly, Gary Pagenstecher and Susan Shanks
A291–A302	Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue (TVF&R)	Chief Allen Kennedy
A303–A347	Washington County	Chris Deffebach, Steve Kelley, Shaun Quayle and Julie Sosnovske

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
T1	The Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon	Cheryle Kennedy	Not specified	<p>On behalf of The Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon (Grand Ronde or Tribe), thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project, Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SW Corridor dEIS). Grand Ronde is a sovereign nation made up of more than 30 antecedent tribes and bands, including tribes from the Portland Basin. Our Portland Basin tribes include the Clackamas, Wahlalla (aka Cascades), Multnomah, and Clowwewalla (aka Willamette Tumwaters), Chinookan peoples; the Northern (aka Principal) Band of Molalla; and the Tualatin Band of Kalapuya. We are the original people of Metro's area (please see attached map), and have been here since time immemorial.</p> <p>The antecedent tribes and bands identified above signed the ratified Willamette Valley Treaty (aka Treaty with the Kalapuya Etc.) of January 22, 1855. The Treaty ceded tribal homelands to the U.S. in exchange for certain rights and benefits. The tribes were removed to the Grand Ronde Indian Reservation and Tribal treaty rights under the Willamette Valley Treaty are vested today in the people of the Grand Ronde Reservation.</p> <p>The area of potential impact from the SW Corridor project is entirely within Grand Ronde's ceded lands. Potential project impacts to important Tribal resources include but are not limited to: disturbance/destruction of archaeological resources, degradation of water quality, loss/fragmentation of habitats, disruption/alteration of hydrology, and permanent alteration of Tribal cultural landscapes.</p> <p>As a sovereign nation, Grand Ronde has a special trust relationship with the United States and the Federal Transit Administration. In addition, Grand Ronde has cultivated and maintained a government-to-government relationship with Metro.</p> <p>We would like to invite you, key project staff, and the Metro Council to meet with us at Tribal headquarters in Grand Ronde for a government-to-government consultation meeting on the SW Corridor dEIS.</p>	<p>Thank you for your letter provided during the Draft EIS comment period. Since having received your letter, FTA, TriMet and Metro have met with the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon to further discuss the Project. Representatives met at the TriMet offices on May 31, 2019 and at Tribal headquarters in Grand Ronde on August 12, 2019. Additional information summarizing meetings and other consultation with the Grand Ronde is provided in Appendix E, Agency Coordination and Correspondence, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>In addition, the project team has continued to solicit input from the Grand Ronde regarding impacts to historic and archaeological resources in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Attachment C, <i>Cultural Resource Survey for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project, Multnomah and Washington Counties, Oregon</i>, of this Final EIS provides further details on the methods, research, coordination and documentation completed under Section 106. The mitigation commitments to address adverse effects on historic and archaeological resources are documented in Appendix K, Memorandum of Agreement for Historic and Archaeological Resources, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Regarding the potential disturbance or destruction of archaeological resources, the Project would include construction activities that could permanently alter archaeological resources, including up to four known archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The analysis has also identified high probability areas (HPAs), which are locations where project archaeologists have predicted a high likelihood of discovering a significant archaeological site. The HPAs include a potential village of the Tualatin Band of Kalapuya, referred to as the Place of Aromatic Herbs in project documents (from the name <i>čhačhimahiyuk</i>). Mitigation measures to address impacts to archaeological resources include completing additional archaeological surveying prior to construction, monitoring for archaeological resources during construction, and following an inadvertent discovery plan when resources are identified during construction. These mitigation commitments are documented in Appendix K of this Final EIS. The associated plans are provided in Attachment C of this Final EIS. Section 4.6, Historic and Archaeological Resources, of this Final EIS provides a summary of the Project's historic and archaeological impacts.</p> <p>Regarding the degradation of water quality, impacts could result from converting existing vegetation to impervious surfaces such as streets and park and ride lots, as well as from ongoing activities at the Hunziker O&amp;M Facility. Since the Draft EIS, the Preferred Alternative has been designed to include stormwater treatment facilities such as basins, including at park and rides and at the O&amp;M facility. Water quality treatment would be provided for approximately 82 acres of existing impervious surface that is currently untreated and would be modified by the Project, including much of SW Barbur Boulevard. These upgrades likely would result in a decrease in the amount of pollutants reaching surface waters under most storm conditions. Activities at the O&amp;M facility would be conducted to protect water quality by preventing, containing and cleaning up spills in accordance with applicable requirements. For more information on water quality impacts, please see Section 4.9, Ecosystems, and Section 4.10, Water Resources, of this Final EIS. Appendix L, Biological Opinion, of this Final EIS provides additional detail in the context of the Project's effects on federally-listed threatened and endangered fish species, which include several species identified as significant to the Grand Ronde.</p> <p>Regarding the disruption/alteration of hydrology, impacts could result from new or reconstructed stream crossings, new floodplain crossings, and new impervious surface. Converting existing vegetation into new impervious surfaces could affect groundwater recharge; increase runoff volumes, flow rates and flooding frequencies; and contribute to stream erosion and aquatic habitat degradation. Since the Draft EIS, the Preferred Alternative has been designed avoid or minimize these impacts by including stormwater flow control, such as detention ponds or vaults. The Preferred Alternative has also been designed to cross all surface streams and floodplains on elevated structures. These structures may require pier columns within floodplains, but no fill or abutments would be placed within floodplains. A future engineering study would determine the extent of compensatory flood storage and stream mitigation necessary to address the effects of piers within the floodplain. For more information</p>

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
					<p>on hydrology impacts and the resulting effects on fish species, see Section 4.9, Section 4.10 and Appendix L of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Regarding the loss/fragmentation of habitats, the Project could impact aquatic habitat, terrestrial habitat, and wetlands. Impacts to aquatic habitat as a result of stormwater runoff or stream crossings are discussed in the two preceding paragraphs. The Preferred Alternative would cross two streams that flow into Fanno Creek and may contain resident fish species: Red Rock Creek and Ball Creek. Both of these streams would be crossed using elevated structures to allow for fish passage. Impacts to terrestrial habitat include removal of trees and other vegetation in areas designated as environmental zones within Portland or as vegetated corridors within Tigard. Informed by the discussions with the Grand Ronde in 2019, TriMet has included mitigation language in Section 4.9 of this Final EIS committing to provide consulting tribes the opportunity to harvest culturally significant plants, such as western red cedar, prior to vegetation removal during construction. Some of this vegetation removal would be within the Westside Wildlife Corridor, which is an area that has been identified by Portland Parks and Recreation as a target for linking wildlife passage between Forest Park and Tryon Creek along the forested spine of the West Hills. The Marquam Hill Connection would also introduce new infrastructure through Terwilliger Parkway, which is part of the Westside Wildlife Corridor. The connection would use inclined elevators operating on an angled structure above the hillside, which would be designed to allow wildlife passage underneath and minimize light spillover to the vegetated areas below the structure. The Project could impact small wetlands in Portland that are along SW Barbur Boulevard and along the freight railroad in Tigard, and would cross larger wetlands along Red Rock Creek near Highway 217 in Tigard. These larger wetlands along Red Rock Creek would be crossed on an elevated structure, which would limit permanent impacts to the area of the bridge piers. Unavoidable impacts to wetlands would be addressed under state and federal regulations, including Clean Water Act Section 404 and the Oregon DSL Removal-Fill permitting process. For more information on habitat impacts, see Section 4.9 and Attachment D, Ecosystems Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>FTA, TriMet and Metro recognize that the above resources contribute to tribal cultural landscapes within the project area and the broader ceded tribal homelands of the Grand Ronde. The analysis of impacts and the mitigation measures identified in this Final EIS are reflective of input from the Grand Ronde.</p> <p>FTA, TriMet and Metro also acknowledge and value the government-to-government relationship with the Grand Ronde and have appreciated your engagement and input throughout this process.</p>
A1	U.S. Department of the Interior	Allison O'Brien	Not specified	<p>The Department of the Interior has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Section 4(f)/6(f) Evaluation Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project (MAX) line from Portland to Tigard and Bridgeport Village in Tualatin, Oregon. We have no comments on the draft EIS.</p> <p>The Department, through the National Park Service (NPS), first began working with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) on this proposal in 2016 during early scoping to inform the preparation of the EIS. NPS has met with FTA twice in Seattle to discuss the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) program, opportunities for coordination, and the potential alignment choices that would result in NPS having a related action. NPS has also been working closely with representatives from the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department and the City of Portland.</p> <p>As noted in the draft EIS, this project is likely to impact a portion of Terwilliger Parkway, a LWCF site. The LWCF Act (codified at 54 U.S.C. Section 200305) and existing regulations (36 CFR 59) require that any impacts to LWCF sites from non-recreation uses result in a conversion of perpetual stewardship requirements from one location to another. NPS understands that the conversion footprint will be determined prior to release of the final EIS, which will also address potential impacts associated with acquisition and development of any needed replacement parks. NPS intends to use the analysis presented in the final EIS to inform our determination about the equivalency of the conversion and replacement properties in advance of approving any conversion request submitted on behalf of the City of Portland.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to continue with our collaboration on this phase of the proposed project.</p>	<p>Thank you for providing this letter during the Draft EIS comment period.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 9 regarding impacts to Terwilliger Parkway related to the Marquam Hill Connection.</p> <p>The Draft EIS identified potential Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) conversions for the Project at two separate locations within Terwilliger Parkway (a city park): Parcel 1S1E16AD-00200 (known as the Gilbert Parcel) and Parcel 1S1E16AA-00400 (a small triangle-shaped parcel along SW Barbur Boulevard, referred to as "the triangle parcel"). Since the Draft EIS, FTA has conducted additional research regarding the status of these properties and has found that no LWCF properties would be converted for the Project. The Gilbert Parcel is subject to the protections of Section 6(f) of the LWCF Act but would be avoided by the Project. Based on additional information provided by FTA, the National Park Service has concluded that the triangle parcel is not included in the LWCF encumbrance boundary for Terwilliger Parkway and that work in that parcel would not cause a conversion of use under the LWCF Act. Appendix N, Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act Documentation, of this Final EIS includes more information on the research and findings regarding Section 6(f), including related coordination with the National Park Service.</p>

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
A2	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Jill A Nogi	Not specified	<p>The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has reviewed the draft environmental impact statement for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project, Multnomah and Washington Counties, Oregon (EPA Region 10 Project Number 16-0051-FTA/CEQ No. 20180131 ; ) pursuant to Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and the National Environmental Policy Act.</p> <p>Federal Transit Administration, Metro, and the Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon propose to construct and operate a 12-mile extension of the existing Metropolitan Area Express (MAX) light rail network to serve southwest Portland, Tigard, and Tualatin. The Draft EIS examines a No Action Alternative and light rail alignment alternatives within three project area segments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Segment A: Inner Portland;</li> <li>• Segment B: Outer Portland; and</li> <li>• Segment C: Tigard and Tualatin.</li> </ul> <p>Additional project elements would be paired with all alignment alternatives. These include up to 13 new stations, a new operations and maintenance facility in Tigard, a shared transitway, up to seven park-and-rides, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, a transit shuttle, and a new pedestrian connection to the Oregon Health Sciences University on Marquam Hill. A draft Preferred Alternative, the initial route proposal, is based on Alternatives A 1, B2, and C2. A shorter Minimum Operable Segment route terminating at the Tigard Transit Center could also be approved if there is insufficient funding to construct the entire light rail line. A final Preferred Alternative will be identified in the Final EIS.</p> <p>The EPA supports the proposed project, and we commend the project partners for conducting a thorough NEPA process. The project purpose and need are well documented, a range of alternatives are presented for each project segment, and the use of existing rights-of-way is emphasized to help reduce project impacts. The alignments would generally be either center-running within existing or new streets, or adjacent to roadways or railroads. The light rail project has the potential to offer environmental, aesthetic, and human health benefits within the affected corridor, which could help to mitigate the impacts to communities most affected by project construction, operation, and maintenance. Using the draft preferred alternative as a basis for evaluation, we are rating the proposed project as EC-1, Environmental Concerns, Sufficient Information. An explanation of the EPA rating system is enclosed with this letter.</p> <p>Briefly, our concerns and recommendations for your consideration are below:</p> <p>Our review finds there would be floodplain impacts from all alternatives in Segment C except C6, and we have an additional concern regarding the location of the Hunziker operations and maintenance facility in the floodplain of Red Rock Creek. The alternative O&amp;M facility locations mentioned in the Draft EIS are the Through 72nd Facility, which pairs with Alternatives C1 and C3, and the Branched 72<sup>nd</sup> Facility, which pairs with Alternatives C5 and C6. We recommend considering the selection of a 72<sup>nd</sup> Facility location to avoid siting the O&amp;M facility in the floodplain.</p> <p>In addition, the removal of trees and impacts to stream buffers, wetlands, park lands, and community gardens would occur with project construction. We appreciate the efforts to minimize these impacts articulated in the Draft EIS, and we encourage consideration of some additional mitigation measures to offset these losses. For example, we recommend consideration of whether community garden plots removed due to the project footprint might be re-established elsewhere in the affected communities. We also recommend all new parking areas, bike lanes, sidewalks and station areas incorporate pervious pavement and vegetated strips as much as possible, to reduce the amount of polluted stormwater runoff that is typical with additional impervious surface construction.</p> <p>The Air Quality Section of the Draft EIS includes discussion of mitigation measures to control dust emissions during project construction but does not address construction mitigation measures for diesel emissions. We recommend the Final EIS include a construction mitigation plan for diesel emissions that would prevent and reduce diesel emissions throughout project construction. For more information, contact Dan Brown in the EPA Portland Operations Office at 503-326-6832 or at brown.dan@epa.gov.</p> <p>We appreciate the opportunity to review the Southwest Corridor Draft EIS and look forward to the Final EIS.</p>	<p>Thank you for providing this letter during the Draft EIS comment period.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS for a description of the Project, including the Preferred Alternative and the terminus options.</p> <p>Please see Section 6.5, Agency and Tribal Coordination, of this Final EIS regarding consultation undertaken with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as part of the Project.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.10, Water Resources, of this Final EIS for more about floodplain impacts associated with the Project. Specific to your comment, the design of the Hunziker O&amp;M Facility has been modified to avoid placing structures or other impervious surfaces in the floodplain.</p> <p>Regarding your suggested mitigation for removal of community garden plots, the Project is no longer anticipated to remove any garden plots within the affected community gardens. Please see Section 4.7, Parks and Recreation Resources, of this Final EIS for discussion of impacts to community gardens and other parks.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of this Final EIS regarding impacts to trees, stream buffers and wetlands, and related mitigation measures.</p> <p>Regarding the use of pervious pavement, pervious pavement has been and will be considered for the Project. However, soil types throughout the corridor are not conducive for optimal use of pervious pavements. As noted in Appendix L, Biological Opinion, of this Final EIS, a key factor in designing any stormwater management facility is soil type, especially their infiltration potential. Most of the project soils are hydrologic C type, which typically do not drain or infiltrate well. Additionally, much of the alignment along SW Barbur Boulevard includes steep slopes and slide-prone areas which would not support infiltration. Pockets of hydrologic Group B soils exist near the south end of the alignment in Tigard. Group B soils infiltrate moderately.</p> <p>Section 4.10 additionally describes stormwater detention and treatment throughout the corridor. Vegetated strips are a component of the Project in many areas. As noted above, no community garden plots are anticipated to be removed in association with the Project.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.12, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, of this Final EIS regarding construction mitigation measures for diesel emissions, specifically referencing the City of Portland's Clean Air Construction Program related to diesel emissions during construction.</p>
A3	U.S. National Park Service	Heather Ramsay	Not specified	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this document and for all your early coordination efforts. As previously discussed, I understand that you are still in the process of refining alignments and that it can't yet be determined whether or not an LWCF conversion will be required. We discussed keeping the analysis in the dEIS general and then revising the documentation to include more specificity in the fEIS once the final alignment and replacement property (if needed) is known. I think appendix D does a good job of capturing what we agreed to and includes a nice summary of the process and the resource. Thank you!</p>	<p>Thank you for providing this comment during the Draft EIS comment period.</p> <p>The Draft EIS identified potential Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) conversions for the Project at two separate locations within Terwilliger Parkway (a city park): Parcel 1S1E16AD-00200 (known as the Gilbert Parcel) and Parcel 1S1E16AA-00400 (a small triangle-shaped parcel along SW Barbur Boulevard, referred to as "the triangle parcel"). Since the Draft EIS, FTA has conducted additional research regarding the status of these properties and has found that no LWCF properties would be converted for the Project. The Gilbert Parcel is subject to the</p>

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
				<p>Because the actual light rail project does not require a permit or funding from the LWCF program, I have only reviewed the sections of the report specific to LWCF and not any aspect of the broader project. That said, there are a couple of spots in the document that could use a little refinement regarding the LWCF program:</p> <p>S-22: LWCF requirements apply whether the property was acquired, developed, or merely part of a park that was acquired or developed with LWCF funds. Saying they apply to parcels that were acquired is only partially true and potentially misleading. The statement on 4-67 is better.</p> <p>D-51: Grammar note second line of the first paragraph - I think you mean grants (plural) not grant (singular)...or maybe *a* grant...? Also, you talk about three types of conversions but there are only two bullets.</p> <p>Since this is the city's park, I can't speak to the merits of conversion versus additional impacts to private property (required if alignment were shifted to avoid the park). However, I don't foresee any major challenges to locating suitable replacement property. That is, I don't identify any outdoor recreation resources or other unique characteristics of the site that would make finding something with "similar usefulness" impossible.</p> <p>I look forward to our further coordination on this project.</p>	<p>protections of Section 6(f) of the LWCF Act but would be avoided by the Project. Based on additional information provided by FTA, the National Park Service has concluded that the triangle parcel is not included in the LWCF encumbrance boundary for Terwilliger Parkway and that work in that parcel would not cause a conversion of use under the LWCF Act. Appendix N, Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act Documentation, of this Final EIS includes more information on the research and findings regarding LWCF resources, including related coordination with the National Park Service.</p> <p>Regarding your comment on page S-22, the text in the Summary has been updated to clarify that the Section 6(f) requirements apply to properties that were acquired or developed with LWCF assistance, or were part of a park that was acquired or developed with LWCF assistance.</p> <p>Regarding your comment on page D-51, the word "grant" has been replaced with "grants from the fund" in the equivalent sentence in Appendix N of this Final EIS. The bullets describing full and partial conversions are not included in this Final EIS.</p>
A4	ODOT	Rian Windsheimer	Not specified	<p>Thank you for providing the opportunity to review and comment on the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). We congratulate Metro, TriMet and agency partners on achieving this major milestone. ODOT has been an active participant in the development of the Project and remains a committed partner in this important regional endeavor. As discussed throughout the Project's duration, ODOT generally supports the DEIS's Initial Route Proposal (IRP), which will serve an important role in meeting the Portland region's growing transportation needs.</p> <p>This letter describes ODOT's feedback on the DEIS. The sections immediately below outline our general comments and concerns, while Appendix A presents detailed comments on the DEIS document, appendices and attachments.</p> <p><b>General Comments and Concerns</b></p> <p><u>Jurisdictional Transfer and Travel Forecast Year:</u></p> <p>One of ODOT's primary concerns relates to the travel forecast year included in the DEIS, which is based on the assumption of a jurisdictional transfer of Barbur Boulevard and Naito Parkway that has yet to be finalized. Per the understanding between our respective agencies on the travel forecast year (defined in ODOT's January 5, 2017 letter), Metro and TriMet staff used a 2035 forecast year for the DEIS, with 2045 forecast year analyses only at interchanges that affect I-5 and I-405 ramp operations. We understand that FTA requested use of the 2035 forecast year as a measure for near-term light rail ridership. However, FHWA and ODOT require a 2045 forecast year analysis for federal and state facilities to ensure roadway modifications serve the traveling public 20 years from project opening.</p> <p>Use of the 2035 travel forecast year in the DEIS for Barbur Boulevard and Naito Parkway relies on a jurisdictional transfer of these two highways within Portland city limits from the State to the City of Portland. Project partners set an initial target of Portland City Council action on a jurisdictional transfer intergovernmental agreement (IGA) no later than June of 2017 and in advance of DEIS publication. As of July 2018, ODOT and the City of Portland continue to negotiate the transfer terms, with no City-defined schedule for Council action. Absent a transfer IGA, the 2035 analysis for Barbur Boulevard and Naito Parkway in the DEIS is insufficient to meet state requirements. In addition, ODOT requires updated analysis using a 2045 forecast year or an executed transfer IGA to endorse a locally preferred alternative.</p> <p><u>Barbur Viaducts</u></p> <p>ODOT supports the light rail alignment utilizing SW Barbur Boulevard's Newbury and Vermont structures (commonly referred to as the Barbur viaducts). ODOT has significant concerns about potential geotechnical impacts associated with the side-running light rail alignment depicted in the IRP's "Design Refinement #1" (particularly to the recently completed I-5 retaining wall), as well as potential encroachments into the I-5 planning envelope. Should Design Refinement #1 continue to be explored in the FEIS, further investigation of geotechnical, right-of-way and fiscal constraints will be necessary.</p> <p><u>I-5 and OR-99W Planning Envelopes</u></p> <p>ODOT has a planning envelope for I-5 and OR-99W in the Portland metro region to protect future right-of-way needs for operational and safety improvements. Future I-5 improvements continue to be studied and include, but are not limited to, adding a truck climbing lane to facilitate freight operations, building new auxiliary lanes to</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the initial route proposal.</p> <p>Comments provided by ODOT in Appendix A of this comment letter have been separated into distinct comments and responses below, identified as comments A4–A110.</p> <p>Regarding your comments about jurisdictional transfer of SW Barbur Boulevard, the City of Portland and ODOT have signed an intergovernmental agreement to transfer ownership and maintenance responsibilities of a portion of SW Barbur Boulevard from ODOT to the City of Portland. This agreement is conditional on the Project's reconstructing the roadway as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed support for utilizing the Newbury and Vermont viaducts in Segment A (Inner Portland), as opposed to a separate structure to the east of SW Barbur Boulevard, which was studied as Refinement 1 in the Draft EIS. Refinement 1 is not included in the Preferred Alternative. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Regarding your comment on the I-5 and Pacific Highway (99W) planning envelopes, TriMet, Metro and ODOT have coordinated in the areas where the light rail alternatives are proposed within the I-5 right of way, and where ODOT ramps would be affected. TriMet will continue to coordinate with ODOT on final designs and permitting following publication of the Final EIS.</p> <p>Regarding your comment on I-5 safety and operations, per the <i>Analysis Methods for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Environmental Impact Statement</i> (Metro, 2017) (please see <a href="https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf">https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf</a>), the EIS includes mitigation measures to address anticipated impacts to I-5 ramps. These mitigation measures were developed with input from ODOT and other partner agencies.</p> <p>Regarding the Ross Island Bridgehead, the Final EIS studies the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration as a related transportation improvement. The Bridgehead designs were modified for the Final EIS, and related traffic modeling and analysis were updated, in coordination with ODOT and City of Portland staff. The Final EIS evaluates the Bridgehead assuming completion of the Preferred Alternative, and clearly distinguishes significant adverse effects and mitigations from those required for the Preferred Alternative alone. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS for more information on the traffic analysis and proposed mitigations. As the project sponsors, ODOT and the City of Portland will continue to coordinate after the Final EIS on final designs and permitting.</p> <p>Regarding your comments on traffic analysis, the traffic analysis in the Final EIS reflects additional coordination with ODOT to ensure that the model calibration met ODOT protocol in accordance with the agreed-upon methods. Queuing impacts are reported, including ramp queue information, also in accordance with the agreed-upon methods. Projects included in the No-Build Alternative have been confirmed for the Final EIS. Please see Appendix A, Detailed</p>

Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
				<p>address localized bottlenecks, providing shoulders to meet federal interstate design standards, improving sight distance, adjusting curve shifts, and considering value pricing infrastructure as directed by House Bill 2017. As Project design progresses, including design of the refinements considered in the IRP, ODOT will need certainty that the Project will remain outside of the I-5 and OR-99W planning envelopes and does not preclude future improvements to State facilities. Preserving the planning envelopes is critical in supporting ODOT’s mission to a safe and efficient transportation system that supports economic opportunities and livable communities for Oregonians.</p> <p><u>I-5 Safety and Operations</u></p> <p>The DEIS indicates that, compared with the No-Build Alternative, several of the light rail alternatives would generate significant adverse impacts (delays and queuing) at I-5 ramp termini, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I-5 southbound off-ramp at Terwilliger/Barbur/Bertha (queuing significantly exceeds No-Build level)</li> <li>• I-5 southbound off-ramp at Barbur/24th (volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio significantly exceeds No-Build level)</li> <li>• I-5 southbound off-ramp at Taylors Ferry (v/c ratio significantly exceeds No-Build level)</li> <li>• I-5 northbound off-ramp at Haines/65th (queuing significantly exceeds No-Build level)</li> <li>• I-5 northbound off-ramp at Carman (v/c ratio and queuing significantly exceed No-Build level)</li> <li>• I-5 southbound off-ramp at Upper Boones Ferry (v/c ratio and queuing significantly exceed No-Build level)</li> <li>• I-5 northbound off-ramp at Lower Boones Ferry (queuing significantly exceeds No-Build level)</li> </ul> <p>In the FEIS, additional information is sought to better understand freeway off-ramp impacts including queuing distances. Additionally, where Project-related significant impacts to ramp termini are anticipated, mitigation measures should be identified to restore operations to or near No-Build levels, per the Oregon Highway Plan. This may include evaluating the sizing of future park-and-rides (e.g., Bridgeport Village, Upper Boones Ferry Road, SW 53rd Avenue, Barbur Transit Center) and refining other local street and intersection design assumptions. As design conversations progress, we look forward to working with agency partners to identify solutions to avoid, minimize or mitigate safety and operational issues in these areas.</p> <p><u>Ross Island Bridgehead</u></p> <p>Separate but concurrent with the EIS process, ODOT and the City of Portland are actively developing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) outlining a work plan for the Ross Island Bridgehead area. The MOU will be finalized upon completion of the Barbur/Naito jurisdictional transfer. ODOT understands that modifications to the Bridgehead area are being considered as part of the Project. The Ross Island Bridgehead is a state facility (US-26) and is regionally significant in facilitating travel between Washington County and East Portland, as well as to areas north and south of central Portland. As the owner of the Bridgehead, ODOT’s goal is to maintain and/or improve safety and operations of US-26 and connecting state facilities (I-405, I-5, Sunset Highway, Powell Boulevard, Naito Parkway, and OR-43), as well to preserve and enhance highway connections for regional traffic movement and avoid precluding future highway improvements to this area. In the FEIS, confirmation of the existing conditions model calibration should be complete prior to substantially advancing future-year analyses in this area.</p> <p>Sufficient traffic analysis will also be needed to differentiate the Project mitigation measures that have a nexus to the traffic impacts resulting from light rail on Barbur Boulevard versus additional modifications to the Bridgehead that are supplemental to the Project mitigation measures. Finally, the analysis will also need to demonstrate that the modifications do not degrade the safety and operations of the state facilities and that ODOT’s v/c ratio mobility targets can still be met for a 20-year design horizon from construction. While ODOT remains committed to considering all options, this information will be needed in advance of ODOT supporting a final Bridgehead design.</p> <p><u>Traffic Analysis</u></p> <p>Related to the topic areas above, ODOT offers the following general traffic analysis comments, and we look forward to these issues being resolved in the FEIS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Model calibration: Prior to substantially advancing future-year analyses, confirmation of the existing conditions model calibration should be complete. For example, some of the current model outputs appear to show intersections operating better than what is observed in the field or otherwise supported by available data. Additionally, model inputs (e.g., intersection volumes) appear to be missing in some locations. Accurately representing existing conditions is critical to understanding potential future transportation issues (and applicable mitigation) with and without the Project. This is especially important for key areas including the Ross Island</li> </ul>	<p>Maps and Descriptions of the Alternatives, of this Final EIS for a list of notable projects included in the traffic modeling.</p>

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
				<p>Bridgehead, design refinement areas, and other locations where further design options are being considered (e.g., Upper Boones Ferry).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No-Build Alternative assumptions: In the FEIS, confirmation of the specific projects assumed in the No-Build Alternative is requested.</li> <li>• Queuing impacts: In the FEIS, ODOT seeks a more thorough presentation of potential queuing impacts, both for the street system and freeway off-ramps. Where applicable, queues should be further broken out by lane (not just by movement). Additional requested information includes the peak hour for each queue, specific queue lengths, and documentation whether a queue impacts upstream intersections or freeway mainlines. This information will provide a better understanding of system-wide operational impacts.</li> </ul> <p>As the Project progresses to and beyond the FEIS, ODOT looks forward to participating in the Locally Preferred Alternative design process, including further defining assumptions in the Design Refinement areas, and refining project designs throughout the study area to ensure safety and convenience for all transportation users.</p> <p>ODOT appreciates the substantial work undertaken by Metro, TriMet and the project team to complete the DEIS. We remain a committed partner in this important regional effort, and look forward to continued collaboration with our agency partners. Thank you for your ongoing partnership and assistance with resolving the issues described above.</p>	
A5	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3	"If Barbur Blvd. and Naito Pkwy. remain under ODOT jurisdiction at the time of project development, ODOT's access management regulations will need to be followed regarding the restriction of turn movements along the highway (OAR 734-051-1065) and any proposed modification, relocation or closure of any driveway along the highway (see OAR 734-051-5120)."	The Final EIS assumes that a jurisdictional transfer will occur for SW Barbur Boulevard and SW Naito Parkway. The project team will continue to work with project partners, including ODOT and the City of Portland, to ensure that the Project is designed to meet applicable standards.
A6	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3	Oregon 99W becomes a Reduction Review Route south of Milepost 7.16 in Tigard.	TriMet expects to follow ODOT's prescribed process for review of vehicle carrying capacity for any roadway modifications along this section of Pacific Highway (99W).
A7	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3, page 3-1	In the FEIS, further explanation of how "mainline freeways" were evaluated is requested.	As documented in the Draft EIS, mainline freeway operations on I-5 and I-405 would not be impacted by the Project and were not included in the analysis. However, queuing was reviewed to ensure that ramp queues would not spill onto the freeway mainline. This queuing review is documented in the Final EIS in Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation.
A8	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3, page 3-4, Section 3.1.4, second paragraph	Queuing on off-ramps becomes an issue when the queue extends into the ramp's deceleration area (not at the gore point or on the freeway mainline).	Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of the Final EIS includes, as an impact of concern, off-ramp queuing that extends into the ramp's deceleration area. The <i>Analysis Methods for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Environmental Impact Statement</i> (Metro, 2017) (please see <a href="https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf">https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf</a> ), developed in coordination with ODOT specifically address safe stopping distance for freeway off-ramps.
A9	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3, page 3-4, Section 3.1.4, second paragraph	In the FEIS, a table presenting the results (and how they do/do not meet V/C standard) would lend a better understanding of the impacts.	Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of the Final EIS includes a new table, Table 3.1-2, Intersections Currently Not Meeting V/C Targets During AM Or PM Peak Hour, presenting the intersections that do not currently meet volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio targets during the AM or PM peak hour.
A10	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3, page 3-7	In the FEIS, a more detailed description of impacts is requested (e.g., including queuing impacts, available storage, impacts to adjacent intersections).	Detailed queuing data can be found in the Final EIS in Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, and its appendices. Existing queuing information was updated for Segment A for the Final EIS.
A11	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3, pages 3-8 – 3-9, first full paragraph	It should be noted that Barbur Blvd. functions as an incident management route when non-recurring congestion or other events adversely impact operations on I-5.	Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of the Final EIS notes that SW Barbur Boulevard is a parallel route that some drivers use when there are incidents on I-5.
A12	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3, page 3-10, Section 3.2.1, first paragraph	In the FEIS, please confirm the "future travel levels" (including the anticipated differentials) for both the No-Build and the light rail alternatives.	Section 3.2.1, Regional and Corridor Travel Impacts, of the Final EIS includes updated language on future travel levels.
A13	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3, page 3-10	Segment A: In the FEIS, please provide a more detailed description of the affected streets and the associated traffic impacts.	A more detailed description of affected streets and associated traffic impacts can be found in Section 3.3.2, Segment A System-wide Analysis, of Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of the Draft EIS and Section 3.2, Segment B Existing Conditions, of Attachment B, Transportation Impact Results Report, of the Final EIS.
A14	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3, page 3-11	"Service Levels": In the FEIS, confirmation of the frequency of trains and relative traffic operations impacts is requested. For instance, 18 trains per hour in the peak period (9 in each direction) would consume extensive signal green time in each hour (depending on signal coordination and the amount of time each gate closure event).	The assumed frequency shown in this section of the Draft EIS is correct and is used as the basis for analysis in the Final EIS.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
A15	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3, page 3-18, Table 3.2-5	In the FEIS, please confirm the anticipated operational results. For instance, projected results for the Barbur/Bancroft intersection appear relatively optimistic, given that this intersection will accommodate many left turn movements under the light rail alternatives.	The anticipated operational results identified in Table 3.2-5, Segment A Intersections Not Meeting V/C Targets for Forecast Year 2035, in the Draft EIS have been confirmed in the Final EIS. Build volume forecasts have been updated since the Draft EIS, and were reviewed by project partners, including ODOT and the City of Portland. The updated volumes resulted in a slight decrease in southbound left-turn demand, and thus the Final EIS shows improved PM peak hour operations with the Preferred Alternative.
A16	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3, page 3-18	Segment A queuing: In the FEIS, additional discussion regarding anticipated queuing is requested for: I-405 SB to Ross Island Bridgehead/SE Powell Blvd., Barbur/Sheridan/Arthur area, and intersections in downtown Portland.	In Section 3.2.4, Motor Vehicle Operations Impacts, of the Final EIS, the queuing discussion for Segment A has been expanded to include a discussion of the traffic flow along U.S. 26 from I-405 to the Ross Island Bridge. The grade separation of the Preferred Alternative over SW Caruthers Street and SW Sheridan Street has also significantly lessened the Project's impact to the portion of U.S. 26 on surface streets. The downtown queuing discussion in the Final EIS focuses on I-405 and I-5 ramps, in accordance with the <i>Analysis Methods for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Environmental Impact Statement</i> (Metro, 2017) (please see <a href="https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf">https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf</a> ). The Project would not cause any significant changes in queuing at downtown intersections.
A17	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3, page 3-19, first and third bullets	In the FEIS, please confirm the anticipated traffic operations results for these locations.	Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS includes updated analysis of the anticipated traffic operations results at these locations.
A18	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3, page 3-19	Segment B Intersection Analysis: In the FEIS, please confirm that mitigation measures have been identified to restore traffic operations to (or near) No-Build levels at the four intersections listed.	Of the four intersections listed in the Draft EIS, only the SW Barbur Boulevard and SW Taylors Ferry Road/Barbur Transit Center Park and Ride access would require mitigation in accordance with the <i>Analysis Methods for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Environmental Impact Statement</i> (Metro, 2017) (please see <a href="https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf">https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf</a> ). Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS for the proposed mitigation. Impacts to the other three intersections have been avoided through design refinements to the Preferred Alternative; however, TriMet will continue working with ODOT on final designs and permitting for all locations where light rail interacts with an interstate ramp terminal, including at SW Barbur Boulevard and SW 24th Avenue.
A19	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3, page 3-20, Table 3.2-6	In the FEIS, please confirm whether the model calibration for these intersections is correct. Projected results at some intersections (e.g., Barbur/Capitol, Barbur/Terwilliger) appear under the light rail alternatives appear relatively optimistic.	In the Final EIS traffic analysis, the Segment B Highway Capacity Manual analysis was revised and confirmed.
A20	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3, pages 3-23 – 3-24	“Roadway Freight”: In the FEIS, please provide a more detailed discussion on the anticipated locations of access closures and U-turns, and their associated impacts on roadway freight movement.	Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of the Final EIS includes updated information on freight access and describes U-turns at major signalized intersections. No access would be precluded, but access would change for many businesses. During final design, TriMet would work with ODOT, the City of Portland and freight community representatives to confirm the characteristics of U-turns and alternative freight routes.
A21	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3, pages 3-23 – 3-24	“Roadway Freight”: In the FEIS, consider expanding the section to discuss access management to describe challenges or potential impacts to properties with direct access to Barbur.	Please see the response to Comment A20.
A22	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3, page 3-23 – 3-24	“Roadway Freight”: In the FEIS, expand the discussion to include gas station access for large trucks delivering fuel.	Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of the Final EIS describes that truck access in Segment B would be altered but maintained at two gas stations.
A23	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3, page 3-26, Table 3.3-1	In the FEIS, please confirm that the proposed mitigation measures would adequately address the identified issues.	The mitigation measures proposed in Table 3.3-1 of the Draft EIS have been updated in the Final EIS based on the updated impacts assessment, and are shown in Table 3.6-1, Potential Motor Vehicle Mitigation, of the Final EIS. TriMet and Metro consulted with ODOT staff during preparation of the Final EIS on mitigation language and on the process for post-EIS design and permitting collaboration.
A24	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3, page 3-27, Table 3.3-1	The proposed mitigation measure at Barbur/24th may not be less effective, given that a degree of enforcement may be necessary.	The updated traffic analysis in the Final EIS shows that the intersection of SW Barbur Boulevard and SW 24th Avenue would not require mitigation with the Preferred Alternative based on the agreed-upon volume-to-capacity ratio thresholds. TriMet will continue working with ODOT on final designs and permitting for all locations where light rail interacts with an interstate ramp terminal, including at SW Barbur Boulevard and SW 24th Avenue.
A25	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3, page 3-27, Table 3.3-1	In the FEIS, please describe in further detail the anticipated queuing for I-5 off-ramps.	I-5 ramp queuing is described in the Final EIS in Section 3.2.5, Motor Vehicle Queuing Impacts. Additional queuing analysis is included in Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of the Final EIS.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
A26	ODOT	Unknown	Chapter 3, page 3-27, Table 3.3-1	In the FEIS, please confirm the proposed location for additional vehicle storage at this intersection (e.g., 53rd NB leg versus Pomona WB leg).	The Final EIS assumes a second northbound lane at the SW 53rd Avenue/SW Barbur Boulevard intersection, with additional queuing on SW Pomona Street.
A27	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment A, page 4, Section 3.1.2	In the FEIS, please confirm that a consistent units are used (other sections of the DEIS appear to have used different units, thereby complicating the ability to compare between alternatives).	Different elements of the EIS analysis use a variety of different units of measurement, though units of measurement are the same when comparing specific analysis measures between alternatives. It is unclear what other sections or different units are being referred to in this comment.
A28	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment A, page 21, Section 3.4.2, second paragraph	In the FEIS, please clarify whether this scenario would result in additional parking demand (albeit at fewer park-and-rides) versus the full (non-MOS) light rail alternatives.	Based on the Final EIS traffic analysis, the terminus options would not result in significant additional parking demand compared to the Preferred Alternative.
A29	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B	In the FEIS, please ensure that the analysis, and presentation of results, is consistent with the previously-developed methodology. For example, queuing results should be rounded to the nearest 25 feet, and queuing should be presented by individual lane (not by general movement).	The queuing mitigation criteria threshold is defined as within 25 feet of the No-Build Alternative. Therefore, the results are not rounded to the nearest 25 feet in order to avoid a false mitigation identification. The approved methodology does not require rounding to the nearest 25 feet. Queuing results are represented by lane when possible, but in many instances this is not feasible with the approved software.
A30	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 3, Section 2.1	In the FEIS, please consider including the full methods report.	The full methods report, <i>Analysis Methods for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Environmental Impact Statement</i> (Metro, 2017), is available on Metro’s project website, (please see <a href="https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf">https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf</a> ).
A31	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 13, Section 3.2.3	In the FEIS, please clarify whether “worst case” is based on delay or V/C.	The “worst-case” approach at an intersection is based on volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio, not delay.
A32	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, pages 13 – 14, Table 3.2-2	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration. Traffic operations at some intersections are shown to perform better than they potentially do on-the-ground.	Existing conditions operations in the model were updated in the Final EIS and reviewed by Metro and ODOT staff, and are representative of on-the-ground conditions. Model results are documented in accordance with the ODOT Vissim Protocol within the appendices to Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS.
A33	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, pages 20 – 21	In the FEIS, please provide more detailed information regarding queueing (e.g., lengths, endpoints).	Detailed queuing data can be found in the Final EIS in Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, and its appendices. Existing queuing information was updated for Segment A for the Final EIS.
A34	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 21	The term “latent demand” is used incorrectly. This term more accurately applies to “future” scenario modeling, where anticipated improvements would generate new demand. Please adjust language in FEIS.	The term “latent demand” and discussion surrounding that term were removed from the Final EIS.
A35	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 22	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration. Traffic operations at some intersections are shown to perform better than they potentially do on-the-ground.	Please see the response to Comment A32.
A36	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 24, Table 3.2-5	In the FEIS, please confirm the latent demand. This likely should be zero vehicles.	Please see the response to Comment A34.
A37	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, pages 25 – 26	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration. Traffic operations in some areas are shown to perform better than they potentially do on-the-ground.	Please see the response to Comment A32.
A38	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 30, Section 3.3	In the FEIS, please provide the specific list of projects that are assumed under the No-Build alternative.	Projects assumed under the No-Build Alternative are documented in Appendix A, Detailed Maps and Descriptions of the Alternatives, of the Final EIS.
A39	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, pages 30 – 35	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration, and adjust future-year model results if necessary.	Please see the response to Comment A32.
A40	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, pages 36 – 39	In the FEIS, please clarify whether these maps depict a 1- versus 2-hour period.	The circulation study figures referenced in this comment refer to the AM and PM peak, which are 2-hour periods (7-9 AM and 4-6 PM). The circulation analysis has been updated for the Final EIS, specifically in Appendices B20 and B32 to Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report.
A41	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, pages 36 – 39	In the FEIS, please include supporting discussion describing where traffic is diverting to/from, and what is causing the associated increases/decreases in volumes.	Please see the response to Comment A40.
A42	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, pages 53 – 54	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration, and adjust future-year model results if necessary. Some intersections are shown to operate better compared with existing conditions.	Please see the response to Comment A32.
A43	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 63, Table 3.3-12	In the FEIS, please include supporting discussion describing where traffic is diverting to/from.	Please see the response to Comment A40.
A44	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 63, Table 3.3-12	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration, and adjust future-year model results if necessary.	Please see the response to Comment A32.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
A45	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, pages 65 – 66, Table 3.3-13	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration, and adjust future-year model results if necessary. Some intersections are shown to operate better compared with the No-Build Alternative.	Please see the response to Comment A32.
A46	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, pages 73 – 74, Table 3.3-14	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration, and adjust future-year model results if necessary. Some intersections are shown to operate better compared with the No-Build Alternative.	Please see the response to Comment A32.
A47	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 80, Table 3.3-15	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration, and adjust future-year model results if necessary. Some intersections are shown to operate better compared with the No-Build Alternative.	Please see the response to Comment A32.
A48	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, pages 86 – 87, Table 3.3-16	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration, and adjust future-year model results if necessary. Some intersections are shown to operate better compared with the No-Build Alternative.	Please see the response to Comment A32.
A49	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 93, Table 3.3-17	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration, and adjust future-year model results if necessary. Some intersections are shown to operate better compared with the No-Build Alternative.	Please see the response to Comment A32.
A50	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 114, first through fourth paragraphs	In the FEIS, please note that the OAR referenced in this section would continue to apply to much of the Ross Island Bridgehead area, as several connecting streets and ramps would remain under ODOT jurisdiction, regardless of the jurisdictional transfer of SW Naito Pkwy.	References to the Oregon Administrative Rules were included in the Draft EIS and will be applicable for roadways under ODOT’s jurisdiction.
A51	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 115, Section 3.3.7	In the FEIS, please provide a more detailed discussion on the anticipated locations of access closures and U-turns, and their associated impacts on roadway freight movement.	Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS includes updated information on freight access and describes U-turns at major signalized intersections. No access would be precluded, but access would change for many businesses. During final design, TriMet would work with ODOT, the City of Portland and freight community representatives to confirm the characteristics of U-turns and alternative freight routes.
A52	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 115	In the FEIS, consider expanding the section to discuss access management to describe challenges or potential impacts to properties with direct access to Barbur.	Please see the response to Comment A51.
A53	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 115	In the FEIS, expand the discussion to include gas station access for large trucks delivering fuel.	Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS describes that truck access in Segment B would be altered but maintained at two gas stations.
A54	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 127, Table 4.2-1	In the FEIS, please clarify that Interstate 5 is under the purview of both FHWA and ODOT.	Section 3.1, Affected Environment, of the Final EIS clarifies that I-5 is under the purview of both FHWA and ODOT.
A55	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 133	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration, and adjust future-year model results if necessary. For instance, the Barbur/22nd summary indicates that HCM does not account for aggressive driver behavior.	Please see the response to Comment A32.
A56	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 133, fifth bullet	In the FEIS, please confirm whether a “dump loop” was used to accommodate off ramp queuing at this location.	The Final EIS analysis did not include a dump loop to accommodate off-ramp queuing at this location (the I-5 off-ramp at SW Barbur Boulevard and SW 24th Avenue).
A57	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 133, ninth bullet	In the FEIS, a more detailed description of queuing impacts is requested.	The referenced section is intended to briefly summarize intersection operations where mobility targets are not met under existing conditions. It is not intended to provide detailed descriptions of queuing impacts under existing conditions, and therefore this section does not require additional detail in the Final EIS. A detailed presentation of queuing impacts for the Preferred Alternative can be found in the Final EIS in Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, and its appendices.
A58	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 134, first bullet	In the FEIS, a more detailed description of queuing impacts is requested.	Detailed queuing data can be found in the Final EIS in Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, and its appendices. Existing queuing information was updated for Segment A for the Final EIS.
A59	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 134	“2017 Existing Simulation Analysis”: In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration, including whether travel times were used, per VISSIM protocol.	Please see the response to Comment A32.
A60	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 142, first sentence at top of page	In the FEIS, please clarify how the volumes were adjusted.	The traffic volumes originated from the regional travel model, which accounts for changes in traffic based on changes in land use and population in the future forecast years. Volumes are adjusted to develop turning and through traffic volumes for use in detailed traffic analysis. The methodology is detailed in the <i>Analysis Methods for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Environmental Impact Statement (2017)</i> (please see <a href="https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf">https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf</a> ).
A61	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, pages 147 – 152	In the FEIS, please specify how roadway segment immediately adjacent to an existing pedestrian crossing would not meet pedestrian crossing standards. Some roadway segments are depicted as meeting the standard, while others are shown as not meeting the standard.	In the pedestrian crossing analysis, segments are bounded by their adjacent pedestrian crossings. If the roadway segment spans a greater distance than the standard, it is noted as not meeting pedestrian crossing standards.
A62	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, pages 154 – 155, Table 3.3-15	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration, and adjust future-year model results if necessary. Some intersections are shown to operate better compared with the existing conditions.	Please see the response to Comment A32.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
A63	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 160, Table 4.3-8	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration, and adjust future-year model results if necessary. Some intersections are shown to operate better compared with the No-Build Alternative.	Please see the response to Comment A32.
A64	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 161, Table 4.3-9	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration, and adjust future-year model results if necessary. Some intersections are shown to operate better compared with the No-Build Alternative.	Please see the response to Comment A32.
A65	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 166, Table 4.3-10	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration, and adjust future-year model results if necessary. Some intersections are shown to operate better in 2045 compared with 2035.	Please see the response to Comment A32.
A66	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 166, second paragraph, second sentence	In the FEIS, please confirm the source(s) of the congestion. The Terwilliger/Taylor's Ferry intersection may be contributing to operational issues at the interchange.	Analysis in the Final EIS discusses the congestion at this location in Section 3.3.2 of Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report. The Terwilliger/Taylor's Ferry intersection is not included as a study intersection. Based on the modeled data, during average peak hour conditions, queues at the SW Terwilliger Parkway/SW Taylor's Ferry Road intersection would not likely back up to the SW Terwilliger Parkway/I-5 interchange.
A67	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 166, final two paragraphs	In the FEIS, please include this added level of detail in the main document. Please also note the need for mitigation.	Queuing details are not included within the main Final EIS document but are described in Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report. The Final EIS analysis finds that at the I-5/SW Terwilliger Boulevard/SW Bertha Boulevard area the Project would not result in a deterioration of No-Build Alternative conditions beyond the thresholds set in the <i>Analysis Methods for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Environmental Impact Statement</i> (Metro, 2017) (please see <a href="https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf">https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf</a> ). TriMet will continue working with ODOT on final designs and permitting for all locations where light rail interacts with an interstate ramp terminal, including at this location.
A68	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 170, paragraphs 1 – 4	In the FEIS, please note that the OAR referenced in this section would continue to apply to much of the Ross Island Bridgehead area, as several connecting streets and ramps would remain under ODOT jurisdiction, regardless of the jurisdictional transfer of SW Naito Pkwy.	Please see the response to Comment A66.
A69	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 170	In the FEIS, please provide a more detailed discussion on the anticipated locations of access closures and U-turns, and their associated impacts on roadway freight movement.	Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS includes updated information on freight access and describes U-turns at major signalized intersections. No access would be precluded, but access would change for many businesses. During final design, TriMet would work with ODOT, the City of Portland and freight community representatives to confirm the characteristics of U-turns and alternative freight routes.
A70	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 174	In the FEIS, please confirm the percentage of demand expected to access the park-and-ride from I-5. The 5% estimate may understate the true demand, given this facility's relatively close proximity to, and relatively easy access from, I-5 northbound.	In the Final EIS, park and ride traffic distributions have been updated in Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report. The traffic models used for the analysis reflect a higher percentage of park and ride demand from I-5.
A71	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 174	In the FEIS, please confirm the anticipated construction timeframe.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, of the Final EIS for the anticipated construction schedule. Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS also provides estimated time frames for the construction of discrete project elements.
A72	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, pages 175 – 176	In the FEIS, please describe any proposed freight mitigation measures (to address access constraints, etc.)	No freight-specific mitigation measures are proposed in the Final EIS. Access would not be precluded at any site, though circulation would change. The Final EIS discusses these changes in Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigations, specifically Section 3.2.7, Freight Facility Impacts.
A73	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 176, third paragraph	In the FEIS, please further describe where northbound left-turning traffic would divert to.	The Draft EIS proposed a mitigation option that would close the northbound left turn at SW Barbur Boulevard/SW 24th Avenue/I-5 southbound off-ramp during the AM peak. That mitigation option is not proposed in the Final EIS.
A74	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 176, last paragraph	In the FEIS, please describe how queuing will be mitigated.	Queuing impacts and mitigation were updated for the Final EIS. Mitigation for Segment B has been moved from Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, to Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of the Final EIS.
A75	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 183, Table 5.2-1	Please confirm roadway ownership at freeway ramp termini	Roadway ownership as described in the Draft EIS is correct.
A76	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 192, Table 5.2-3	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration. Traffic operations at some intersections are shown to perform better than they potentially do on-the-ground.	Please see the response to Comment A32.
A77	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 193, Table 5.2-4	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration. Traffic operations at some intersections are shown to perform better than they potentially do on-the-ground.	Please see the response to Comment A32.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
A78	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 196	“SW Carman Drive/SW Upper Boones Ferry Road Subarea”: In the FEIS, please update this section per the ongoing traffic analysis that is being conducted for this area.	In the Final EIS, traffic analysis for this location has been updated, and updated results are included in both Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report.
A79	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 198, Table 5.2-8	In the FEIS, please update the table to include the eastbound right queue that is discussed in the second paragraph below the table.	Queuing with the No-Build Alternative and the Preferred Alternative is discussed in detail and updated in Section 4.3.3, Segment C Future Queuing Impacts, of Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report of this Final EIS.
A80	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 215, Table 5.3-5	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration, and adjust future-year model results if necessary. Some intersections are shown to operate better compared with the existing conditions.	Please see the response to Comment A32.
A81	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 220, Table 5.3-8	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration, and adjust future-year model results if necessary. Some intersections are shown to operate better compared with the existing conditions.	Please see the response to Comment A32.
A82	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 222, Table 5.3-10	In the FEIS, please clarify why there is no growth between 2035 and 2045.	Volume changes between 2035 and 2045 are based on the Metro travel demand model. The model shows that there is identified growth between 2035 and 2045, as can be seen by comparing Table 4.3-4, Segment C 2035 No-Build Alternative HCM (Synchro) Analysis – SW Carman Drive/SW Upper Boones Ferry Road Subarea, and Table 4.3-7, Segment C 2045 No-Build Alternative HCM (Synchro) Analysis – SW Carman Drive/SW Upper Boones Ferry Road Subarea, in Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS.
A83	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 236-253	In the FEIS, please confirm the existing conditions model calibration, and adjust future-year model results if necessary. Some intersections and roadway segments are shown to operate better compared with the No-Build Alternative.	Please see the response to Comment A32.
A84	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 243, Table 5.3-24	In the FEIS, please clarify why differing movements are shown, compared with the No-Build Alternative.	It is unclear which table the comment refers to regarding “differing movements.” The table this comment refers to displays the 2035 No-Build Alternative PM queuing.
A85	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 246, Table 5.3-28	In the FEIS, please clarify why differing movements are shown, compared with the No-Build Alternative	Please see the response to Comment A84.
A86	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 247, “Tigard Subarea” paragraph	These findings would also apply to areas in Segments A and B. In the FEIS, please incorporate these findings into the applicable sections throughout the FEIS.	In the Final EIS, references to queuing in all segments have been updated to note where queuing would change or degrade.
A87	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 249	The information presented in Table 5.3-31 appears to be inconsistent with the discussion on page 247 regarding light rail effects.	The Segment C analysis text in the Final EIS has been updated to rectify this discrepancy.
A88	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 260	In the FEIS, please clarify why queue lengths for intersections C30b, C31, C32 and C33 would increase compared with the No-Build alternative.	Language has been added to both Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to clarify that queue lengths would increase at these intersections due to the at-grade light rail crossings. The SimTraffic model also calculates slightly different queues each time the model is run, resulting in queue length differences between scenarios.
A89	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, pages 263 – 264	In the FEIS, please clarify why queue lengths for intersections C19 and C23 would increase compared with the No-Build alternative.	Language has been added to both Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to clarify that queue lengths would increase at intersection C23 due to the at-grade light rail crossings. For intersection C19, the Preferred Alternative would change volumes in the Tigard area compared to the No-Build Alternative. The SimTraffic model also calculates slightly different queues each time the model is run, resulting in queue length differences between scenarios.
A90	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, pages 263 – 264	In the FEIS, please clarify why the movements shown in Table 5.3-40 are different from what is shown in Table 5.3-36.	The analysis for 2045 is limited to the I-5 and I-405 ramp terminal locations only, as noted in the Final EIS in Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, Section 2.3.1, Segment A Future Intersection Operations.
A91	ODOT	Unknown	Attachment B, page 277	In the FEIS, please include the anticipated results of the proposed mitigation measures.	Relevant mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIS have been incorporated into the project design, and the traffic analysis in the Final EIS reflects these changes. The mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIS have been evaluated for their subsequent effects on traffic. None of the proposed traffic mitigations in the Final EIS are expected to result in other traffic impacts that would require mitigation. The traffic mitigations proposed would not have further quantifiable impacts on other issues areas, including ones related to private property.
A92	ODOT	Unknown	Appendix D, page D-20, Table D-2, Map ID #400	This old motel/motor court lacks integrity because of an incompatible standing seam metal roof and out-of-period replacement windows. It is not eligible for the National Register. This comment was raised in an earlier round of review (April 2017). It would be inappropriate to have the project try to mitigate for a Section 106 Adverse Effect on a historic resource that does not have the integrity required to be a historic property that is eligible for the National	The motel at 10138 SW Barbur Boulevard was identified as a potentially eligible historic resource in the Draft EIS. This property is not evaluated further in the Final EIS because it would not be impacted by the Preferred Alternative.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
				Register, or to evaluate a Section 4(f) use of it when the resource is clearly not a Section 4(f) "historic site." Please incorporate into the FEIS accordingly.	
A93	ODOT	Unknown	Appendix D, page D-25	Lair Hill Park: It is unclear what the preparer is attempting to communicate in this section. It appears that the potential project impacts to the park entrance and the backboard court are not minor, or de minimis. In any event, a use is a use in terms of Section 4(f) and parks. Separately, since the park is a Section 4(f) historic site and a contributing property to the historic district, one would need to determine how the project will impact the park as a historic site and how it will impact the district as a whole. The preparer states that the impacts to the park are minor, but that the project impacts to the district would be adverse. Is this the entire project's impacts to the district or only those involving this park? There is much that goes into determining whether a project will have a Section 4(f) use of a historic district. Please consult Question 7C of the 2012 FHWA Section 4(f) Policy Paper for guidance. <a href="https://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/legislation/section4f/4fpolicy.pdf">https://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/legislation/section4f/4fpolicy.pdf</a>	Appendix D has been updated since the Draft EIS and is presented as the Final Section 4(f) Evaluation in this Final EIS. FTA has made a determination that there would be a <i>de minimis</i> use of Lair Hill Park based on an evaluation of the impacts. Both Portland Parks & Recreation and the State Historic Preservation Office concurred with this determination. The selection of the Preferred Alternative has resulted in avoidance of the backboard court. The sidewalk will be slightly reconfigured in the northwest corner of the park. Impacts to the park would not result in a change of use within the park boundary.  Adverse impacts to the historic district would be the result of effects on other resources within the district. These impacts are documented under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. To learn more, see Section 4.6, Historic and Archaeological Resources, Attachment C, <i>Cultural Resource Survey for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project, Multnomah and Washington Counties, Oregon</i> , and Appendix D.
A94	ODOT	Unknown	Appendix D, page D-31	George Himes Natural Area Park: The document mentions closing SW Trail #3 during construction, but does not address Section 4(f) either as a temporary occupancy that does not constitute a Section 4(f) use if it meets certain criteria, such as having a reasonable detour route, or as a Section 4(f) use that will require an analysis. This is separate from the discussion in the document about a Section 4(f) de minimis use of the park as a historic site.	The temporary occupancy of George Himes Park is discussed in Appendix D, Final 4(f) Evaluation, of this Final EIS. Access to the trail would be restricted during construction but fully restored upon completion of construction.
A95	ODOT	Unknown	Appendix D, pages D-34 – D-43, Tables D4 through D7	The term "Potential Temporary Use" is used. Does this mean a temporary occupancy that is not a Section 4(f) use if it meets certain criteria? Or is it a temporary occupancy that will require analysis to determine if it meets de minimis impact criteria and is a de minimis use? Please clarify in FEIS.	Appendix D has been updated since the Draft EIS and is presented as the Final Section 4(f) Evaluation in this Final EIS, and includes full and definitive review of temporary uses. Proposed activities at George Himes Park were determined to meet the criteria for a Temporary Occupancy Exception; as the official with jurisdiction of the park, Portland Parks & Recreation concurred with this determination.
A96	ODOT	Unknown	Appendix D, pages D-46 – D-47, Table D8	Please confirm the accuracy of the table header names.	In Appendix D, Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation and Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Evaluation, of the Draft EIS, the table header names were correct in Table D8.
A97	ODOT	Unknown	Section 4.8, pages 4-81 – 4-84	Alternative A1 includes a design refinement for the "The Woods" section along Barbur Blvd. ODOT understands the refinement includes a side-running LRT in lieu of a center-running LRT. The siderunning refinement moves the NB and SB LRT lines immediately adjacent to the anchored retaining walls located between I-5 and Barbur Blvd. north and south of the Iowa Street viaduct on I-5, and in the vicinity of the Capitol Hwy. flyover on Barbur Blvd. The retaining walls along I-5 in this area were designed to resist loading from landslides, but were not designed for an additional surcharge. Reconfiguration of the slope above Walls 1 and 2 and changes to load conditions might change the location and geometry of the critical failure surfaces and could impact the long-term performance of the retaining walls.	Refinement 1 was not included in the Final EIS. The Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS includes center-running light rail in this section. Side-running light rail at this location is not included in the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS. The design team is addressing the risks of building in this area, and is evaluating loads and slope stability as designs advance.
A98	ODOT	Unknown	Section 4.8, pages 4-81 – 4-84	Alternative A1, Design Refinement 1: Any reconfiguration of slopes to unload the I-5 walls must also examine upslope stability to ensure the unloading does not destabilize the slopes above the alignment. These translate to cost-risks and it is not clear if these have been included.	Please see the response to Comment A97.
A99	ODOT	Unknown	Section 4.8, pages 4-81 – 4-84	Alternative A1, Design Refinement 1: Notes from the 3/20/2018 meeting regarding the Barbur Woods Side-Running Alignment (BW-SRA) indicate the "...side-running alignment includes drilled shaft foundations within 5-feet of tie-back anchors of I-5 wall." A 5-foot setback is likely inadequate given the design risks and construction-risks. There are design risks associated with the soil-structure interaction and the zones of influence around both the drilled shafts and the bond zone of the tiebacks. There are construction risks associated with the construction of the drilled shafts in close proximity to the tiebacks (repairing a damaged tieback would likely be very difficult and likely expensive). These translate to cost risks and it is not clear if these have been included.	Please see the response to Comment A97.
A100	ODOT	Unknown	Section 4.8, pages 4-81 – 4-84	Alternative A1, Design Refinement 1: Section 4.8.2 indicates, "There are no appreciable differences among the various alignment alternatives for the project..." This appears to be incorrect because the side-running alignment appears to have significant design risk and construction risk that translates to high cost risk and it is not clear if these have been included.	Please see the response to Comment A97.
A101	ODOT	Unknown	Section 4.12	If ODOT retains ownership of Barbur Blvd./Naito Pkwy., ODOT would require an air quality technical report with details on how the GHG emissions were calculated. The report would compare GHG emissions across alternatives (including No-Build) at the project level and also show how they relate to GHG emissions associated with current conditions. The emissions should be broken down into operational, maintenance and construction emissions.	The project team will continue to work with project partners, including ODOT and the City of Portland, to meet permitting requirements and ensure that the Project is designed to meet applicable standards.  The Final EIS has updated information on project impacts and mitigations related to air quality and greenhouse gases in Section 4.12, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
A102	ODOT	Unknown	Section 4.12	If any Project alignments utilize ODOT facilities, the EIS should include the potential of future climate change impacts on transportation infrastructure, potential future climate change effects to local ecosystems, and whether or not project GHG emissions can be or will be mitigated.	Please see the response to Comment A101.
A103	ODOT	Unknown	Section 4.12, page 4-126	The methods memorandum states that the affected environment in EIS will discuss trends in air pollution from monitoring data from Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. This is missing from Section 4.12.1.	The air quality analysis in this Final EIS was updated to include a discussion of air pollution trends based on Oregon Department of Environmental Quality monitoring data, in Section 4.12, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, specifically in Section 4.12.1, Affected Environment.
A104	ODOT	Unknown	Section 4.12, page 4-127	The methods memorandum states that the DEIS short-term impacts section will evaluate GHG emissions in terms of CO2e. This was not included in Section 4.12.3. Could a reference be included on where to find this data?	Section 4.12, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, specifically Section 4.12.3, Short-Term Impacts, of this Final EIS was updated to include evaluation of greenhouse gas emissions in terms of CO2e (carbon dioxide equivalent).
A105	ODOT	Unknown	Section 4.12, page 4-127, Table 4.12-1 or "Short-Term Impacts" section	In the FEIS, please include daily emissions associated with construction and maintenance.	Section 4.12, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, specifically Section 4.12.3, Short-Term Impacts, of this Final EIS was updated to include Table 4.12-2, Daily Construction GHG Emissions, which documents daily construction and maintenance emissions.
A106	ODOT	Unknown	Section 4.12, page 4-129, Table 4.13-2	In the FEIS, please clarify why VMT for heavy trucks are lower for heavy-duty trucks under the No-Build Alternative compared with the Light Rail Alternative.	Estimates of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) are derived from Metro's regional travel demand model. Variations in truck VMT are likely due to different truck routing related to implementation of light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard.
A107	ODOT	Unknown	Section 4.12, page 4-129	The FEIS should include more discussion about the cumulative effects of GHGs from this project. For example, how the project is part of a larger initiative/program to address the rising cumulative GHGs. Please also clarify the following statement from page 4-157: "The air quality analysis is cumulative in nature and shows that cumulative air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions from regional transportation sources will decrease in the future with the project, compared to the No-Build Alternative. No additional mitigation would be needed." Cumulative GHGs are not decreasing, rather they are increasing over time. Daily and annual GHG emissions from the project in the future may be lower than existing, but cumulative CO2e are going up in the future.	The Final EIS analysis shows that regional daily GHG emissions will decrease under the Project compared to under the No-Build Alternative, and both the No-Build Alternative and the Preferred Alternative would result in lower daily emissions than under existing conditions. The reductions in emissions would be primarily a result of improvements in technology and more stringent vehicle inspection and maintenance programs.
A108	ODOT	Unknown	Section 4.12	It is recommended that an air technical document be added in the appendix. The air appendix should provide sufficient detail about how the emissions were calculated and could be repeated if new information was available. This document could include data inputs and the breakdown of the emissions between operations, maintenance and construction. There is a detailed noise tech report included in the EIS, and air calculations are equally detailed and deserve consideration in this document.	The air quality analysis is supported by Appendix B4.12, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases Background, of this Final EIS, which describes the process and model tools used to estimate emissions impacts. The level of detail included in the Final EIS is appropriate for understanding the relative impacts of the Project and the No-Build Alternative.
A109	ODOT	Unknown	Section 4.14, page 4-130	ODOT appraisal records indicate there service station existed at SW Pacific Hwy and 63rd in Tigard that was purchased for right-of-way when I-5 was constructed. The site appears to be within close proximity of some light rail alignments.	This location appears to have been previously acquired by ODOT and developed as part of an I-5 off-ramp. There is no confirmed release at this location according to the ODOT appraisal records; no additional acquisitions are planned in this immediate area. If contaminated soil associated with this former service station is disturbed as part of the Project, the soils will be handled in accordance with approved hazardous materials management plans discussed in Section 4.14, Hazardous Materials, specifically Section 4.14.4, Short-Term Impacts, of the Final EIS.
A110	ODOT	Unknown	Section 4.14, page 4-130	ODOT has identified lead contaminated surface material on and adjacent to the proposed light rail alignment. The contamination is from highway runoff and vehicle emissions.	Roadside soils contaminated with metals and/or petroleum hydrocarbons from highway runoff and vehicle emissions will be handled in accordance with approved hazardous materials management plans discussed in Section 4.14, Hazardous Materials, specifically Section 4.14.4, Short-Term Impacts, of the Final EIS.
A111	ODOT	Unknown	Appendix B4.14, page B4.14-33, Table B4.14-33	ODOT consulted aerial photos and reverse directories to identify historic service stations that were present at 7710 and 7737 SW Barbur in the 1960s and 1970s. Both sites appear to be on or close to the light rail alignments. However, neither site is listed in Table B4.14-3.	The site located at 7737 SW Barbur Boulevard is not anticipated to be an acquisition by the Project, but it is evaluated and discussed in the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for parcel SW3437. The subject of the Phase I ESA for SW3437 is 7710 SW Barbur Boulevard. This site is recommended for a complex Phase II ESA and is identified in Appendix B.14, Hazardous Materials Background Information, of this Final EIS.
A112	CWS	Anne McDonald	Section 4.9, pages 4-87 – 4-88, figures	Need to include protected vegetated corridors (Metro Title 3, 13 compliant) for Washington County in these figures, as shown in Attachment D Ecosystems Results Report Figure 3.2-5. These are equivalent to Portland's environmental overlay zones.	Figures in Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of this Final EIS have been updated to include Washington County's protected vegetated corridors.
A113	CWS	Anne McDonald	Section 4.9, page 4-89, second non-bulleted paragraph	Fanno Creek is anadromous fish-bearing (steelhead) and also has habitat for coastal cutthroat trout, while lamprey have been observed in Ball Creek east of I-5 within the last decade. The lower reaches of the Fanno Creek tributaries within and downstream of the study area are more likely to be fish bearing (with species of concern and other native species) than this paragraph suggests (and than is suggested in Attachment D p. 13, lines 35-37). In particular, juvenile trout are commonly found during fish salvage. ODFW fish surveys within urban Portland metro are substantially less complete and recent than in other parts of western Oregon. "Further investigations" should proceed with this in mind.	Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of this Final EIS, has been updated to clarify that anadromous fish are unlikely to occur, but small numbers of resident fish may be present.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
A114	CWS	Anne McDonald	Section 4.9, page 4-90, second full paragraph	Please note that the designated vegetated riparian corridors and wetlands buffers in Tigard and Tualatin come with protections similar to those in Portland's environmental overlay zones. See Clean Water Services' Design and Construction Standards for more details.	Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of this Final EIS has been updated to reflect these protections.
A115	CWS	Anne McDonald	Section 4.9, page 4-91, figure	Same comment as on pages 4-87, -88	Please see the response to Comment A112.
A116	CWS	Anne McDonald	Section 4.9, page 4-94, first bullet	Lower reaches of Red Rock, Ball Creek should be assumed to be fish bearing until demonstrated otherwise, following comment on page 4-89.	Please see the response to Comment A113.
A117	CWS	Anne McDonald	Section 4.9, page 4-94, second bullet	Vegetated corridors/ wetland buffers do have specific protections; see comment to page 4-90 and comments from the City of Tigard for details.	Please see the response to Comment A114.
A118	CWS	Anne McDonald	Section 4.9, page 4-95, first non-bulleted paragraph	Note that fish presence could also influence approaches to stormwater quality treatment and volume management for the project.	Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of this Final EIS and the Biological Opinion prepared for the Project address stormwater management and potential impacts on fish.
A119	CWS	Anne McDonald	Section 4.10, page 4-100 – 4-101, Table 4.10-2	303(d) listings extend to tributaries unless specifically excluded, not just the trunk stream (e.g., Fanno Creek), so these tables should be corrected to indicate that. For instance, the Tualatin temperature TMDL extends to all "perennial or fish bearing" (including native fish) streams within the Tualatin River Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) while the bacteria TMDL applies to all stream segments in the same HUC (see DEQ's 2001 Tualatin River TMDL document). This may influence approaches to stormwater management as well as mitigation of vegetated corridor/ environmental overlay zones.	In the Final EIS, footnotes have been added to the table in Section 4.10, Water Resources, to clarify 303(d) listing status.
A120	CWS	Anne McDonald	Section 4.10, page 4-102, "No-Build Alternative" section	Nearly all new and redeveloped impervious surfaces within the study area would be subject to stormwater management requirements for quality (and soon, quantity) under the no-build alternative, reducing water quality impacts under this alternative also. This is not mitigation -- it is a required element of development activity.	Permitting requirements for stormwater treatment are noted in Section 4.10, Water Resources, of the Final EIS. These are now referred to as best management practices and permitting requirements, not mitigation.
A121	CWS	Anne McDonald	Section 4.10, page 4-103, "Floodplain" bullet	Add after "analysis" in the 2nd to last line: ", excavation equivalent to fill (i.e., "balanced cut and fill"),"	The text in Section 4.10, Water Resources, has been revised in the Final EIS; the line this comment refers to has been removed. The Final EIS acknowledges that placement of any columns, fill, or other structures within the floodway would require an engineering study with detailed survey and hydraulic modeling to confirm the base-flood elevation, delineate the regulated floodway boundary, evaluate floodplain protections, quantify fill restrictions, and determine the extent of compensatory storage and stream mitigation requirements.
A122	CWS	Anne McDonald	Section 4.10, page 4-103, first full non-bulleted paragraph	Need to note that replaced crossings would need to be made fish passable. This is likely to require widening of the crossing, but would also require other improvements (e.g., natural stream bottoms).	Fish passage is addressed in Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of the Final EIS.
A123	CWS	Anne McDonald	Section 4.10, page 4-105, Segment C section, middle paragraph.	Remove the term "likely" for the studies listed. These would absolutely be required under current regulations (including City of Tigard's Sensitive Lands development code).	The text in Section 4.10, Water Resources, has been revised in the Final EIS. A floodplain engineering study and a stream buffer replacement study are anticipated for work in Segment C, and best management practices to manage stormwater would follow current regulations.
A124	CWS	Anne McDonald	Section 4.10, page 4-107, Hunziker O&M discussion	See prior comment on pg. 4-107. Note that the footprint of floodplain encroachment at the Hunziker site is substantial, and compensatory storage will be difficult given existing development along this creek. Therefore, CWS suggests that a more thorough feasibility analysis be undertaken prior to the FEIS to determine if TriMet's plans for this site can be realized given Tigard's floodplain development code/FEMA restrictions, and as modified (or with required mitigation) would still be better than could be obtained at the proposed 72nd St. site(s). In addition to excluding fill from floodplain, floodproofing should include protections for releases of debris, hazardous substances and solid waste during floods. Note that the Red Rock Creek floodplain is likely to be nearly fully inundated at flows much more frequent than the "100-year" event.	The Hunziker O&M site has been modified since the publication of the Draft EIS. Section 4.10, Water Resources, of the Final EIS shows the floodplain area as it relates to the updated design.
A125	CWS	Anne McDonald	Section 4.10, page 4-108, Section 4.10.4, second paragraph	Need to also reference City codes for Tigard and Tualatin. CWS sets minimum standards for stormwater management, but Cities typically have additional requirements.	Additional permitting requirements are listed in Chapter 6, Public Involvement, Agency Coordination and Required Permits, of this Final EIS.
A126	CWS	Anne McDonald	Section 4.10, page 4-108, last line	Please remove the phrase "or vaults" in reference to options to address runoff volumes. These are not preferred by CWS, particularly as public facilities.	While vaults are not preferred by Clean Water Services, they are retained in the Final EIS as an example of possible options to address runoff volumes. TriMet will continue to work with project partners on stormwater management following publication of the Final EIS.
A127	CWS	Anne McDonald	Section 4.15, page 4-136, Table 4.15-1	"Use the same term for wastewater/sanitary sewer for all jurisdictions. Also, many of the wastewater and stormwater conveyance facilities within the City limits of Tualatin shown below are owned by the City of Tualatin and may be potential conflicts. Therefore, Tualatin should be listed as having stormwater/wastewater in this table as well. Note that there is a level of uncertainty in the location of many wastewater/stormwater conveyance facilities such that a strict 50-foot buffer to the edge of construction may prove inadequate. Location of specific facilities prior to final design is highly suggested. [IMAGE OF MAP]"	The Final EIS uses the term "sanitary sewer" throughout the document in order to be consistent. As project design continues to advance, utilities will be located through survey and as-builts to determine and include specific locations in the plans for coordination with utilities on any potential specific impacts.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
A128	CWS	Anne McDonald	Section 4.15, page 4-137, third paragraph	May want to add that wastewater and stormwater utilities depend on gravity conveyance, so are very sensitive to changes in elevation.	Section 4.15, Utilities, specifically Section 4.15.4, Short-Term Impacts, of this Final EIS includes the following language: "Many stormwater and sanitary sewer lines are gravity conveyance systems and are sensitive to changes in elevation, which can add to relocation challenges."
A129	City of Lake Oswego	Scott Siegel	Not specified	<p>The City of Lake Oswego has reviewed the DEIS for the Southwest Corridor Plan. Our review focuses on Alternatives C3 and C4, as these options have the fewest stops in the Tigard Triangle and provide the most direct links between Highway 99 and Bridgeport Village (no spurs), resulting in the fastest overall transit times between downtown Portland and the SW Corridor communities. The City's comments on C3 and C4 follow.</p> <p>Alternative C3 has the potential to construct a maintenance facility adjacent to the Highway 217/I-5 interchange. It is our understanding based on the proposed location and facility size, it would not be visible from Lake Oswego with the exception of the upper floors of hotels; however, any facility located there should be designed to complement (or at least not detract from) the appearance and functionality of the Kruse Way corridor, which is an economic engine for the Portland region. Alternative C4 does not have the option for a maintenance facility in this location.</p> <p>Adjacent to Lake Oswego, both C3 and C4 have light rail stations on Bonita Road and Upper Boones Ferry Road (BFR). The Bonita station will have surface parking, with an estimated 150 parking stalls along C3 and 100 parking stalls along C4. Alternative C4 has surface parking at the Upper Boones Ferry location, with an estimated 50 spaces. C3 shows a three story garage with 600 parking spaces. Based on this concept, we would expect C3 to have lower parking impacts on abutting residential neighborhoods, as the stations on either side of Bonita will have parking, limiting the demand at Bonita while including more parking spaces.</p> <p>Also, C3 parking spaces are closer to residences, with the Bonita station more likely to be considered a walkable distance from employment areas along Kruse Way/Meadows Road. Bike and Pedestrian improvements are possible along Bonita, which would increase this potential.</p> <p>Under either option, C3 or C4, please address the potential traffic impacts, including spillover parking, into Lake Oswego's residential neighborhoods. How will these impacts be avoided or mitigated? In addition, please describe the station access (bike and pedestrian) improvements that are proposed for Bonita Road and Carman Drive. These improvements should be specified in the Final EIS, as they will be needed for pedestrian safety, and to mitigate traffic impacts from light rail, and would also support light rail ridership.</p> <p>In conclusion, provided the above impacts are mitigated, we recommend Alternative C3 with Alternative C4 as second choice.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for Alternative C3, followed by Alternative C4 as a second choice. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin).</p> <p>Regarding your comments about a proposed maintenance facility adjacent to the Highway 217/I-5 interchange, the Preferred Alternative does not include this maintenance facility. Instead, the Preferred Alternative includes the Hunziker O&amp;M Facility, adjacent to the freight rail tracks and SW Hunziker Street near downtown Tigard.</p> <p>Regarding your comments about park and ride, the Preferred Alternative does not include any park and ride spaces at either the Bonita Station or the Upper Boones Ferry Station. Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS for information about park and ride capacities at other stations with the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed interest in bicycle and pedestrian improvements along SW Bonita Road and SW Carman Drive, which are studied in the Draft EIS and Final EIS as station access improvements SA26 and SA27, respectively. These improvements would be eligible for FTA capital grant funding for the light rail investment but are currently assumed to be funded separately from that grant request. The improvements are included in this Final EIS to facilitate incorporating them into the light rail investment at a later date if funding allows, or seeking other sources of federal funds. Please see Appendix A, Detailed Maps and Descriptions of the Alternatives, of this Final EIS for maps and descriptions of these and other station access improvements.</p> <p>Traffic impacts and mitigations are studied in both the Draft EIS and Final EIS. Mitigations are proposed for traffic impacts from the Preferred Alternative at SW Upper Boones Ferry Road and SW 72nd Avenue. Spillover parking is not anticipated in Lake Oswego's residential neighborhoods. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS for more information on the traffic analysis and proposed mitigations.</p>
A130	Portland BDS	Benjamin Nielsen	Summary, Section S.6, page S-21, Table S-4	Re: air quality and land use - "no adverse long-term impacts"; are there any positive impacts?	As described in Section 4.12, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, of this Final EIS, the Project would result in a slight, but measurable, improvement in air quality and a slight reduction in greenhouse gas emissions compared to the No-Build Alternative.
A131	Portland BDS	Benjamin Nielsen	Chapter 2, page 2-15, "Alternative A2-BH" section	Properties impacted by the Bridgehead Reconfiguration should be identified. Are any historic properties impacted/removed?	Property impacts related to the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration are identified in Section 4.1, Acquisitions, Displacements and Relocations, and Appendix F, Properties Affected by Acquisitions and Permanent Easements, of this Final EIS. Impacts to historic resources resulting from the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration are identified in Section 4.6, Historic and Archaeological Resources, of this Final EIS.
A132	Portland BDS	Benjamin Nielsen	Section 4.2, page 4-12, 4.2.1	Planning and Policy Framework: Central City 2035 has now been adopted (2018).	Language and dates regarding this plan have been updated throughout this section of the Final EIS.
A133	Portland BDS	Benjamin Nielsen	Section 4.4, page 4-32, Table 4.4-2	A2-LA: Naito Limited Access "would displace six historic properties along SW Naito Parkway". This should really read as "demolish" since it is highly unlikely that these buildings will be relocated, and particularly unlikely that they will be relocated within the South Portland Historic District.	Alternative A2-LA is not studied further in this Final EIS, because it was not selected as part of the Preferred Alternative for the light rail investment. For more information on impacts to eligible historic properties in the South Portland Historic District, please see Section 4.6, Historic and Archaeological Resources, and Appendix K, Memorandum of Agreement for Historic and Archaeological Resources, of this Final EIS.
A134	Portland BDS	Benjamin Nielsen	Section 4.4, page 4-33, Table 4.4-2	Marquam Hill Connection Options: Under "Community Facilities", there is potential loss of important landscaped parkway along Terwilliger Parkway due to the proposed connection. This could also be considered under "Neighborhood Quality of Life".	The impact of the Marquam Hill connection options on Terwilliger Parkway was identified on page 4-31 of the Draft EIS, in the row of Table 4.4-2 that describes impacts common to all Segment A alternatives. In the Final EIS, the analysis in Section 4.4, Communities, has been updated to reflect impacts to the Marquam Hill Connection included in the Preferred Alternative, including impacts to SW Terwilliger Parkway.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
A135	Portland BDS	Benjamin Nielsen	Section 4.5, page 4-51, Section 4.5.3	Impacts to Designated Scenic Resources: Please note that the Terwilliger Parkway Design Guidelines and the Terwilliger Parkway Corridor Plan both contain references to important landscape characteristics and identified view corridors along the parkway. There is no "s" overlay associated with most of those, as far as I am aware, but there are design review approval criteria associated with them. Both documents refer to "Map 1" and "Map 2", which unfortunately are not included with the digital copies of either document. Fortunately, however, the Friends of Terwilliger have copies available on their website: <a href="http://terwilligerfriends.org/images/uploads/Archive/Terwilliger_Parkway_Corridor_Study_Proposed_Terwilliger_Landscape_Concept_Plan_1983_MAP_1.PDF">http://terwilligerfriends.org/images/uploads/Archive/Terwilliger_Parkway_Corridor_Study_Proposed_Terwilliger_Landscape_Concept_Plan_1983_MAP_1.PDF</a> and <a href="http://terwilligerfriends.org/images/uploads/Archive/Terwilliger_Parkway_Corridor_Study_Terwilliger_Plan_Proposed_Access_Plan_MAP_2.PDF">http://terwilligerfriends.org/images/uploads/Archive/Terwilliger_Parkway_Corridor_Study_Terwilliger_Plan_Proposed_Access_Plan_MAP_2.PDF</a>	Proposed changes to SW Terwilliger Parkway itself would follow the design guidelines established by documents referenced. Designated viewpoints identified in the <i>Terwilliger Parkway Corridor Plan</i> were incorporated into Central City 2035, which was considered for the Draft EIS and was further studied for the Final EIS.
A136	Portland BDS	Benjamin Nielsen	Appendix A, page A-19, Figure A-17	Park & ride proposals appear to demolish the existing Barbur TC structure, which is listed on the Historic Resource Inventory with Rank III. Efforts should be made to preserve the structure. However, if demolition is necessary, the proposal to replace the existing structure with a retail frontage is appreciated.	The Final EIS designs for the Barbur Transit Center Park and Ride would preserve the existing structure. This structure was not included in the survey of historic resources, because it is not yet 45 years old.
A137	Portland BDS	Benjamin Nielsen	Appendix A, page A-26 – A30, Figures A-24 – A-27	All four connections would have significant impacts on the Terwilliger Parkway and could negatively affect the parkway's character. Of the four options presented, Connection 1A appears to have the lowest amount of impact; it has the fewest switchback ramps, which would remove significant areas of vegetation from the boulevard. It also has the lowest towers; however, if the tower connecting the trail to Kohler Pavilion could be pushed closer to Campus Drive without adding ramps, that would better help to retain the forested character of the parkway.	Please see Master Response 9 regarding impacts to Terwilliger Parkway.
A138	Portland BDS	Benjamin Nielsen	Appendix E, page E-6, "Design Refinement 2" section	Concern that additional vehicle lanes and light rail overpass structure would negatively impact development of the area, which has been identified as a "town center" in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan.	The Preferred Alternative identified for the Project in the Final EIS does not include Refinement 2. Instead, light rail will cross SW Capitol Highway south of the intersection and then cross SW Barbur Boulevard west of the intersection before returning to run at-grade adjacent to I-5 west of SW Capitol Highway.
A139	Portland BDS	Ethan Brown	Section 4.1, page 4-4, Section 4.1.2	Clarify that the transfer of SW Barbur would be from ODOT to CoP, unclear as written.	The description of the jurisdictional transfer intergovernmental agreement has been clarified in Section 4.1, Acquisitions, Displacements and Relocations, of this Final EIS to state that the transfer of SW Barbur Boulevard would be from ODOT to the City of Portland.
A140	Portland BDS	Ethan Brown	Section 4.9	City of Portland Environmental Overlay zones, 33.430, regulate dedication and expansion of rights-of-way, development, and disturbance within the environmental zones. Environmental review for specific portions proposed rail corridor should be anticipated, and which will require more detailed alternatives analyses specific to each smaller segment (analyzing alternative designs, locations, and construction methods to reduce impacts to environmental resources).	Additional analysis and coordination with the City of Portland will occur during advanced design and permitting phases.
A141	Portland BDS	Ethan Brown	Section 4.9, page 4-86, Figures 4.9.1 and 4.9.2	City of Portland Environmental Overlay zones are not an appropriate proxy for ecosystem resources to be considered for NEPA. As was previously identified by BPS, additional resources occur, and should be acknowledged, outside of these mapped zones.	Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of this Final EIS includes the environmental overlay zones, as well as streams, mapped wetlands, delineated wetlands and vegetated corridors. The City of Portland's Natural Resource Inventory (NRI) habitats and project impacts to NRI habitat types are described in Attachment D, Ecosystems Results Report, of this Final EIS. Additional evaluation will be completed during the permitting phase of the Project.
A142	Portland BDS	Ethan Brown	Section 4.9, page 4-92, Section 4.9.2	Impacts to mapped E-zones are identified here in terms of acres, but the degree of impact is not mentioned or specified. Will this project remove all trees and vegetation across these impacted acres, effectively removing all natural resource values?	The degree of impacts has been defined and anticipated mitigation has been refined in Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of this Final EIS.
A143	Portland BDS	Ethan Brown	Section 4.9, page 4-96, Section 4.9.4	Some preliminary possibilities for mitigation of impacts to City Environmental Zones should be included here.	The degree of impacts has been defined and anticipated mitigation has been refined in Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of this Final EIS.
A144	Portland BDS	Ethan Brown	Section 4.10, page 4-108, Section 4.10.4	Consider adding text to acknowledge that most streams or water bodies are mapped within Environmental Protection overlay zones and will require additional protection and mitigation measures.	Additional protection of streams and water bodies in nvironmental protection overlays, and anticipated mitigations for impacts, are discussed in Section 4.9, Ecosystems, and in the overview of permitting requirements in Chapter 6, Public Involvement, Agency Coordination and Required Permits, of this Final EIS.
A145	Portland BDS	Hillary Adam	Summary, Section S.3, page S-16, "Initial Route Proposal" section	Segment A1 is noted as the recommended alignment over A2-BH or A2-LA. It is also noted that if A1 is the Preferred Alternative, we "will seek to fund and construct the Bridgehead Reconfiguration as a companion project." However, it is not clear through any of the supporting documents if the Bridgehead Reconfiguration (without a light rail line) will affect the same properties to the same, lesser, or greater extent than is noted for the A2-BH alignment. This should be clarified.	Please see Master Response 17 regarding property acquisitions related to the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration.
A146	Portland BDS	Hillary Adam	Appendix A, page A-5, Figure A-3	Consider relocating the Gibbs Barbur platform slightly further south, if possible, to see if this would alleviate the need for a full acquisition of 3124 SW Barbur, a contributing resource.	In the Final EIS, the house at 3124 SW Barbur Boulevard is identified as a contributing resource of the South Portland Historic District. The house would be acquired and removed, and would contribute to an adverse effect to the historic district. Please see Appendix D, Final Section 4(f)

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
					Evaluation, of this Final EIS for more information on impacts to the property and effects to the historic district.
A147	Portland BDS	Hillary Adam	Appendix D, page 2-11, Table 2.3-3	The proposed Barbur TC Park & Ride is located within the Design Overlay Zone and will be subject to Design Review.	TriMet and Metro acknowledge that applicable design review and permitting will be required for the Project, including at the Barbur Transit Center.
A148	Portland BDS	Hillary Adam	Attachment C, Part 3, Appendix B, page 19, "Baseline Table of Historic Resources Identified"	The resource at 230 SW Woods (#57) is a contributing resource and should be noted as such. In 2016, this resource went through the permitting process to repair fire damage; however the permits were never finalized; there is a new permit to complete the work. Based on your comments and the image provided it appears that the repair work does not match the approved permit (vinyl windows would not have been allowed); therefore, this resource is currently in violation of City Code and should be able to be returned to a more compatible condition and therefore should retain its designation as a contributing resource.	In the Final EIS, the house at 230 SW Woods Street is identified as a contributing resource of the South Portland Historic District.
A149	Portland BDS	Hillary Adam	Attachment C, Part 1, pages 87 – 93, Table 8	Several historic properties regulated by Title 33 of the Portland Zoning Code are noted as "full acquisitions". This includes contributing resources within the South Portland Historic District and Historic Landmarks individually-listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Demolition of these historic resources. Demolition of each of these resources requires a Type IV Demolition Review with City Council. A Pre-Application Conference is required prior to submittal of a Type IV application. While each resource will require its own Type IV application with its own land use application number, some of these reviews can run concurrently and be reviewed together under the same approval criteria. For instance, the two contributing resources proposed for full acquisition (demolition) along SW Barbur can be processed together, while the Jewish Shelter Home will require its own review, separate from all others because it is a stand-alone resource. Likewise, if the Bridgehead Reconfiguration is also pursued, the resources proposed for full acquisition within that area can be processed together (each with its own land use application). One Pre-Application Conference can suffice for all required Type IV applications.	TriMet and Metro acknowledge that applicable reviews and permitting will be required for the Project.
A150	Portland BDS	Hillary Adam	Attachment C, Part 1, pages 87 – 93, Table 8	Alterations to individual resources, whether landmarks, contributing resources, or non-contributing resources, may require Historic Resource Reviews to approve the changes resulting from the proposed project. These reviews will have to be pursued on an individual basis.	Please see the response to Comment A149.
A151	Portland BDS	Hillary Adam	Attachment C, Part 1, pages 87 – 93, Table 8	To the greatest extent possible, staff encourages retention of those historic resources deemed eligible for listing on the National Register, particularly those related to automobile culture along SW Barbur such as the Capitol Hill Motel and the Ranch Inn. Pursue design options that may require only a partial acquisition and alterations to the existing resources, rather than full acquisition and demolition.	Please see Appendix D, Final Section 4(f) Evaluation, of this Final EIS for a discussion of the design efforts to avoid and minimize impacts to historic resources.
A152	Portland BDS	Stephanie Beckman	Chapter 6, Section 6.3, page 6-7, "Local Agency Approvals" section	The topic areas listed are very general. But not mentioned is the topic of Trees. Some alignment alternatives could have significant impact to trees and could be subject to Title 11, the City's Tree Code or 33.430, Environmental Overlay Zone regulations.	Title 11 (City of Portland Tree Code) and associated mitigation requirements are noted in the list of potential Federal, State, and Local Agency approvals in Section 6.5, Agency and Tribal Coordination, of the Final EIS.
A153	Portland BDS	Stephanie Beckman	Appendix E, page E-3, "Design Refinement 1" section	IRP Refinement 1 in the Woods segment moves the alignment between Barbur and I-5. This area is almost completely within the Environmental Conservation Overlay zone, with some area of Protection Overlay zoning. This portion of the project would require an Environmental Review (PCC 33.430) which applies to lands in public and private ownership and to rights-of-way (33.10.030). The Refinement 1 appears to create significantly more disturbance area within the environmental zones than other alignments which would largely take place within already disturbed areas and would result in significant tree removal and may include stream crossings. An alternatives analysis that examines different location and construction options to avoid impacts to streams and tree removal would need to be analyzed. Mitigation for unavoidable impacts would be required. Because it be difficult to mitigate at the project location TriMet should anticipate the potential need for off-site mitigation.	Refinement 1 is not included in the Preferred Alternative or studied further in the Final EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.
A154	Portland BDS	Stephanie Beckman	Appendix E, page E-3, "Design Refinement 1" section	Refinement 1 may be subject to Title 11, the City's Tree Code, depending on the ownership of the trees impacted. Trees within public right-of-way that are managed by the State of Oregon are exempt, as are trees on lands owned by state or federal agencies. It currently appears that the trees impacted by Refinement 1 would currently be exempt from Title 11. However if ownership transfers to the City, the trees would be subject to Title 11 requirements, as well as the Zoning Code requirements identified above. This would require early consultation with Parks Urban Forestry to determine allowed tree removal and mitigation.	Please see the response to Comment A154.
A155	Portland BDS	Stephanie Beckman	Appendix E, page E-3, "Design Refinement 1" section	It appears that Refinement 2 in the Crossroads vicinity may impact Environmental Protection and Conservation Overlay zones located north and south of the SW Taylors Ferry right-of-way between SW 43rd and SW 46th. There are also mapped open stream channels in these areas. Construction activities within the environmental overlay zones outside of existing right-of-way will require Environmental Review approval from the City of Portland. The other alternatives for the Crossroads area do not appear to impact environmental overlay zones, therefore this refinement appears as though it would have greater impacts	Refinement 2 is not included in the Preferred Alternative or studied further in the Final EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
A156	Portland BES	Fred MacGregor	Summary, page S-19 – S-21, Section S.5, Table S-4	Add the impact to the utility systems by construction of the project to include all public and private utilities und and above ground: Natural gas, electric, communications, water storm sewer, etc. This subject does not appear to be covered in the table.	Table S-4, Summary of Transportation and Environmental Effects, does not include specific impacts to utility systems by construction of the Project, because there are no long-term utility impacts requiring mitigation. Section 4.15, Utilities, of this Final EIS does describe generally anticipated impacts to utility systems by construction of the Project, under Section 4.15.3, Long-Term Impacts, and Section 4.15.4, Short-Term Impacts. As described in Section 4.15.5, Mitigation Measures, of this Final EIS specific utility relocations would be identified in coordination with affected utility companies as project designs continue to advance.
A157	Portland BES	Fred MacGregor	Summary, page S-21, Section S.5, Table S-4	Water resources: The impacts to local waterways through increase in runoff volume and alteration of peak timing.	Section 4.10, Water Resources, of the Final EIS has been revised to reflect this comment.
A158	Portland BES	Fred MacGregor	Summary, page S-21, Section S.5, Table S-4	Geology, Soils and Hydrogeology: The second bullet point should address the shallow and deep landslide risk along the route as well as risk to the neighboring properties and infrastructure.	The Final EIS notes that the Preferred Alternative crosses areas that require measures to reduce slope instability and landslide risk to the Project and local infrastructure.
A159	Portland BES	Reuben Snyder	Section 4.10, page 4-101, "Drainage System" section	States that City of Portland combined sewer system in Segment A and first few miles of Segment B conveys mixture to treatment plant before discharge to Willamette River. This is incorrect. This area is conveyed to a treatment plant that discharges to the Columbia River. That said, any overflows from the combined sewer in this area would discharge to the Willamette River.	Section 4.10, Water Resources, of the Final EIS has been revised to reflect this comment.
A160	Portland BES	Reuben Snyder	Section 4.10, pages 4-102 – 4-103	These two pages refer to Section 4.10.6 Potential Mitigation Measures 3 times. This heading appears to be section 4.10.4.	As noted in your comment, the Draft EIS used an incorrect section number in referencing mitigation measures in Section 4.10, Water Resources. Section references have been updated to reflect correct section numbers in the Final EIS.
A161	Portland BES	Reuben Snyder	Section 4.10, page 4-108, Section 4.10.4	Last line first paragraph. Please revise to state: " including mitigating flow changes to combined and separated storm sewer systems." for clarity.	Section 4.10, Water Resources, of the Final EIS has been revised to reflect this comment.
A162	Portland BES	Reuben Snyder	Section 4.18, page 4-157, Table 4.18-1	"Potential station area developments should be in areas that are already largely developed." This statement may be confusing. In the study area of the track alignment plus 50 feet that may be the case station areas are largely developed. However, station areas outside of the 50 feet are in various stages of development in terms of storm water management, road paving, curbs and gutters, etc. The Station Access Projects will undergo permit review and be subject to local storm water requirements. That said, the projects may increase the area of storm water collected and discharged to local waterways and indirect and cumulative impacts should not be dismissed as necessarily negligible.	Section 4.18, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts, of this Final EIS notes that any new developments would need to comply with local regulations related to stormwater management. Additionally, permitting requirements are noted in Chapter 6, Public Involvement, Agency Coordination and Required Permits, of the Final EIS.
A163	Portland BES	Reuben Snyder	Section 4.18, page 4-157, Table 4.18-1, "Ecosystems" row	The statement that "no cumulative ecosystem impacts were identified" is largely subjective and not the case. This project will increase the efficiency and area of storm water collected and ultimately discharged to stream systems exacerbating common urban hydro modification problems. Yes, land use review and permitting will work to minimize these cumulative effects. I understand your argument to be that the area is urbanized so additional cumulative effects will result in no ecosystem negative consequences. It is important that cumulative effects are recognized and must be considered to not further impact an already impacted water resource.	In the Final EIS, discussion of cumulative impacts has been revised since the Draft IES, and the language cited in the comment is no longer in the document. Section 4.18, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts, of this Final EIS includes language stating that there would be a low potential for increased cumulative impacts to ecosystems due to other projects or actions in the study area.
A164	Portland BES	Reuben Snyder	Section 4.18, page 4-157, Table 4.18-1, "Water Resources" row	"Potential station area developments should be in areas that are already largely developed." This statement may be confusing. In the study area of the track alignment plus 50 feet that may be the case station areas are largely developed. However, station areas outside of the 50 feet are in various stages of development in terms of storm water management, road paving, curbs and gutters, etc. The Station Access Projects will undergo permit review and be subject to local storm water requirements. That said, the projects may increase the area of storm water collected and discharged to local waterways and indirect and cumulative impacts should not be dismissed as necessarily negligible.	Please see the response to Comment A162.
A165	Portland BPS	Eric Engstrom	Summary, Section S.7, page S-22, "Environmental Justice" section	Concerns about the depth of this section were expressed by Portland's Planning and Sustainability Commission. Staff generally agrees with the PSC critique, and believes that the Environmental Justice and the Indirect and Cumulative Effects analysis should do a better job of exploring displacement impacts driven by changes in land value and rents that occur with a major transit investment. There is a variety of regression analysis research nationwide that isolates the transit premium effect of new transit investments on land value and rent escalation. A review of that literature could be sued to predict the impact of this escalation on housing costs on at-risk housing and impacted communities of color in the SW Corridor. More data about the specific at-risk housing and impacted communities of color are available in the City's Equitable Housing Strategy.	Section 4.18, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts, of this Final EIS notes the relative role that transit could play in affecting land value and rents, in conjunction with other factors such as general market conditions and the local jurisdiction's land use plans and zoning, particularly if they already allow development at higher levels than exist today.
A166	Portland BPS	Eric Engstrom	Chapter 3, Section 3.3, page 3-26, Table 3.3-1	We appreciate inclusion of the final column in this table, to note potential impacts on the pedestrian ad bike system from these mitigation measures. We would remind the project staff the Portland's Comprehensive Plan Policy 9. 6 addresses this. To the extent the project prioritizes vehicle movement over pedestrian and bike safety, there should be a policy-based explanation of why that choice was made. In general, such a prioritization conflicts with City policy.	Within the City of Portland, the project design follows the city's modal hierarchy, which places bicycles, pedestrians and transit ahead of personal vehicles. However, the Project is also required to mitigate traffic impacts that are within a certain threshold of the "No-Build Alternative" conditions. Within the constraints of the traffic impact requirements, the Project

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
					would provide bicycle and pedestrian improvements along the corridor in order to improve safety and access to the Project.
A167	Portland BPS	Eric Engstrom	Section 4.2, pages 4-11 – 4-12	Please note that Portland’s new Comprehensive Plan took effect in May 2018, and the new Central City 2035 Plan took effect in July 2018. The land use information used by project staff should be updated accordingly as the project proceeds into station area planning and further design.	Language and dates regarding these two plans have been updated throughout this section in the Final EIS.
A168	Portland BPS	Eric Engstrom	Section 4.2, page 4-13, last sentence of paragraph	The statement below is not entirely accurate. Portland has adopted station- or corridor - specific plans in the past, and anticipates doing so in several locations along the SW Corridor as station locations are finalized. "This approach follows Portland's past position on land use around transit, which is to rely on pre-existing districtwide guidelines and to not rezone afterwards nor create specific station area plans."	This statement has been revised in the Final EIS.
A169	Portland BPS	Eric Engstrom	Section 4.2, page 4-16, Table 4.2-3	The A2-LA: Naito Limited Access alternative is directly in conflict with local land use plans, which call for this section of Naito to be reconstructed as an urban street with intersections and crosswalks (South Portland Circulation Study, Corbet-Terwilliger Lair Hill Neighborhood Plan, Barbur Concept Plan). We disagree with project staff’s response to our earlier comment – The South Portland Circulation study was incorporated into Portland’s Comprehensive Plan and TSP (both the old and the new one) as a master street plan. The neighborhood plan, which calls for the removal of the limited access ramps, is also formally incorporated by reference into the City’s Comp Plan.	Alternative A2-LA is not included in the Preferred Alternative and is not further studied in the Final EIS. The Final EIS does include an analysis of the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration as a related transportation improvement. That project would include reconfiguration of the bridgehead ramps and changes to SW Naito Parkway to better connect the neighborhood.
A170	Portland BPS	Eric Engstrom	Section 4.4, page 4-40, “Potential Mitigation Measures” section	The following statement should be edited to include language about ""adopting new tenant protections."" "In addition, TriMet, Metro, the City of Portland and the City of Tigard are coordinating to identify strategies to prevent the indirect economic displacement of residents living near the light rail alignment. these strategies could include banking land for future development of affordable housing; purchasing existing, naturally occurring affordable housing to preserve its affordability; and providing financial assistance to low-income residents."	This Final EIS includes language related to tenant protections in Section 4.18, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts.
A171	Portland BPS	Eric Engstrom	Section 4.9, page 4-86	We disagree with project staff’s response to our earlier comment about the e-zones being used as a proxy for natural resource information. The City’s adopted NRI maps should be the primary data source for natural resource information, not the e-zones. The e-zones are not a good proxy for two reasons. First, most e-zone maps are more than 20-years old, and reflect resource inventory work done in the 1980s and 1990s, before GIS and LIDAR and other mapping technology existed. The NRI was updated with the new Comprehensive Plan in 2010-2012, and reflects more accurate mapping technology and our current understanding of the relevant natural resource and ecological science. Second, the e-zone maps are the result of compromises made after considering economic, energy, and social factors. In other words, there are identified resources outside of e-zones that may be relevant to a federal decision, even if they are not currently protected by the City.	Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of this Final EIS includes the environmental overlay zones, as well as streams, mapped wetlands, delineated wetlands and vegetated corridors. The City of Portland’s Natural Resource Inventory (NRI) habitats and project impacts to NRI habitat types are described in Attachment D, Ecosystems Results Report, of this Final EIS. Additional evaluation will be completed during the permitting phase of the Project.
A172	Portland BPS	Eric Engstrom	Section 4.12, page 4-127	The analysis rests on the assumption that vehicles will be cleaner in the future because of more stringent standards. However, in April of 2018 the EPA announced reconsideration and potential weakening of federal emissions standards. The impact on this analysis is unclear at this point because it depends on the fate of California’s stricter standards, and if Oregon continues to follow those standards. The final EIS should re-visit this statement considering the standards in place at that time. The analysis methods used also looks at this question narrowly, by focusing only on the emissions difference attributable to changes in transportation. Light rail also impacts the built environment in the corridor. The increased land values and employment access that comes from light rail transit will increase the economic viability of multifamily and mixed-use housing. By changing the mix of future housing in the corridor, the amount of energy used by buildings is changed. Generally, dwellings that share common walls with other dwellings consume less energy. Some of Portland’s anticipated GHG reduction is based on this change in land use pattern and related building energy usage.	The fuel standards noted in this comment remain in litigation, but are still in effect as of the publication of this Final EIS. Regardless, the Project would reduce emissions compared to No Build regardless of whether different fuel standards are in place.  Regarding the potential reduction in greenhouse gases associated with changing land use patterns, those effects are possible but removed from the direction project action, and are therefore not addressed in Section 4.12, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, of the Final EIS.
A173	Portland BPS	Eric Engstrom	Section 4.18, page 4-154, Table 4.18-1	The following statement is vague: "TriMet and Metro would coordinate with local partners to develop station area redevelopment plans that include measures to minimize indirect impacts, including advancing programs to increase affordable housing supply in the corridor." More specific measure are identified in the Equitable Housing Strategy prepared by the cities of Portland and Tigard and a broad array of community and institutional partners including TriMet and Metro. In the final EIS TriMet and Metro should be more specific about how they will support these actions to achieve the affordable housing targets in the strategy.	This Final EIS includes additional language related to affordable housing and the Southwest Corridor Equitable Development Strategy (SWEDS) in Section 4.18, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts.
A174	Portland BPS	Eric Engstrom	Section 4.18, page 4-156, Table 4.18-1	Concerns about the depth of this section were expressed by Portland’s Planning and Sustainability Commission. Staff generally agrees with the PSC critique, and believes that the Environmental Justice and the Indirect and Cumulative Effects analysis should do a better job of exploring displacement impacts driven by changes in land value and rents that occur with a major transit investment. There is a variety of regression analysis research nationwide that isolates the transit premium effect of new transit investments on land value and rent escalation. A review of	Please see Appendix C, Environmental Justice Compliance, of this Final EIS regarding your concerns about the Environmental Justice analysis. Appendix C has been updated and expanded in the Final EIS compared to the Draft EIS, in part to address concerns raised in this comment and other publicly submitted comments.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
				that literature could be used to predict the impact of this escalation on housing costs on at-risk housing and impacted communities of color in the SW Corridor. More data about the specific at-risk housing and impacted communities of color are available in the City's Equitable Housing Strategy.	Please see Master Response 18 regarding housing stability, gentrification and indirect displacement, including discussion of the Southwest Corridor Equitable Housing Strategy. Please see Section 4.18, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts, of this Final EIS for additional information on transit impacts to rents and property values.
A175	PBOT	John Gillam	Summary, Section S.3, page S-17, Table S-3	Because a new shuttle service may be provided as part of the project using SW 53rd Avenue which would have a fairly high level of transit vehicles, much different than current conditions, this may require a TSP Street Classification amendment. This is not the place in the DEIS to list this potential policy impact.	A Transportation System Plan Street Classification amendment is outside the scope of the Final EIS. Project partners will continue to work with the City of Portland to address this potential amendment.
A176	PBOT	John Gillam	Chapter 3	The main DEIS document due to required size limits can not inform the reader of the depth of analyses undertaken which would answer many questions people have. It would be helpful for each subsection to have a page reference to the corresponding analyses in the Transportation Results Report.	Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS has been updated and follows a similar organization to the overall Final EIS, reviewing traffic results by segment, so that it is easier to navigate between the two documents. No specific page references have been added.
A177	PBOT	John Gillam	Chapter 3, Section 3.2, page 3-10, Section 3.2.1	The discussion of segment A impacts - Corbett, Kelly, SW 1st does not appear to be addressed by mitigation measures, presumably because it is the changed nature of the network under these alternatives. This warrants more discussion and in some cases may require TSP street classification amendments.	These streets were analyzed in the Final EIS relative to adopted mitigation criteria. A Transportation System Plan Street Classification amendment is outside the scope of the Final EIS. Project partners will continue to work with the City of Portland to address this potential amendment.
A178	PBOT	John Gillam	Chapter 3, Section 3.2, page 3-10, Section 3.2.1	The provision of LRT on Barbur changes local street access and neighborhood circulation in many locations. This is an undisclosed impact that needs to be discussed. A possible mitigation would be a public process for developing neighborhood access and circulation plans to respond to the changes created by the LRT project.	The Final EIS includes a discussion of circulation impacts in Segment A and Segment B. Appendices to Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS also include detailed information on circulation changes.
A179	PBOT	John Gillam	Chapter 3, Section 3.2, page 3-10, Section 3.2.1	Although maybe provided in the technical supplement there should be a statement about traffic volume changes on Barbur under the LRT alternatives (or preferred alternative). It is useful to know, as stated, that Taylors Ferry and Capitol will have lower traffic. But what about Barbur?	Traffic analysis related to SW Barbur Boulevard is discussed in Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS. Further detail is provided in Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS.
A180	PBOT	John Gillam	Chapter 3, Section 3.2, page 3-11, Section 3.2.2	There is reference to a results report about "supporting bus networks". Statements should be added about how assumptions were made about local bus networks just for the purpose of analyses. But that a future public process will be undertaken prior to project opening about bus service and network changes.	The Final EIS assumes changes in the bus network based largely on TriMet's <i>Southwest Service Enhancement Plan</i> , which was developed from an extensive public engagement process in 2015. About a year before opening of the Project, TriMet will engage riders in further public process to revisit these assumptions and confirm a bus service plan that serves the greatest needs while minimizing service duplication. To learn more about assumed bus network changes, see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.
A181	PBOT	John Gillam	Chapter 3, Section 3.2, page 3-17, Section 3.2.4	The Station Access Improvement Options section says "the project would include additional station access improvements". This implies that many (most, all?) of the station access improvements would be constructed as part of the project. There should be a statement to clarify how this list of projects will be used moving forward.	Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of the Final EIS includes language clarifying the relationship of station access improvements as related transportation improvements. These improvements would be eligible for FTA capital grant funding for the light rail investment but are currently assumed to be funded separately from that grant request. The improvements are included in the Final EIS to facilitate incorporating them into the light rail investment at a later date if funding allows, or seeking other sources of federal funds.
A182	PBOT	John Gillam	Chapter 3, Section 3.3, page 3-17, Section 3.3.2	The Station Access Improvement Options section says "the project would include additional station access improvements". This implies that many (most, all?) of the station access improvements would be constructed as part of the project. There should be a statement to clarify how this list of projects will be used moving forward.	Please see the response to Comment A181.
A183	PBOT	John Gillam	Attachment B	For each segment there should be a list of planned or funded transportation projects that may have an effect on transportation analysis. This is hard to pick out from Table B4.18-1 and this list may not include all pertinent projects. For example in Segment B around Crossroads there is the ODOT ARTS project, the Capitol Hwy project north of Taylors Ferry and the road diet for Capitol Hwy south of Crossroads. The latter may affect motor vehicle access to the SW 53rd station P&R.	Projects assumed under the No-Build Alternative are documented in Appendix A, Detailed Maps and Descriptions of the Alternatives, of the Final EIS.
A184	PBOT	John Gillam	Attachment B, page 36, Figure 3.1-1	Because there are some traffic volume changes with Alt 1 compared to No Build in the immediate RIB area, even if forecast as less than 5%, this project may affect the conditions of local streets and create a neighborhood livability impact. A 5% threshold difference may be minor for arterial streets but more so for local residential streets. Plus traffic analysis at this scale is not adequate to draw conclusions about this impact. So, a neighborhood traffic management plan for this area is recommended as part of the LRT project.	A discussion of circulation impacts related to the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration is included in Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, specifically in Section 3.2.1, Regional and Corridor Travel Impacts, of the Final EIS, and is described in greater detail in the appendices to Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS. Neighborhood traffic management is identified as a mitigation strategy.
A185	PBOT	John Gillam	Attachment B, page 145	Impacts to Pedestrian and Bicycles Facilities states that under B-1, B-2, B-3 and B-4 SW Barbur would have new or reconditioned sidewalks from Brier Place to SW 60th. Is that part of the project cost assumptions, particularly south of Crossroads?	In the Final EIS, the Project includes continuous sidewalks along SW Barbur Boulevard between SW Brier Place and SW 60th Avenue. These sidewalk improvements are included as a part of project cost assumptions. Some sections of existing sidewalks would not be modified.
A186	PBOT	Lewis Wardrip	Appendix E, page E-6, "Design Refinement 2" section	Additional analysis is needed for the City of Portland to support this refinement. Synchro/Simtraffic doesn't accurately model the traffic impacts due to side-running light rail. The additional weighted average lost time per	Refinement 2 was not included in the Preferred Alternative and is not further studied in the Final EIS.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
				vehicle phase methodology cannot accurately represent real world situations such as back to back light rail crossing events. The intersections of Taylors Ferry & the I-5 off ramp, Capitol & Taylors Ferry, Barbur & Capitol and Barbur & Taylors Ferry should be included in the model.	
A187	PBOT	Lewis Wardrip	Appendix E, page E-6, "Design Refinement 2" section	The ODOT ARTS project is being rethought so the assumptions in the FEIS may not be correct. The ARTS project may not include a signal at Capitol and Taylors Ferry in which case the project will need to install one.	Refinement 2 was not included in the Preferred Alternative and is not further studied in the Final EIS. The Preferred Alternative does not include modifications to the intersection of SW Capitol Highway and SW Taylors Ferry Road.
A188	PBOT	Lewis Wardrip	Attachment B, Part 1, page 69, Figure 3.3-14c	It seems like reducing the number of lanes on 4th approaching Caruthers will have a traffic impact. In the Results Report a left-through-through configuration is shown. But on the roll maps we have seen it shows a left-left-through. The volumes in the Results Report indicate it should be a left-through-through. With a left-left-through there is almost a one lane width offset across the intersection. But with the 2 way bike facility on the west side of 4th the lane shift across the intersection is unsafe for 2 through lanes.	As studied in the Final EIS, the Preferred Alternative retains the existing four-lane configuration on SW Fourth Avenue approaching SW Caruthers Street. The project team will continue to work with the project partners to optimize this intersection.
A189	PBOT	Taylor Phillips	Chapter 2, Section 2.3, page 2-13, Figure 2.3-3	Support for A1 with bridgehead reconfiguration or A2-BH. Keeping Naito and the Ross Island Bridgehead as they are, whether Naito or Barbur is chosen as the preferred alignment is unacceptable if we hope to have a walkable central city. The current configuration of Naito is not conducive to safe biking or walking and creates a barrier for those living and working in these neighborhoods.	The Final EIS includes an analysis of the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration as a related but separately funded transportation investment. That project would include reconfiguration of the bridgehead ramps and changes to SW Naito Parkway to better connect the neighborhood, and would add continuous sidewalks and bicycle lanes on both sides of SW Naito Parkway between SW Barbur Boulevard and SW Lincoln Street, as well as five new at-grade signalized crossings of SW Naito Parkway, addressing the concerns raised in this comment. To learn more about the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration, please see Section 2.2.7, Related Transportation Improvements, of this Final EIS.
A190	PBOT	Taylor Phillips	Chapter 2, Section 2.3, page 2-18, Figure 2.3-4	Support for B1 along Barbur for the entirety of the line. Building along the side of the highway is not conducive to high ridership or fostering development potential and is not in line with Barbur Concept Plan	Regarding your concerns regarding a highway-adjacent alignment, the Preferred Alternative identified for the Project in the Final EIS includes a modified version of Alternative B2, which includes center-running light rail and continuous sidewalks and bicycle lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard east of the Barbur Transit Center. West of the Barbur Transit Center, the light rail alignment is adjacent to I-5 to the 53rd Station before crossing I-5 to the north of SW Barbur Boulevard. The City of Portland's representative on the Southwest Corridor Steering Committee supported both Alternative B2 and the recommended Preferred Alternative.
A191	PBOT	Taylor Phillips	Chapter 3, Section 3.2, page 3-16, Section 3.2.4	Any chance to revisit more direct connections to both OHSU and PCC would be greatly appreciated. These are two of the region's largest trip generators and better serving them would likely drive greater transit ridership and align better with the original purpose of the project, specifically, "Improve multimodal access to existing jobs, housing and educational opportunities and foster opportunities for commercial development and a range of housing types adjacent to transit" (Purpose and Need Statement)	Please see Master Response 12 regarding the decision to remove direct connections to OHSU and PCC-Sylvania from further consideration. Connections to both OHSU and PCC-Sylvania are included in the Project and documented in the Final EIS.
A192	PBOT	Taylor Phillips	Chapter 3, Section 3.3, page 3-25, Section 3.3.2	Sidewalk analysis should include a detailed assessment not only of where sidewalks are missing, but of where they are substandard per City design guidelines. - PBOT staff asked for this at the previous comment period and this was not done in the DEIS. We need to do this analysis to ensure that sidewalk corridors have sufficient width for a high-capacity rail line, particularly near the stations.	The sidewalk analysis conducted for the Final EIS looked at the impacts of the Project and followed the <i>Analysis Methods for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Environmental Impact Statement</i> (Metro, 2017) (please see <a href="https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf">https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf</a> ). Identifying the consistency of sidewalks with the City of Portland design guidelines is outside the scope of the Final EIS.
A193	PBOT	Taylor Phillips	Chapter 3, Section 3.3, page 3-26	With any impact that would widen pedestrian crossings, please consider median refuge islands, protected pedestrian phases, and other measures to make it easier for people walking to cross	This level of detail is not addressed in the Final EIS; however, these comments have been shared with the design team to consider as designs progress.
A194	PBOT	Taylor Phillips	Appendix A, pages A-35 – A-39, maps	None of the proposals here include sufficient crossings of Barbur or Naito. The DEIS outlines the City of Portland crossing spacing guidelines, yet does not propose crossings that fulfill these guidelines. If we truly do anticipate growth to occur here, we need to provide safe crossings to not only access transit stations, but also to allow people to safely cross this wide, busy, high speed street.	An analysis of crossings was completed and is shown in Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS, in Section 3.3, Short-Term Transportation Impacts. Figures in the main Final EIS document do not show all of the proposed crossings.
A195	PHB	Jill Chen	Section 4.1, page 4-3, Section 4.1.2	TriMet has already prejudged its disposal policy under "If there is surplus property (property no longer needed after construction), TriMet could sell or lease the surplus property." Please note that participating bureau (PHB) has not agreed.  Under FTA regulations, surplus properties may be disposed of by sale, lease, Joint Development or Transfer to Public Agency for non-Transit Use.  Please revise lines 9-11 to be in compliance with FTA regulations that allows for Joint Development and Transfer to Public Agency for non-Transit Use, see 49 U.S.C., 5334(h)(1) – (h)(3).	Language regarding surplus property has been updated in the Final EIS to state that excess property will be managed and disposed of in accordance with FTA guidance and applicable state laws, and with consideration of the Memorandum of Understanding signed between TriMet, City of Tigard, City of Portland, Washington County and Metro.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
				If the DEIS needs to be complete before an agreement is reach between Trimer and PHB, suggest this language - "If there is surplus property (property no longer needed after construction), TriMet would dispose of the surplus property in accordance with FTA regulations."	
A196	PHB	Jill Chen	Section 4.1, page 4-4, Section 4.1.2	Once the route is selected, would the Final EIS quantify the number of sites under a "full" or "partial" acquisition? And provide the demographics, especially accounting for income and race, of the owners and residents from those parcels that are now acquired for the project?	Section 4.1, Acquisitions, Displacements and Relocations, of this Final EIS quantifies the number of properties impacts by full acquisition, partial acquisition or permanent easement. Data that allows for a breakdown of owners and residents by race or income are not available.
A197	PHB	Jill Chen	Section 4.3, page 4-22, Section 4.3.2	Regarding the subsection on Impacts of Business and Employment Displacements, once the route is selected, would the Final EIS quantify the type and ownership of businesses indirectly impacted due to increased rent? And provide the demographics, especially for income and race, of the impacted workers and owners of these businesses?	The type and ownership of businesses potentially impacted by increased rents are not reviewed in the Final EIS.
A198	PHB	Jill Chen	Section 4.4, page 4-30, Section 4.4.3	Under the subsection of Light Rail Alternatives the statement "All of the station access improvement options would increase neighborhood cohesion and quality of life by improving walking, biking and transit access" is inaccurate since neighborhood cohesion could be difficult if neighbors are being displaced and/or priced out due to increased rents.	Indirect impacts to neighborhood cohesion and quality of life are addressed in Section 4.18, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts, of both the Draft EIS and this Final EIS. While the light rail investment could contribute to rising property values, and thus increased rents, this impact would not negate the long-term benefits of improved walking, bicycling and transit access for neighborhood cohesion and quality of life.  Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to affordable housing, gentrification and indirect displacement.
A199	PHB	Jill Chen	Section 4.4, page 4-40, Section 4.4.6	"Under the subsection related to Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, it implies coordinated strategies with TriMet but that does not yet exist. This is similar to the comment made under Acquisitions.  Please note that these listed strategies in this section are unfunded."	The text of the Draft EIS describes that TriMet, Metro, the City of Portland and the City of Tigard were coordinating at the time of the Draft EIS publication to identify strategies to prevent indirect economic displacement, and the Draft EIS listed examples of what those strategies could include. This Final EIS includes updated information about these efforts in Section 4.18, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts.  Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to affordable housing, gentrification and indirect displacement.
A200	PHB	Jill Chen	Section 4.18, page 4-154, Table 4.18-1	Similarly once the route is selected, would the Final EIS quantify the number of sites indirectly impacted and provide the demographics, especially for income and race, of the owners and residents impacted indirectly?	There is insufficient information to speculate on specific properties that could be indirectly impacted. The Final EIS is focused on the Preferred Alternative and its conceptual design, but final design, construction and operation are yet to occur. Indirect effects would occur on properties that TriMet does not own or otherwise have jurisdiction over, and demographic information on individual property owners or residents and tenants is not publicly available.
A201	PHB	Jill Chen	Section 4.18, page 4-156, Table 4.18-1	Under Communities it is unclear how, with displacement of residents resulting from the project, neighborhood quality of life would generally indirectly benefit, as stated. It is also unclear how neighborhood cohesion would be increased with the rail (the existing residents could potentially be displaced and a new, richer group of residents could come in which could benefit from the new rail.	The Project will retrofit a corridor that is highly auto-oriented and lacks safe and uniform nonmotorized facilities. The transit improvements, along with the improved connectivity and human-scale experience provided by bikeways, sidewalks and landscaping, would improve the quality of life in the neighborhoods.
A202	PHB	Jill Chen	Section 4.18, page 4-156, Table 4.18-1	Under Communities it should be noted that "The increased supply and range of housing types that could be developed could also offset these impacts" is inaccurate since most of the expected new developments are more expensive construction which would equate to higher rents and increased displacement of existing tenants.	The text in Section 4.18, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts, has been revised in the Final EIS, and the specific line referred to in this comment has been removed. Instead, the Communities discussion in Section 4.18 explains that the effects of redevelopment and rent increases on tenants may be experienced differently in various parts of the corridor because of different jurisdictional policies, such as anti-displacement protections, relocation assistance, or requirements for affordable housing.
A203	PHB	Jill Chen	Appendix C	Once the route is decided, can Trimer provided data on the specific displaced residents demographics, i.e. Segment A1 for 41 residential units - broken down by % people of color or % low income? If so, are the demographics of the displaced different than the overall demographics of the SWC resident.	The property acquisitions as well as existing uses that may be displaced are estimates, and the actual disposition of properties depends on final design information as well as negotiations with property owners. Public data are not available at the parcel level to allow for a breakdown of household residents by race or income.
A204	PHB	Jill Chen	Appendix C, page C-15-16, Table C-3	Under Acquisition and Displacements, most affected by displacement are likely to be through increased rent and taxes which are indirect impacts of the project. However, Trivert's primary mitigant is through it property acquisition program including compensation and relocation assistance which can only be accessed by those who are directly impacted.  Therefore, suggest that in the Final EIS, Trimer and Metro provide a more detailed description of how the agencies intend to mitigate indirect impact.	As noted in additional discussion in Section 4.18, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts, of the Final EIS, the potential for increased rent or taxes would depend on many factors, of which the Project could be one. Local jurisdictions and their plans and zoning decisions have a more direct influence on the development potential of land, and they also have more options to capture the benefits of increased land values and to develop programs to maintain diversity and benefit low-income and minority residents.
A205	PHB	Jill Chen	Appendix C, page C-19, Table C-4	Under Communities - Mitigation  As noted above there is no agreement between Trimer and PHB on land. And listed strategies are unfunded.	In October 2018, after publication of the Draft EIS, TriMet, the City of Tigard, the City of Portland and Metro signed a Memorandum of Understanding that details goals and roles to increase the supply of affordable housing in the corridor, including identifying locations for 700 to 800

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
					affordable housing units in Portland and 150 to 250 units in Tigard. TriMet would consider this memorandum when disposing of property no longer needed by the Project.
A206	PHB	Jill Chen	Appendix C, page C-27, "Next Steps" section	Given the expected significant levels of indirect displacement (largely due to increased rent for residential and commercial property), a study of indirect displacement would be a useful to quantify the displacement	Please see the response to Comment A198.
A207	PP&R	Brett Horner	Section 4.7, page 4-77, middle of page	We still disagree with how this is worded: "However, because the OHSU campus is directly uphill of Terwilliger Parkway here and is the dominant feature experienced by parkway users in this location, the change to the setting would be localized and reduced by the existing presence of large buildings and transportation infrastructure." OHSU is the dominant human-made feature, but the impact of adding infrastructure to the area east of OHSU, as is being proposed, is NOT minimized by the presence of OHSU.	The Final EIS analysis has been revised to more clearly state the effects of the Marquam Hill Connection on Terwilliger Parkway.
A208	PP&R	Brett Horner	Section 4.7	"Repeat of previous comment that was not responded to: No specific reference page, but somewhere in this DEIS chapter there needs to be discussion of the project's impact on existing park service deficiencies (defined by the City of Portland as households further than 1/2 mile walk to a park). Since the project will unquestionably induce more demand for housing in Southwest than would happen under the no project alternative, the DEIS needs to quantify and assess this impact and provide a narrative about this unavoidable impact. Affordable housing envisioned with the project, which is being promoted, does not pay Parks SDCs, so the parks impact is even more exacerbated if the number of affordable units exceeds the normal city average of affordable/market housing ratio."	The Project is being developed in conjunction with the City of Portland and regional plans for increased population, employment and urbanization. The City of Portland's Barbur Concept Plan gave a detailed vision for how the city would accomplish transit-oriented development in station areas, and this directly shaped the proposed Project and its station location choices. Section 4.18, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts, of this Final EIS provides additional details on how increased urbanization could affect parks properties. However, the City of Portland controls the underlying land use and permitting decisions that would allow or deny increased development. The city also has the ability to condition developments, apply funding mechanisms or direct the likely increases in tax revenues to support improved public facilities and services, including parks.
A209	PP&R	Brett Horner	Section 4.12	So will an analysis of total tree removal and its impact on air quality be included in the Final EIS? Will you consider mitigation options to address the results? Currently, there is no mitigation proposed in this section.	Where trees are removed by the Project, they will be replaced in-kind, except for those areas that would be converted permanently to a new transportation use (e.g., the Marquam Hill Connection). The removal of trees by the Project would have a negligible impact on air quality.
A210	PP&R	Janelle St. Pierre	Section 4.2, page 4-10, Figure 4.2.1	Figure 4.2.1 is missing significant natural areas in South Marquam and Keller Woodlands (although they are included in figure 4.7-1).	Figure 4.2-1, Existing Land Use, has been updated in the Final EIS to include these natural areas.
A211	PP&R	Janelle St. Pierre	Section 4.7	Section 4.7 fails to recognize Terwilliger Parkway and Terwilliger Wildlands as a natural area that provides a key wildlife corridor and special status habitat for Oregon White oak. The Marquam Hill Connector requires more analysis due to the potential to significantly impact the ability of wildlife to utilize the corridor. It also fails to recognize the Terwilliger Parkway Corridor Plan (City ordinance 155241) and the intention to maintain a natural view corridor. I would strongly emphasize that OHSU is not a dominant visual feature along the Parkway and additional development for a connector could have a very significant impact to this resource. We are intentionally managing this area to minimize the visual impact of the Casey Eye Institute and other OHSU facilities.	The requested language has been added to Section 4.7, Parks and Recreation Resources, of this Final EIS. Further information on the Project's impact to natural resources, wildlife habitat and stormwater functions within the parks can also be found in Section 4.9, Ecosystems, and Section 4.10, Water Resources, of this Final EIS.
A212	PP&R	Janelle St. Pierre	Section 4.8, page 4-82, "Landslides and Steep Slopes" section	For 4.8.1 Additional analysis is needed on impacts of unstable slopes. Much of Terwilliger Parkway has evidence of historic landslides and unstable slopes. The analysis of landslide risk for the Marquam connector and impacts to the toe of the slope due to widening Barbur below Terwilliger Parkway have not been adequately addressed.	Analysis of the project area in the Draft EIS indicated that historical landslides and steep slopes exist in these areas, which are common to all alternatives. Mitigation of active or historical landslides and steep slopes will be addressed as project designs continue to advance.
A213	PP&R	Janelle St. Pierre	Appendix B4.2, page B4.2-10, Figure B4.2-4	Figure is missing significant natural areas in South Marquam and Keller Woodlands.	The figure referenced in this comment has not been updated for the Final EIS, as it shows generalized zoning and does not specifically identify parks. Parts of the referenced natural areas may not be zoned for "Parks and Open Spaces" but instead zoned for other uses.
A214	PP&R	Tate White	Section 4.5, page 4-51, first paragraph	Impacts to designated scenic viewpoints, drives and overlay zones are acknowledged but not fully analyzed. Can you please do more extensive analysis of the preferred alignment and connector for the Final EIS (beyond Tables 4.5-6 and 4.5-9)? We want the design and mitigation to be informed by this work, especially for protected views on Terwilliger.	The Final EIS presents simplified and updated visual resource mapping overlaid with the Preferred Alternative, and updates the visual impact assessment to address this comment.
A215	PP&R	Tate White	Section 4.6, page 4-60, "Light Rail Alternatives" Section	The statement we originally took issue with is still in the chapter: "A preliminary identification of cultural resources, including cultural landscapes and parkways, showed no known long-term impacts to cultural resources in the APE from the light-rail alternatives" - we need to see the analysis that supports this claim.  A proceeding section acknowledges the Terwilliger Parkway as a NRHP-eligible historic property located in the APE near the Marquam Hill Connection, but doesn't say anything about what this means for the project. Will this be analyzed more fully in the Final EIS and appropriate mitigation explored?	The Final EIS has removed these statements and replaced them with an analysis of the Project's effect on Terwilliger Parkway. See Section 4.6, Historic and Archaeological Resources, of this Final EIS.
A216	PP&R	Tate White	Section 4.7, page 4-77, middle of page	This comment is in reference to the paragraph about the Marquam Hill Connection options and the stated "negligible" impact on recreation. We currently have serious storm water issues in the SW Terwilliger/Whitaker area that is adjacent to and downhill from the proposed Marquam Connection. These issues have negative impacts on the park and recreation trails in the area which will only be exacerbated by further development. These storm water issues should be considered in further analysis, the Final EIS and for potential mitigation options.	The Marquam Hill Connection will meet applicable stormwater control requirements, which would prevent the worsening of existing drainage issues in the area and the potential for indirect or cumulative impacts to other recreational facilities.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
A217	PP&R	Tate White	Section 4.7	The Marquam Connection will have to go through required reviews for the design, conservation and scenic resource overlays, so it would be beneficial to do more detailed analysis of impacts to the ecosystem, design guidelines and protected views at the Final EIS stage. Will be needed for 4f and potentially 6f analysis as well.	Section 4.7, Parks and Recreation Resources, of the Final EIS and the related analysis for Section 4(f) resources in Appendix D, Final Section 4(f) Evaluation, incorporate those reviews and approvals as part of the assumptions for how design of the Project will continue to advance in coordination with the City of Portland.
A218	PP&R	Tate White	Section 4.7, page 4-81, middle of page	Added sentence is in section 4.7.4 reads "Removal of mature trees and shrubs would be quantified at the time of development permit review, and appropriate mitigation would be provided" - does this mean tree/plant removal and mitigation won't be addressed more fully in the Final EIS? They really should be, especially in the context of the preferred alignment and connector option.	Attachment D, Section 4(f) Evaluation, describes the anticipated impacts to trees and vegetation at parks, and acknowledges the Project's commitment to develop designs to minimize tree removal and to meet requirements for tree replacement.
A219	PP&R	Tate White	Section 4.9, page 4-93	Multiple times it is stated "Removal of trees would have a negative impact on these species, but the impact would be minimal in the context of the remaining habitat in the area." Given how preliminary the designs are, this statement seems premature. More analysis is needed. There is also no acknowledgement of White Oak as a special status habitat in the City of Portland Terrestrial Ecology Enhancement Strategy. East Terwilliger is part of the Westside Wildlife Corridor and a number of oak associated species are considered sensitive.	Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of this Final EIS has been updated to reflect additional analysis based on revised designs.
A220	PP&R	Tate White	Appendix B4.2, page B4.2-12	Although the plans we requested were added to the table in the Appendix, the alignment options are not analyzed for compatibility to these plans as is done for others like the Barbur Concept Plan or the OHSU 20-yr facility plan. We will want the preferred alignment to be analyzed for consistency with relevant plans we have, e.g. Terwilliger Parkway Corridor Plan, Parks Vision 2020 and the Vision Update, if completed. These guide our land use and service level planning.	The Final EIS analysis addresses consistency of the Preferred Alternative with these plans.
A221	PP&R	Tate White	Appendix D, page D-8, second row in table	We have done preliminary research that shows the Water and Gibbs Community Garden may still be 4(f) resource based on use. We will follow up on this if necessary after the preferred alignment has been chosen.	The Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS does not include any impacts to the Water and Gibbs Community Garden.
A222	PP&R	Tate White	Appendix D	A more definitive understanding/analysis of the impact on trees and shrubs will be required to finalize the 4f/6f section and final DEIS, so cannot wait until the permit stage as suggested above.	The degree of impacts has been defined, and anticipated mitigation has been refined in Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of this Final EIS.
A223	PP&R	Tate White	Appendix E, page E-7, second bullet	Need more details to evaluate the full potential impact to Woods Memorial Natural Area. The southeast section does have a trail. Need to evaluate 4f and ecological implications and provide appropriate mitigation.	Bicycle and pedestrian improvements are proposed along SW Taylors Ferry Road to provide access to the Barbur Transit Center Station as a station access improvement. The proposed improvements would occur within the existing right of way and would not result in a change of use for Woods Memorial Natural Area. This topic is discussed in the station access improvements portion of Section 4.7, Parks and Recreation Resources, of the Final EIS.
A224	PP&R	Tate White	Appendix E	In general need more details and opportunity to comment on these new design refinements - need full analysis of tree impacts, etc.	Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative, including information regarding analysis of impacts related to design refinements.
A225	PWB	Cherri Warnke	Appendix B4.15, page B4.15-2, Table B4.15-1	In Table B4.15-1, under the B1: Barbur section, looking at the PWB mapping records, the PWB impacted facility identified as "SW 3rd Ave to SW 7th Ave: 12-inch" actually appears to be located on the west side of SW Barbur Blvd between where SW Terwilliger Blvd crosses SW Barbur Blvd, south to where SW Bertha Blvd connects with SW Barbur Blvd. Please change "SW 3rd Ave. to SW 7th Ave" to "SW Terwilliger Blvd to SW Bertha Blvd".	In the Final EIS, Portland Water Bureau utilities are not listed in Appendix B, Supporting Documents, of this Final EIS, because of concerns about confidentiality. Therefore, this text was not included in the Final EIS.
A226	PWB	Cherri Warnke	Appendix B4.15, page B4.15-2, Table B4.15-1	In Table B4.15-1, under the B1: Barbur section, the PWB impacted facility in SW 35th Ave to SW Taylors Ferry Rd should include not only the listed 24-inch pipe, but a 6-inch pipe as well, with the similar listed length. The 6-inch water main parallels the 24-inch water main in this section of SW Barbur Blvd.	In the Final EIS, Portland Water Bureau utilities are not listed in Appendix B, Supporting Documents, of this Final EIS because of concerns about confidentiality. Therefore, this text was not included in the Final EIS. Only waterlines 12 inches in diameter or larger were included in Table B4.15-1 of the Draft EIS. The table was not intended to be an exhaustive list of all potential conflicts, because of the considerable length of the Project and the many utilities potentially impacted.
A227	City of Tigard	Kenny Asher	Not specified	<p>Thank you for documenting the City of Tigards' comments on the recently published Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project. You and your team are to be commended on producing such a comprehensive report and the City of Tigard, as a participating agency, values your management of the process.</p> <p>This letter supplements City of Tigard comments provided via the Metro-provided spreadsheet. The content of this letter highlights the city's most important impact and mitigation concerns, and in some cases, repeats what you will find in our spreadsheet comments.</p> <p>An overall category of city concern is the relative dearth of impact and mitigation description for the refinements that are proposed as part of the Initial Route Proposal. As there are several design refinements proposed for Section C (Refinements 4, 5, and 6), the City of Tigard is especially sensitive to the fact that as yet we neither have useful information about the extent of the impacts nor their associated mitigation possibilities. If these refinements are carried forward as a Preferred Alternative, please be prepared for the city, along with our business partners and</p>	<p>The Final EIS includes additional analysis and documentation of impacts related to Refinements 4, 5 and 6, which were included as part of the Preferred Alternative. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>As of 2015, establishments within city of Tigard employed approximately 46,000 workers. In that same year, the city was home to approximately 19,000 households—a ratio of 2.4 jobs per household. In comparison, Portland has 1.7 jobs per household, and the metro area overall has about 1.3 jobs per household. A loss of 791 jobs (assuming all displaced employers choose to relocate outside of Tigard) represents approximately 1.7 percent of the city's total job base. Because Tigard does not collect sales or income taxes, the primary resulting fiscal impacts of employer displacement would stem from reduced property tax collections.</p> <p>This Final EIS considers an option for a minimum operable segment terminating near the Tigard Transit Center, referred to as the Hall Terminus Option. The Hall Terminus Option would have</p>

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
				<p>public, to closely monitor the discovered impacts and strongly advocate for appropriate mitigations for those impacts. Of particular note are the property and business impacts yet to be identified or studied. When combined with impacts to the dozens of businesses and hundreds of jobs (more than 500 by our read) described in the DEIS in locations outside the refinement areas, we are convinced that the project's economic impact on Tigard will be significant.</p> <p>We request that mitigation measures address not only the displacement and relocation of individual businesses, but also the economic impact on the city itself. As we have seen in previous light rail construction projects, businesses can and do relocate to strong and well-suited locations, but often, for a variety of reasons, outside of their original jurisdiction. The loss of employment and tax base within the City of Tigard must therefore be considered and mitigated. Tigard is primarily a residential city; the loss of industrial land and business has a disproportionately negative effect on Tigard's tax base. We do not agree, therefore, with the statement in section 4.3.2 that the "property tax revenue impact (loss) would be negligible to the budget of each local jurisdiction" and ask that the FEIS methodology and impact analysis be constructed to assure us that the tax revenue loss to the City of Tigard is not understated.</p> <p>We also ask that in the Final Environmental Impact Study (FEIS), the project include a mitigation for the Minimum Operable Segment (MOS) to the Tigard Transit Center that does not impact traffic on Hall Boulevard or naturally occurring affordable housing on Ash Avenue. Both of these impacts are described in Alternatives C1 and C2, and C3 and C4 respectively. The City of Tigard asks that the project study an alternative that places a downtown station within downtown Tigard proper, crossing Hall Boulevard on structure and situating a station south and west of the existing railroad tracks. The city believes that such an option would show a net benefit on both transportation and economic measures and unlike Refinement 6, achieves consistency with the city's goals and plans for downtown.</p> <p>In a full-build scenario, the City of Tigard requests mitigation for an undisclosed land use impact related to the location of the downtown-serving station described in Refinement 6. According to the DEIS, "Long-term impacts can ... occur if the transportation improvements are not consistent with the goals of existing plans and policies." (Section 4.2, page 9). The transportation improvements described by Refinement 6 are not supported by existing plans and policies. The city anticipates that comprehensive plan policies and possibly zoning map and text changes will be desired to allow future land uses to complement the proposed transportation improvements - land uses that are prohibited under current regulations. This impact should be examined in the FEIS and the light rail project should include the cost of recommended comprehensive plan and community development code updates as mitigation for land use impacts.</p> <p>In either an MOS or full-build scenario, the City of Tigard is requesting TriMet sponsor a joint development project proposal under which private investment will create an economic and transit benefit for the region, along with a new source of operating revenue for TriMet. The city requests that the FEIS be scoped to include properties and impacts associated with the joint development proposal. This should include an expansion of the downtown Tigard Park and Ride parking structure from 300 spaces to 600 spaces, with the additional spaces designated to support the joint development project. FTA guidance states that, to the extent information about joint development is known and reasonably foreseen, the joint development impacts should be studied in the NEPA evaluation of the larger PTA-assisted project (i.e. the SWC Light Rail Project).</p> <p>Lastly, the city would like to make sure some high-level transportation concerns are on the record. Regarding roadway impacts, the city requests that several areas receive additional study, including Highway 99 around 68<sup>th</sup>, Hall Boulevard around Hunziker, and Upper Boones Ferry Road near 72<sup>nd</sup>.</p> <p>Regarding active transportation impacts, the city requests that Station Area Access Improvement Options for Segment C (Figure A-32) are fully reviewed and updated in coordination with city staff to optimize access for pedestrians and cyclists to all Tigard stations, with special regard for improving active transportation access for Tigard's low and moderate-income residents. With regard to public transportation impacts, the city is extremely interested in understanding changes in the bus network that will accompany new light rail service, as these will impact the operating cost of bus service, connections for bus and WES passengers, and changes to bus traffic on city streets. Tigard requests that TriMet commence planning for bus routes, stops and layover facilities earlier than in past projects as all of these will factor into project-related street and intersection design decisions, as well as level-of-service impacts for Tigard transit users.</p> <p>As I have said, this letter is not an exhaustive list of City of Tigard concerns, but rather underscores our interest in some of the largest issues we face as the project moves into the FEIS and Project Development phases. Again, on</p>	<p>the same alignment as the Preferred Alternative, except that it would terminate at the Hall Station instead of at Bridgeport Village. It would also include the Hunziker O&amp;M Facility and tail tracks south of the Hall Station to allow light rail vehicles to access the facility. Neither the Preferred Alternative nor the Hall Terminus Option would result in traffic impacts on SW Hall Boulevard or residential displacements on SW Ash Avenue. The Final EIS does not study an alignment alternative as requested in this comment, which would place a station within downtown Tigard proper, crossing SW Hall Boulevard on structure and situating a station south and west of the existing railroad tracks.</p> <p>Land use impacts related to the Hall Station are discussed in Section 4.2, Land Use, of this Final EIS. As documented in the Final EIS, the Preferred Alternative, which includes Refinement 6, is supportive of existing plans and policies. In Tigard, the Preferred Alternative would have stations and other improvements including streets, paths and access elements that support the goals of the <i>Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan</i>, the <i>Tigard Downtown Improvement Plan</i> and the City of Tualatin Comprehensive Plan, which are to increase multimodal access and provide an efficient and balanced transportation system.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative would include two stations in the Tigard Triangle (68th Station and Elmhurst Station) and one serving downtown Tigard (Hall Station). Together, the three station areas are expected to encourage more redevelopment and higher intensity land uses. The alignment between the Elmhurst Station and the Hall Station would support the City of Tigard's <i>Downtown Improvement Plan</i>, because it would connect the Tigard Triangle with downtown Tigard.</p> <p>The Hunziker O&amp;M Facility would be located along the light rail alignment in the industrial area east of downtown Tigard. The proposed facility would be compatible with all local plans and would not result in a change in land use in this area.</p> <p>TriMet and the City of Tigard have been coordinating on maximizing transit-oriented development opportunities at the Hall Station. Joint development is a possible option that would be considered later in the project development process. The Final EIS contains additional traffic analysis at the locations identified in this comment. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding station access improvements identified in the Final EIS. TriMet will continue to coordinate with local jurisdictions on the design of station access improvements.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project. TriMet will continue to coordinate with local jurisdictions on changes to future bus service.</p>

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
				behalf of the City of Tigard, please accept my congratulations on successfully reaching this key milestone in the Southwest Corridor planning process.	
A228	City of Tigard	Susan Shanks	Section 4.2, page 4-10	The generalized comprehensive plan designations shown in Figure 4.2-1 are incorrect and do not reflect map amendments adopted by the city in December 2017 for the Tigard Triangle. Any analysis utilizing the spatial data in this figure should be updated.	The Final EIS includes updated land use data and mapping that reflect the map amendments referred to in the comment.
A229	City of Tigard	Susan Shanks	Section 4.2, page 4-9	The city agrees with the statement that long-term impacts can occur if transportation improvements are not consistent with the goals of existing plans and policies, which is why the city is concerned with the location of the O&M facility inside the Hunziker Industrial Core and Design Refinement 6 (Appendix E) that moves the location of the Downtown Tigard station east of Hall Blvd, outside of Downtown Tigard, and inside the Hunziker Industrial Core as well. It is unclear whether the location of these improvements inside the Hunziker Industrial Core is consistent with the city's land use vision for Downtown Tigard or the Hunziker Industrial Core as described in the 2008 Tigard Comprehensive Plan, 2009 Tigard Downtown Future Vision, 2010 Tigard Transportation System Plan, 2012 Tigard High Capacity Transit Land Use Plan, and the 2014 Hunziker Core Infrastructure Strategy. Specifically, it is unclear whether locating an O&M facility in the Hunziker Industrial Core is an appropriate use of the city's limited industrial lands or a hindrance to the city's ability to meet its economic development needs and goals. It is also unclear whether locating a station east of Hall Boulevard will: maintain Downtown Tigard as the city's primary transit center; support Main Street's development as downtown's activity center; or help downtown grow into the urban village envisioned by the community.	The Preferred Alternative would include two stations in the Tigard Triangle (68th Station and Elmhurst Station) and one serving downtown Tigard (Hall Station). Together, the three station areas are expected to encourage more redevelopment and higher intensity land uses. The alignment between the Elmhurst Station and the Hall Station would support the City of Tigard's <i>Downtown Improvement Plan</i> , because it would connect the Tigard Triangle with downtown Tigard.
A230	City of Tigard	Susan Shanks	Section 4.2, page 4-14	While it is true that the city has adopted new land use and development regulations for the Tigard Triangle and Downtown Tigard that encourage transit-oriented and mixed-use developments, the same cannot be said for the Hunziker Industrial Core, which is where Design Refinement 6 (Appendix E) proposes to move the Downtown Tigard station. This area is currently zoned for Light Industrial uses.	The Hunziker O&M Facility would be located along the light rail alignment in the industrial area east of downtown Tigard. The proposed facility would be compatible with all local plans and would not result in a change in land use in this area.
A231	City of Tigard	Susan Shanks	Section 4.2, page 4-18	The city agrees with the statement that the alignments providing two light rail stations in the Tigard Triangle are the most supportive of the city's land use plans and policies.	The Preferred Alternative identified for the Project in the Final EIS includes two light rail stations in the Tigard Triangle.
A232	City of Tigard	Susan Shanks	Section 4.2, page 4-20	The city welcomes a partnership with TriMet and other agencies to mitigate for the likely future loss of unprotected naturally occurring affordable housing in and around Downtown Tigard.	Please see Master Response 18 regarding partnerships between TriMet and other agencies related to affordable housing.
A233	City of Tigard	Susan Shanks	Section 4.6, page 4-55	Suggest revising the last sentence in the section's introductory paragraph to clarify that indirect and cumulative impacts are now located in Section 4.18.	Section 4.6, Historic and Archaeological Resources, of the Final EIS has been revised to make this clarification.
A234	City of Tigard	Susan Shanks	Section 4.6, page 4-57	Suggest enlarging the map symbols on Figure 4.6-1 to make more legible.	Figures in Section 4.6, Historic and Archaeological Resources, of the Final EIS have been revised as requested.
A235	City of Tigard	Susan Shanks	Section 4.6, page 4-65	There's a blank line in Table 4.6-2 that appears to be an omission. The previous draft had a line for "Hunziker Partial."	Section 4.6, Historic and Archaeological Resources, of the Final EIS has been revised to reflect the acquisitions and impacts associated with the Preferred Alternative.
A236	City of Tigard	Susan Shanks	Section 4.16, page 4-140	Suggest revising the last sentence in the section's introductory paragraph to clarify that indirect and cumulative impacts are now located in Section 4.18.	In the Final EIS, this sentence was revised to remove reference to indirect and cumulative impacts. The introduction of Chapter 4, Environmental Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS includes a reference to Section 4.18, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts.
A237	City of Tigard	Susan Shanks	Section 4.16, page 4-141	Suggest adding the First School site to Figure 4.16-1 to show the concentration of public services in the Downtown Tigard area and their relationship to the alignments.	This figure has been updated in the Final EIS to include the First School site.
A238	City of Tigard	Susan Shanks	Section 4.18, page 4-155	See comment for Chapter 4.2 page 9 above regarding the indirect and cumulative land use impacts summarized in Table 4.18-1.	Please see the response to Comment A229.
A239	City of Tigard	Susan Shanks	Appendix B4.2, page B4.2-9	The existing land uses shown in Figure B 4.2-3 are incorrect with regard to multiple public and vacant properties in the Tigard Triangle and Downtown Tigard areas. If more accurate GIS layers are not available, vacant parcels could be fact checked against aerial photos. At the very least, the city's public works site and TVFR's Station 51 (both on Burnham Street) should be identified as public. Moreover, the information in this figure is inconsistent with the existing land uses shown in Figures B 4.18-16, 17, and 18, particularly for the Tigard Triangle and Downtown Tigard areas. It does not help that these figures do not use the same color scheme for the different land uses and were placed over aerial photos, which makes them difficult to read. Any analysis utilizing the spatial data in these figures should be updated, e.g. Figure 4.2-1.	The Final EIS includes updated land use data and mapping that reflect these comments.
A240	City of Tigard	Susan Shanks	Appendix B4.2, page B4.2-10	The generalized zoning shown in Figure B 4.2-4 is incorrect and does not reflect zoning map amendments adopted by the city in December 2017 for the Tigard Triangle. Any analysis utilizing the spatial data in this figure should be updated.	The Final EIS includes updated land use data and mapping that reflect these comments.
A241	City of Tigard	Susan Shanks	Appendix B4.18, pages B4.18-19 – B4.18-24	See comment for Chapter B4.2 page 9 above. These figures are also incorrect (but in a different way) with regard to multiple public and vacant properties in the Tigard Triangle and Downtown Tigard areas.	The Final EIS includes updated land use data and mapping that reflect these comments.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
A242	City of Tigard	Tegan Enloe	Chapter 3, Section 3.2, page 3-11	The DEIS says the Bridgeport Station park and ride would result in "slightly more traffic on SW Boones Ferry Road". The City would like to see more details of this analysis, particularly how the trips from the park and ride were distributed to the network in the study area and how many are assumed at each intersection. We were not able to find the supporting materials in the appendix/attachments. The City also believes that the study area does not include all necessary intersections to address back up/delay/queues from the park and ride through the study area, specifically 72nd/Durham, 72nd/Bridgeport Village Access, and 72nd/Lower Boones Ferry. The City would like to see more detailed analysis of this portion of the study area performed.	The project team provided additional detail to the City of Tigard following publication of the Draft EIS. Additionally, in the Final EIS, additional detail is provided in Section 3.2.4, Motor Vehicle Operations Impacts, and in Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report. The intersections noted by the commenter were included in the Final EIS analysis; please see Section 4.1.3 of Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report.
A243	City of Tigard	Tegan Enloe	Chapter 3, Section 3.2	The City understands that one of the two proposed stations in the Tigard Triangle is proposed to move further north to boarder Hwy 99W, which will allow the walk shed to include the neighborhoods north of Hwy 99W. This area has high pedestrian and bicycle activity the City feels will want to utilize the transit station. With that in mind, the City would like to see additional design consideration given to pedestrian and bicycle users traveling across Hwy 99W to the proposed station. In addition, the City would like to see traffic analysis impacts to surrounding intersections from vehicles entering and existing the proposed station park and ride.	The Preferred Alternative identified for the Project in the Final EIS includes Refinement 4. This refinement includes moving the Baylor Station that was included in the Draft EIS north to SW 68th Parkway and Pacific Highway (99W) and including a park and ride at the station. The Final EIS includes additional traffic analysis related to the proposed park and ride. The project design team will continue to work with ODOT and City of Tigard to explore improved crossings of Pacific Highway in the vicinity of the 68th Station.
A244	City of Tigard	Tegan Enloe	Chapter 3, Section 3.2	The City has concerns over the viability of the proposed at-grade light rail crossings over SW 72nd Avenue and SW Upper Boones Ferry Road. The high level of existing congestion, coupled with anticipated traffic increase in the area, limit opportunities to create an at-grade crossing scenario where vehicles can be cleared out of the way of light rail trains during peak hour. The City would instead support grade separation of both crossings at SW 72nd Avenue and SW Upper Boones Ferry Road to mitigate these concerns.	The Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS includes at-grade crossings of SW 72nd Avenue and SW Upper Boones Ferry Road. The Preferred Alternative has a split station design at SW Upper Boones Ferry Road to allow for a visual safety check before light rail crossings; traffic in this location already successfully manages to safely avoid backups onto the existing freight train and WES tracks. Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, specifically Section 3.2.8, Safety Impacts, of this Final EIS discusses how TriMet will address motor vehicle safety with at-grade light rail crossings. The Final EIS finds that the at-grade crossing has the potential to cause a traffic impact on the I-5 southbound off-ramp onto SW Upper Boones Ferry Road. The Final EIS identifies as a potential mitigation measure grade-separating SW Upper Boones Ferry Road over the light rail tracks and existing freight tracks to address the existing conditions and to possibly mitigate the I-5 ramp impact. For more details see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, specifically Section 3.6, Potential Mitigation Measures, of this Final EIS.
A245	City of Tigard	Tegan Enloe	Chapter 3, Section 3.2, page 3-24	The safety section says the project would improve pedestrian safety through increasing the number of "marked" crossings of SW Naito Parkway and SW Barbur Boulevard. Will these also be enhanced with additional safety measures like RRFBs? Simply marking a crosswalk with paint vs having an unmarked crosswalk doesn't in itself improve safety.	The Final EIS includes analysis of marked crossings of SW Naito Parkway and SW Barbur Boulevard. These crossings would also be enhanced with additional safety measures, such as Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) or traffic signals, in accordance with best practices. Determinations of specific treatments at crosswalks will be made as designs are finalized.
A246	City of Tigard	Tegan Enloe	Chapter 3, Section 3.2, page 3-24	The report states that adding signalized intersections can reduce the high rate of rear-end crashes. Signalizing an intersection is actually associated with an increase in rear end crashes and would not be considered a safety mitigation to reduce rear-end crashes.	The statement regarding signalized intersections and rear-end crashes has been removed from the Final EIS.
A247	City of Tigard	Sean Farrelly	Section 4.1, Section 4.1.2, page 4-3	Can property purchases for construction staging be done strategically with their eventual redevelopment into affordable housing kept in mind?	Please see Master Response 18 regarding the potential for remnant parcels to be used for affordable housing.
A248	City of Tigard	Sean Farrelly	Section 4.1, Section 4.1.2, page 4-4	Tigard is also discussing jurisdictional transfer of Hall Blvd with ODOT	The project team will continue to work with project partners, including ODOT and the City of Tigard, to ensure that the Project is designed to meet applicable standards.
A249	City of Tigard	Sean Farrelly	Section 4.1, Table 4.1-1, page 4-5	The number of residents displaced is difficult to provide at this stage, but the number of displaced jobs is obtainable and should be included on the table	The number of jobs anticipated to be displaced by the Project is documented in Section 4.3, Economics, of this Final EIS.
A250	City of Tigard	Sean Farrelly	Section 4.2, page 4-7	Design Refinement 6 (Appendix E) that moves the location of the Downtown Tigard station east of Hall Blvd, outside of Downtown Tigard, and inside the Hunziker Industrial Core would have a major impact on employment and loss of industrial land	The displacement of industrial uses is discussed in the Final EIS in Section 4.1, Acquisitions, Displacements and Relocations, and Section 4.3, Economics.
A251	City of Tigard	Sean Farrelly	Section 4.2, page 4-9	Please include more information about the timing of communication with residents who will be displaced	Please see Master Response 17 regarding timing of communications related to property acquisitions and displacements.
A252	City of Tigard	Sean Farrelly	Section 4.4, Table 4.4-4, page 4-35	The inclusion of bike/ped facilities on the light rail structure would further improve access across Highway 217 and create cohesion between Downtown Tigard and the Tigard Triangle ( the two parts of Tigard's designated Town Center)	This Final EIS identifies that this station access improvement (SA30) would create a new connection across the barrier of Highway 217. See Section 4.4, Communities, of this Final EIS for more information.
A253	City of Tigard	Sean Farrelly	Section 4.4, Table 4.4-4, page 4-35	Locating the Downtown Tigard station east of Hall Blvd, would reinforce Hall Blvd as a barrier and make it challenging to reach transit service. Careful consideration of urban design, safe street crossings and walkability improvements on Hall will be necessary.	The Preferred Alternative would improve access across SW Hall Boulevard by adding a signalized intersection at SW Commercial Street and realigning the intersection of SW Scoffins Street and SW Hunziker Street. See Section 4.4, Communities, of this Final EIS for more information. TriMet will continue to refine the design of these crossings and other urban design elements through final design based on input from the project partners and the public.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
A254	City of Tigard	Sean Farrelly	Section 4.4, Table 4.4-4, page 4-36	Design Refinement 6 that moves the location of the Downtown Tigard station east of Hall Blvd, inside the Hunziker Industrial Core would have negatively impact the cohesion of the affected business owners	The Preferred Alternative would use the alignment of Refinement 6 along the east side of SW Hall Boulevard. This Final EIS identifies that the business displacements of the Preferred Alternative could disrupt individual social ties. See Section 4.4, Communities, of this Final EIS for more information.
A255	City of Tigard	Sean Farrelly	Section 4.4, Table 4.4-4, page 4-38	Locating the Downtown Tigard station and bus transit center east of Hall Blvd., a high traffic arterial that is not pedestrian friendly, would reduce the convenience of transit for the transit-dependent population of Downtown Tigard.	The Preferred Alternative would improve access across SW Hall Boulevard by adding a signalized intersection at SW Commercial Street and realigning the intersection of SW Scoffins Street and SW Hunziker Street. See Section 4.4, Communities, of this Final EIS for more information.  This alignment along the east side of SW Hall Boulevard (Refinement 6) was selected for the Preferred Alternative in part to avoid residential displacements in downtown Tigard, which has a high proportion of transit-dependent populations.
A256	City of Tigard	Sean Farrelly	Section 4.4, page 4-40	For Design Refinement 6, a mitigation of the loss of jobs and industrial area is the creation of an Employment Transit Oriented Development District which will increase overall employment density increase in the Hunziker Industrial Core.	Please see Master Response 17 regarding property acquisitions and business displacements.
A257	City of Tigard	Sean Farrelly	Section 4.4, page 4-40	Specifically refer to the City of Tigard and City of Portland's Southwest Corridor Equitable Housing Strategy	This Final EIS includes updated information about these efforts in Section 4.18, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts, including a reference to the Southwest Corridor Equitable Housing Strategy.
A258	City of Tigard	Sean Farrelly	Appendix C, Table C-3, page C-15	Tigard requests data collection on rent levels of the apartments impacted by the Ash alignment to document their current affordability	The Ash Avenue alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Alternatives C1, C2 and C5 in the Draft EIS, is not part of the Preferred Alternative.
A259	City of Tigard	Sean Farrelly	Appendix C, Table C-3, page C-17	Replace "along Main Street" with "in Downtown Tigard"	The Final EIS describes how these impacts are avoided with the Preferred Alternative, and they are not included in the Environmental Justice analysis.
A260	City of Tigard	Sean Farrelly	Appendix C, Table C-3, page C-19	Under Land Use, Design Refinement 6 would result in a light rail alternative inconsistent with locally adopted plans	The Preferred Alternative was reviewed for local land use compatibility in the Final EIS. The alignment between the Elmhurst Station and the Hall Station would support the City of Tigard's Downtown Improvement Plan, because it would connect the Tigard Triangle with downtown Tigard.
A261	City of Tigard	Sean Farrelly	Appendix C, Table C-3, page C-19	Under Communities, Design Refinement 6 would have a impact the cohesion of Downtown by placing the Downtown Station on the east side of Hall Blvd, which forms a barrier.	The Preferred Alternative would improve access across SW Hall Boulevard by adding a signalized intersection at SW Commercial Street and realigning the intersection of SW Scoffins Street and SW Hunziker Street. See Section 4.4, Communities, of this Final EIS for more information.
A262	City of Tigard	Sean Farrelly	Appendix C, Table C-3, page C-23	Under Safety and Security, please explain the point "could increase the risk of incidents"	The language referenced by this comment is not included in Section 4.17, Safety and Security, of the Final EIS. This text should not have been included in the Draft EIS, as the impact is speculative and not reasonably foreseeable. Additionally, impacts to transportation safety should not have been discussed in Section 4.17 because they are addressed in Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS.
A263	City of Tigard	Sean Farrelly	Appendix C, page C-26, "Preliminary Conclusion" section	The occurrences of displaced residents to purchase property with the help of relocation compensation is very positive, but is it common? What steps can be taken to make it more common?	TriMet has been coordinating with residents throughout project development and will continue to work collaboratively with them when relocation is required. When acquiring properties and relocating existing residents and businesses, TriMet would comply with the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, Chapter 35 of the Oregon Revised Statutes, and TriMet's Acquisition and Relocation Policy, Procedures, and Guidelines.
A264	City of Tigard	Dylan Dekay-Bemis	Section 4.3, page 4-22	Although displaced businesses are free to relocate within the same city, this may not be possible for Tigard's displaced firms given the low commercial vacancy rates in Tigard (especially for industrial / manufacturing space). This is especially problematic for firms affected by Design Refinement 6 and the Hunziker O&M Facility. Developable land is available in the Tigard Triangle, but development of a new facility would likely not be an option for most of the businesses affected by the design refinements.	Please see Master Response 17 regarding property acquisitions and business displacements. Section 4.3, Economics, of this Final EIS documents the jobs in Tigard affected by displacements under the Preferred Alternative, including the Hunziker O&M facility.
A265	City of Tigard	Dylan Dekay-Bemis	Section 4.3, page 4-23	The City of Tigard requests further analysis of the business and employment impacts of Design Refinements 4 and 6. Without this information it is impossible to objectively evaluate the impact of the alignment alternatives, especially the initial route proposal. For example, Design Refinement 6 would result in much higher levels of business and employment displacement in the Hunziker Industrial Area than the other alignment alternatives. This point should be discussed in the Economic analysis chapter in order to accurately reflect the potential impact of the alignment alternatives and design refinements.	The impacts of Refinements 4 and 6 are analyzed as part of the Preferred Alternative in this Final EIS. Please see Master Response 17 regarding property acquisitions and business displacements.
A266	City of Tigard	Dylan Dekay-Bemis	Section 4.3, page 4-24	The City of Tigard requests further analysis on the total annual property tax loss for Tigard related to Design Refinements 4 and 6. This information is necessary to fully analyze the alignment alternatives in general and the Initial Route Proposal in particular.	The impacts of Refinements 4 and 6 are analyzed as part of the Preferred Alternative in this Final EIS. Please see Section 4.3, Economics, of this Final EIS for the estimated property tax loss in Tigard that could result from the Preferred Alternative.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
A267	City of Tigard	Dylan Dekay-Bemis	Section 4.3, page 4-25	Businesses impacted by Design Refinement 6 would likely see a decline in business performance. Many of these businesses are freight dependent and reliant on the efficient movement of goods to and from their physical location, which would be negatively impacted by construction at key intersections.	Transportation impacts and mitigation are discussed in Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation of this Final EIS; no significant impacts to freight mobility were found as part of the Final EIS analysis.
A268	City of Tigard	Dylan Dekay-Bemis	Section 4.3, pages 4-25 – 4-26	A potential mitigation measure for the loss of businesses and employment related to Design Refinement 6 would be the establishment of an Employment Transit Oriented Development District that allows for greater job density. Additional mitigation measures for this design refinement include orienting the O&M Facility in such a way as to maximize the redevelopment potential of adjacent land and minimize the Facility's noise impacts.	Please see Master Response 17 regarding property acquisitions and business displacements. Establishment of an Employment Transit Oriented Development District has not been identified as a mitigation measure.  TriMet will continue to coordinate with jurisdictions to optimize station area design, as well as at the O&M facility adjacent to the Hall Station.  Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of this Final EIS, regarding concerns about noise impacts.
A269	City of Tigard	Dylan Dekay-Bemis	Appendix B4.18, pages B4.18-19 – B4.18-24	Suggest adding the proposed station locations to these maps for orientation and ease of reference.	These maps are not included in the Final EIS. Instead, maps in Section 4.2, Land Use, are provided in order to display land use information. The exact station locations are not identified on the maps in Section 4.2; however, the stations are located at the center of the 0.5-mile station buffer circles, each of which is labeled with the associated station name, shown on the maps.
A270	City of Tigard	Dylan Dekay-Bemis	Appendix B4.18, pages B4.18-19 – B4.18-24	Many of the land uses shown in these maps are inaccurate. For example, areas zoned Light Industrial (I-L) and Industrial Park (I-P) are labeled as Commercial in Figures B4.18-16, B4.18-17, B4.18-18, B4.18-19, B4.18-20, B4.18-21, B4.18-22, and B4.18-23 .	The Final EIS includes updated land use data and mapping for parcels within 0.5 mile of light rail stations. See Section 4.2, Land Use, for these revised maps.
A271	City of Tigard	Dylan Dekay-Bemis	Appendix E, page E-18	In regard to the last bullet point - although Design Refinement 6 would potentially result in fewer full and partial acquisitions of commercial properties in this segment of the light rail project than the other alignment alternatives, it would result in much higher levels of business and employment displacement. Parcels identified as potentially affected by acquisitions as a result of Design Refinement 6 currently contain approximately 20 businesses employing nearly 600 workers. This design refinement would also reduce Tigard's already constrained industrial land supply.	Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and business displacements.
A272	City of Tigard	Dylan Dekay-Bemis	Appendix F	Suggest identifying all parcels that would be potentially added by design refinements to the list of affected properties for the alignment alternatives. There seems to be inconsistency regarding which parcels are identified as being potentially affected by the design alternatives. Some parcels that may be potentially affected are included in the multi-page table while others are not.	Appendix F, Properties Affected by Acquisitions and Permanent Easements, of this Final EIS lists and maps all parcels that are assumed to be partially or fully acquired for the Preferred Alternative, which includes Refinements 4, 5 and 6.
A273	City of Tigard	Dylan Dekay-Bemis	Appendix F, pages F-13 – F-20	Suggest adding parcels labeled 8431, 11925, 15212, and 21785 in Figure F-12 to the multi-page table for Segment B in addition to the multi-page table for Segment C to avoid confusion about the potential property impacts of the design refinements.	In the Draft EIS, properties affected by Refinement 4 were included in Table F-2, Properties Affected by Acquisitions: Segment B, if they were east of SW 68th Parkway (Segment B, Outer Portland), and in Table F-3, Properties Affected by Acquisitions: Segment C, if they were west of SW 68th Parkway (Segment C, Tigard and Tualatin), as explained in the paragraphs preceding both Table F-2 and Table F-3. The Final EIS does not separately document acquisitions related to the design refinements, because they are either included in the Preferred Alternative or not; therefore, this requested change will not be made for the Final EIS.
A274	City of Tigard	Dylan Dekay-Bemis	Appendix F, page F-27	Figure F-12 - Parcel 159209 is mislabeled; should be labeled 15209. Several other taxlots in this figure are unlabeled and therefore unable to be identified in the multi-page table for Segment C.	Labels for these taxlots were mistakenly omitted in Figure F-13, Properties Potentially Affected by Acquisitions, in the Draft EIS. Figures have been updated for the Final EIS with appropriate taxlot labeling.
A275	City of Tigard	Dylan Dekay-Bemis	Appendix F, page F-32	Parcel 13157 appears to be potentially impacted by Design Refinement 6, but is not labeled as such in the multi-page table for Segment C.	As noted in the legend for Table F-3, Properties Affected by Acquisitions: Segment C, and the introductory paragraph preceding the table, parcels that would be affected by an alignment alternative or alignment alternatives were marked under the appropriate alignment alternative(s), while parcels that would be affected only by a design refinement, and thus would be an additional potential impact beyond those already identified under alignment alternative(s), were identified under the design refinements.
A276	City of Tigard	Dylan Dekay-Bemis	Appendix F, page F-36	Figure F-13 - Several taxlots along 70th near Elmhurst and several taxlots along Elmhurst near 70th are unlabeled and therefore unable to be identified in the multi-page table for Segment C.	Labels for these taxlots were mistakenly omitted in Figure F-13, Properties Potentially Affected by Acquisitions, in the Draft EIS. Figures have been updated for the Final EIS with appropriate taxlot labeling.
A277	City of Tigard	Dylan Dekay-Bemis	Appendix F, page F-36	Parcel 211449 is mislabeled; should be labeled 21449.	Figures have been updated for the Final EIS with appropriate labeling.
A278	City of Tigard	Dylan Dekay-Bemis	Appendix F, page F-36	Suggest adding an orange dotted line showing Design Refinement 4 (as it is currently understood) to Figure F-13, as it potentially impacts multiple taxlots labeled in this figure (21785, 8431, 11925, 15211, and 15212)..	Refinement 4 was shown as an orange dotted line in Figure F-12, Properties Potentially Affected by Acquisitions, and should have been included in Figure F-13 as well. In the Final EIS, the selected design refinements are part of the Preferred Alternative and not documented separately.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
A279	City of Tigard	Dylan Dekay-Bemis	Appendix F, page F-38	The parcel directly north of parcel 19552 is unlabeled and therefore unable to be identified in the multi-page table for Segment C. I believe this parcel should be labeled 19684. Parcel southwest of parcel 11323 is also unlabeled. I believe this parcel should be labeled 3485. Parcels 10574 and 10575 appears to be potentially impacted by Design Refinement 6 but are not identified as such in the multi-page table for Segment C.	Labels for these taxlots were mistakenly omitted in Figure F-16, Properties Potentially Affected by Acquisitions, in the Draft EIS. Figures have been updated for the Final EIS with appropriate taxlot labeling. As noted in the legend for Table F-3 and the introductory paragraph preceding the table, parcels that are affected by an alignment alternative or alignment alternatives were marked under the appropriate alignment alternative(s), while parcels that would be affected only by a design refinement, and thus would be an additional potential impact beyond those already identified under alignment alternative(s), were identified under the design refinements.
A280	City of Tigard	Gary Pagenstecher	Section 4.5, Table 4.5-6, page 4-49	Summary of Visual Impacts, Additional Elements; this table does not include any Tigard segment elements. Tigard has proposed MUP elements on the elevated structures through the Triangle. The proposed MUP structures would increase the visual impact when combined with the guideway over Red Rock Creek, Dartmouth, and Hwy 217 . In several locations, MUP exit/entrance ramps would be added verticle elements in the landscape and increase the visual impact. The DEIS must include these features in the analysis at this time.	Project elements in Tigard were detailed in Table 4.5-6 in the Draft EIS and in Table 4.5-3, Summary of Visual Impacts of the Project by Landscape Unit, in the Final EIS. This table includes the bridge over Highway 217; although it does not specifically mention the proposed multi-use path, studied as a station access improvement in the Final EIS, it is anticipated that visual impacts would be similar for the structure with or without the multi-use path.
A281	City of Tigard	Gary Pagenstecher	Section 4.5, Table 4.5-7	Visual Impacts by Landscape Unit for O&M Facilities; Doentown Tigard, Hunziker Option: With IRP proposed east of hall downtown station, the proximity of the O&M to TOD redevelopment of the Hunziker Core dramatically changes the visual impacts of the proposed O&M to the future vision of a dense and mixed use district. The levels of visual change, viewer sensitivity and overall impact should be revised to "High."	Today, this area is zoned industrial, and the Tigard Comprehensive Plan maintains industrial zoning for the foreseeable future. An O&M facility in this location would be compatible with the industrial zoning and the envisioned comprehensive plan designation. The inclusion of a proposed station at SW Hall Boulevard, between the O&M facility and the planned mixed-use district, would provide a visual transition/buffering, as well as directly serve important transportation needs of the planned mixed-use district. Additional mitigating treatments could include design refinement of the O&M facility, its buffer treatments, and architectural finishing. The determinations for level of visual change, level of viewer sensitivity and overall impact remain as "Low" in the Final EIS.
A282	City of Tigard	Gary Pagenstecher	Section 4.5, page 4-51	Although there are no designated scenic resources in Segment C, development of the hill adjacent to the proposed O&M facility should be considered. This hill will be developed with mixed uses including affordable housing, commercial and industrial uses. Views from hillside residences overlooking the O&M facility could, for example, be adversely affected by highly reflective materials. If this does not qualify for "designated" resource, other accomodation should be made to include it. Include as potential mitigation measures in 4.5.5 , the use of non-reflective materials and painting of structures in dark brown or other visually subordinate colors.	Mitigation measures include provisions to use context-appropriate finishes that complement their surroundings. Additional detail has been added to the Final EIS regarding nonreflective, dark and/or visually subordinate colors.
A283	City of Tigard	Gary Pagenstecher	Section 4.7, Table 4.7-1	Parks and Recreation Resources, Segment C Tigard and Tualatin; With the IRP location of the downtown station east of Hall, the TOD expected in the Hunziker Core shines a light on need for increased pedestrian connectivity. The Tigard Triangle Plan shows an alignment for the Upper Red Rock Creek district trail. The Lower Red Rock Creek trail segment between Hwy 217 and the Fanno Creek Regional Trail bisects the Hunziker Core and roughly follows the creek south to Patzo Dog Park, then onto Wall Street and over Wall Street and the RR yard just south of where Wall turns south along the tracks. Tigard will be the owner of the public facilities for biking and walking uses. The trail alignment must be accomodated by the SWC project between Red Rock Creek and the proposed O&M facility from Hunziker to Patzo dog park, and most likely from Hwy 217 to Hunziker with the projects vegetated corridor mitigation requirements.	The Red Rock Creek Trail is discussed in Section 4.7, Parks and Recreation Resources, of this Final EIS. As the Project continues to advance following publication of the Final EIS, TriMet, Metro and the City of Tigard will continue to coordinate their planning to support the goals of the <i>Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan</i> .
A284	City of Tigard	Gary Pagenstecher	Section 4.7, page 4-73	Segment C: Tigard Triagle Planned Recreation Resources should include the Lower Red Rock Creek segment as described above. Planned Regional Multimodal trail should include the full extent of the planned trail extension from the connection to the Kruse Way I-5 Ped bridge at the south end to the proposed 68th Parkway/Hwy 99 station area along the 70th right of way and including the elevated portion of the guideway over Red Rock Creek. Potso Dog Park should include the Lower Red Rock Creek tail alignment.	The Red Rock Creek Trail is discussed in Section 4.7, Parks and Recreation Resources, of this Final EIS. As the Project continues to advance following publication of the Final EIS, TriMet, Metro and the City of Tigard will continue to coordinate their planning to support the goals of the <i>Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan</i> for the Tigard Triangle.
A285	City of Tigard	Gary Pagenstecher	Section 4.18, Table 4.18-1, page 4-156	Visual Quality: Indirect and Cummulative Impacts addresses station areas.However, the greatest visual impacts in Tigard would likely come from the elevated guideway sections of the alignment over 68th, Dartmouth, Hwy 217, Bonita, and Upper Boones Ferry Road. Design mitigaitons for these structures will be key to preserving the visual quality of the corridor. These structures are unique to the project and will not likely be affected by indirect or cumulative impacts of development.	Project features, including proposed structures, will be designed using urban design best practices to make them blend in and complement their surroundings to the extent feasible.
A286	City of Tigard	Lori Faha	Section 4.9, Section 4.9.1, page 4-90	last sentence of Vegetation and Wildlife Species and Habitat section: change for Tigard to say "... However, Vegetated Corridors and wetlands are designated and regulated in Tigard." Impacts to wetlands may trigger requirements to amend the Tigard Comprehensive Plan. Impacts to Vegetated Corridors require mitigation and/or enhancement requirements.	Language clarifying the designation and regulation of vegetated corridors in Tigard has been added to Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of this Final EIS.
A287	City of Tigard	Lori Faha	Section 4.9, Section 4.9.2, page 4-94	Aquatic Habitat and Species: Fanno Creek and some tributaries are designated as fish-bearing and are listed for ESA species. Please amend to include this. Fanno Creek has recorded use by Steelhead, Ball Creek has recorded use by lamprey.	Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of this Final EIS has been updated to clarify that anadromous fish are unlikely to occur, but small numbers of resident fish may be present.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
A288	City of Tigard	Lori Faha	Section 4.9, Section 4.9.2, page 4-94	Vegetation and Wildlife Species and Habitat: Delete 2nd sentence ("The areas do not have specific protection") as this is incorrect. Vegetated Corridors as designated in Tigard under Clean Water Services requirements are regulated to provide water quality benefits and habitat benefits. Impacts to Vegetated Corridors require mitigation and restoration through Clean Water Services Design and Construction Standards which are adopted by reference in Tigard.	Language clarifying the designation and regulation of vegetated corridors in Tigard has been added to Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of this Final EIS.
A289	City of Tigard	Lori Faha	Section 4.9, Section 4.9.2, page 4-95	Threatened and Endangered Species: Fanno and some tributaries are impacted by salmonid ESA listings.	Language in Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of this Final EIS clarifies that these streams are habitat for Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed species and that the Project would not directly impact these streams.
A290	City of Tigard	Lori Faha	Section 4.9, pages 4-88 – 4-91	Figures 4.9-3 and 4.9-4 Ecosystem Resources: Both of these figures fail to show Vegetated Corridors in Tigard - please add.	Figures in Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of this Final EIS have been updated to include Washington County's protected vegetated corridors.
A291	TVF&R	Chief Allen Kennedy	Chapter 3, Section 3.1.22	Please note that Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue's Command and Business Operations Center and Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue Station 51 are separate facilities. The Command Center is located at 11945 SW 70th Avenue near SW Clinton Street in the Tigard Triangle. Fire Station 51 is located at 8935 SW Burnham Street in downtown Tigard.	References to Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue's two facilities have been corrected in the Final EIS.
A292	TVF&R	Chief Allen Kennedy	Section 4.1, Section 4.1.2, page 4-7	Alternatives C3 and C4 affect Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue's Command and Business Operations Center located at 11945 SW 70th Avenue in Tigard. The paragraph on page 119 of the Environmental Impact Statement incorrectly references a fire station. Alternatives C3 and C4 do not impact TVF&R's Fire Station 51 located at 8935 SW Burnham Street in downtown Tigard.	References to Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue's two facilities have been corrected in the Final EIS.
A293	TVF&R	Chief Allen Kennedy	Section 4.16, Section 4.16.2, page 4-142	Add Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue to the third paragraph regarding preemption, barriers, obstacles, medians etc. which have the potential to impact emergency response and create potential delays.	Section 4.16, Public Services, specifically Section 4.16.3, Long-Term Impacts, of this Final EIS includes a reference to Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue related to modifications to emergency response routes.
A294	TVF&R	Chief Allen Kennedy	Section 4.16, Section 4.16.2, page 4-142	Redact Station 51 from the fourth paragraph of "Emergency Services Providers" since that station is located in downtown Tigard on Burnham. TVF&R's Command and Business Operations Center is located on 70th and Clinton, where possible acquisition may be needed in the vacant unused area along Clinton.	Station 51 remains listed in this section of the Final EIS, because it serves a portion of the study area, although the station itself would not be directly affected by the Project.
A295	TVF&R	Chief Allen Kennedy	Section 4.16, Section 4.16.2, page 4-142	In the event that property at the Command and Business Operations Center owned by TVF&R is needed for the project, the Fire District must maintain access off 70th Avenue.	The Final EIS design shows that the Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue facility would maintain access off of SW 70th Avenue.
A296	TVF&R	Chief Allen Kennedy	Section 4.16	Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue is requesting to work directly with TriMet on reviewing: Construction safety plans related to emergency response, road closure plans in our service area, and light rail training for emergency responders.	TriMet will continue to work with jurisdictional partners, including emergency response agencies, to coordinate safety and risk review and mitigation management.
A297	TVF&R	Chief Allen Kennedy	Section 4.16, Section 4.16.1, page 4-140	Update the third paragraph of "Affected Environment" to references "specialty technical rescue teams" instead of 'hazard response'.	Section 4.16, Public Services, specifically Section 4.16.1, Affected Environment, of this Final EIS includes a reference to "specialty technical rescue teams" instead of "hazard response."
A298	TVF&R	Chief Allen Kennedy	Section 4.16, Section 4.16.1, page 4-140	Please verify the fire station count and attribution in the third paragraph. The third paragraph states that Portland Fire & Rescue has four stations, but we believe they are adding up two Portland Fire & Rescue Stations, one Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue Station and one Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue Command and Business Operations Center.	Section 4.16, Public Services, specifically Section 4.16.1, Affected Environment, of this Final EIS refers to four Portland Fire and Rescue stations (Stations 4, 5, 10 and 18) that serve the study area; two are in Segment A, and two are in Segment B. This section additionally lists the Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue's Station 51 and Command & Business Operations Center within the study area.
A299	TVF&R	Chief Allen Kennedy	Section 4.16, Section 4.16.1, page 4-140	The reference to "American Medical Services" in the third paragraph should be revised to "American Medical Response".	Section 4.16, Public Services, specifically Section 4.16.1, Affected Environment, of this Final EIS includes text referencing "American Medical Response" rather than "American Medical Services."
A300	TVF&R	Chief Allen Kennedy	Section 4.16, Section 4.16.2, page 4-142	In the second paragraph of "Emergency Services Providers", the word "Opticam" should be changed to "opticom".	Section 4.16, Public Services, specifically Section 4.16.3, Long-Term Impacts, of this Final EIS includes text referencing "opticom" rather than "Opticam."
A301	TVF&R	Chief Allen Kennedy	Section 4.17, Section 4.17.1, page 4-145	In the paragraph titled "Affected Environment", please change 'offences' to 'offenses'.	The Final EIS changes "offences" to "offenses" in this section.
A302	TVF&R	Chief Allen Kennedy	Not specified	TVF&R supports the SW Corridor project since it has the potential to reduce current and projected traffic congestion by extending light rail from Portland to the south metro area. As planning and design for the SW Corridor project continues, TVF&R would like to work directly with TriMet and other agencies to coordinate transit preemption at any new or modified road intersections or light-rail crossings. TVF&R would like to ensure that any new vehicle overpasses are designed to support the weight of large emergency vehicles. Finally, TVF&R would like to review construction safety plans related to emergency response, potential road closures in TVF&R's service area, and light rail training procedures for emergency responders.	TriMet will continue to work with jurisdictional partners, including emergency response agencies, to coordinate pre-emption, construction safety plans, road closures and light rail training procedures. Vehicle overpasses will be constructed to applicable standards.
A303	Washington County	Shaun Quayle	Attachment B, page 176	Queuing should be quantified for any at-grade crossing in the FEIS to mitigate any safety concerns with queue spillbacks.	The Final EIS includes discussion of queuing at at-grade crossings, including potential mitigation measures for addressing queuing issues.

Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
				<p><i>"Pre-DEIS Comment: Queuing southbound on 72nd Avenue spills back into 72nd/Beveland today. 72nd fromn Beveland through OR 217 and Hunziker should be analyzed for queuing and mitigation, particularly if an at-grade LRT crossing is proposed along Beveland at 72nd.</i></p> <p><i>Pre-DEIS Response: Will be included in FEIS analysis if included in the preferred alternative"</i></p>	
A304	Washington County	Shaun Quayle	Attachment B, page 178	<p>Pleased to see project team working on VISSIM simulation analysis of this sub-area.</p> <p><i>Pre-DEIS Comment: SimTraffic Model Area needs to extend to at least Upper Boones/Durham &amp; really should include Hall/Durham as the two area bottlenecks in the PM peak period if accurate queuing analysis results are desired.</i></p> <p><i>Pre-DEIS Response: This area will be included in the model results for the FEIS if it is part of the preferred alternative.</i></p>	As discussed in the response provided before publication of the Draft EIS, the Final EIS includes analysis of the intersection of SW Upper Boones Ferry Road and SW Durham Road and the intersection of SW Hall Boulevard and SW Durham Road.
A305	Washington County	Shaun Quayle	Attachment B, page 180	<p>Draft LPA includes these areas, so looking forward to seeing a combined analysis area in the FEIS analysis.</p> <p><i>Pre-DEIS Comment: Recommend combining SimTraffic Models for Carmen/UBF (figure 5.1-2) and Bridgeport (figure 5.1-3) into a single model to see capture the existing spillback along Durham from UBF into the Bridgeport model area, for enhanced queuing analysis accuracy.</i></p> <p><i>Pre-DEIS Response: This area will be included in the model results for the FEIS if it is part of the preferred alternative.</i></p>	The Final EIS analysis does not include a combined SimTraffic model for these locations because of the additional complexity this would have introduced for model calibration. However, a VISSIM analysis of the SW Upper Boones Ferry Road at-grade crossing was performed to evaluate queuing in more detail.
A306	Washington County	Shaun Quayle	Attachment B, page 190	<p>This deserves a closer look in the FEIS. Safety in particular related to queuing needs to be looked at closely along the LPA.</p> <p><i>Pre-DEIS Comment: V/C results for Tigard sub-area are better than expected, particularly for 99W intersections and Bonita/72nd.</i></p> <p><i>Pre-DEIS Response: The traffic analysis collected three days of data. The day of data used for analysis may not reflect a worst case scenario at this particular intersection. Our traffic analysis uses a PHF 1, which reflects a peak hour analysis. The peak 15 minutes may be worse.</i></p>	The traffic analysis in the Final EIS, including analysis related to queuing, was performed consistent with the agreed-upon methods (please see <a href="https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf">https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf</a> ).
A307	Washington County	Shaun Quayle	Attachment B, page 191	<p>This deserves a closer look in the FEIS. Safety in particular related to queuing needs to be looked at closely along the LPA.</p> <p><i>Pre-DEIS Comment: V/C results for Carmen/UBF sub-area are better than field observed, particularly for Durham/UBF and 72nd north/UBF. Did the counts include the queued demand desiring to get to the intersection or only processed volumes?</i></p> <p><i>Pre-DEIS Response: Our traffic analysis uses a PHF 1, which reflects a peak hour analysis. The peak 15 minutes may be worse. Our operations analysis only analyzes the processed volumes, but the queuing analysis (simulation results) depicts the congestion throughout the subarea.</i></p>	The traffic analysis in the Final EIS, including analysis related to queuing, was performed consistent with the agreed-upon methods (please see <a href="https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf">https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf</a> ).
A308	Washington County	Shaun Quayle	Attachment B, page 194	<p>Please plan to analyze and show queuing on a map graphically where projected 95th %ile queues will spillback to near or through upstream traffic signals. FEIS should quantify impact of gate down LRT events.</p> <p><i>Pre-DEIS Comment: Please illustrate existing 95th percentile queue lengths from Table 5.2-6 on map.</i></p> <p><i>Pre-DEIS Response: There are figures showing queue lengths for the Upper Boones Ferry/Carman and Bridgeport Subareas, but not for Tigard.</i></p>	Maps were included only for targeted intersections and not for all study areas. A map was not provided for this location in the Final EIS.
A309	Washington County	Shaun Quayle	Attachment B, pages 197, 198, 201 and 202	<p>Please define 95th percentile queuing in FEIS analysis documentation. Thanks!</p> <p><i>Pre-DEIS Comment: Clarify existing queue lengths are 95th percentile. Include definition of 95th percentile queuing on figures.</i></p> <p><i>Pre-DEIS Response: Noted. Since the audience for this report is likely traffic saavy, we assume the figures can be left as is since they relate to the report (which discusses 95th percentile queues).</i></p>	The 95th percentile queuing and methodology are reported in the Project Methods document (please see: <a href="https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf">https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf</a> ). The definition is also included here: The 95th percentile queue estimates that for any given cycle at a signalized intersection, the queue length calculated is representative of 95 percent of the peak 15-minute vehicular queues during the peak hour at that intersection.
A310	Washington County	Shaun Quayle	Attachment B, page 209, lines 10–16	<p>Sounds good.</p> <p><i>Pre-DEIS Comment: Please provide explanation to account for the documented small change in cut-line traffic volumes, and yet the provided large amount of transit parking and large ridership forecasted. There would seem to be a disconnect unless it is assumed all the new transit trips are diverted or pass-by existing trips &amp; would that even be reasonable?</i></p> <p><i>Pre-DEIS Response: Added this statement:</i></p> <p><i>There is some amount of increase in traffic adjacent to park and rides, and some amount of reduction due to mode shift to transit. From a systemwide basis, many park-and-ride trips would be diverted trips rather than new trips, diverting to access the transit service.</i></p>	As discussed in the response provided before publication of the Draft EIS, volumes and circulation have been updated for the Final EIS. There would be a minor increase in traffic adjacent to park and rides, and some reduction in traffic due to mode shift to transit.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
A311	Washington County	Shaun Quayle	Attachment B, pages 209 – 212	Thanks <i>Pre-DEIS Comment: Please document that analysis year for which this material in 5.3.3 Segment C System-Wide Analysis.</i> <i>Pre-DEIS Response: Added note that the analysis year for the systemwide analysis is 2035.</i>	As discussed in the response provided before publication of the Draft EIS, the Final EIS, Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, has been updated to note that the analysis year referenced in this comment is 2035.
A312	Washington County	Shaun Quayle	Attachment B, page 213	Should this list of assumed projects be included in DEIS and/or FEIS documentation? <i>Pre-DEIS Comment: Please clarify what background projects are assumed for the 2035 no-build and build conditions? List out major RTP financially constrained projects which were included in analysis that have an impact (e.g. OR 217 widening, UBF widening). A graphic summary would be really nice. Without this information it is difficult to assess the reasonableness of V/C results in Table 5.3-5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.</i> <i>Pre-DEIS Response: This list was provided to Shaun Quayle at Washington County on 6/29/18.</i>	Projects assumed under the No-Build Alternative are documented in Appendix A, Detailed Maps and Descriptions of the Alternatives, of the Final EIS.
A313	Washington County	Shaun Quayle	Attachment B, pages 254 – 257, 260 – 261, 264 and 266	Please plan to work collaboratively with agency staff in future to make sure assumptions for "optimizing" signal timings are realistic, acceptable, and documented so readers can rationalize the counter-intuitive result of queuing improving. <i>Pre-DEIS Comment: Great figures. Why are some no-build queues longer than the build queues? This would seem to be counter-intuitive. Also, what is the standard for acceptable queuing, particularly if a queue spills back through signalized intersections?</i> <i>Pre-DEIS Response: Our build analysis optimized signal timing through coordinated corridors, whereas the No Build utilized existing signal timing.</i>	The Final EIS reflects coordination with Washington County on assumptions related to optimization of signal timing. The standard for acceptable queuing is defined in the <i>Analysis Methods for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Environmental Impact Statement</i> (Metro, 2017) (please see <a href="https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf">https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf</a> ). Mitigation is considered for off-ramps where the queue would increase by at least 25 feet and extend into the deceleration zone, or where turn pockets would regularly overflow into the through lanes as a result of the Preferred Alternative.
A314	Washington County	Steve Kelley	Not specified	There should be a simple table identifying the existing and forecasted population and employment in the corridor. Perhaps expand Figure B4.3-1 and Table B4.3-1 to identify the corridor.	This information is provided in Appendix B4.3, Economics Supporting Documents, as part of the Final EIS.
A315	Washington County	Steve Kelley	Not specified	Perform additional study of the potential traffic and safety impacts at the SW Upper Boones Ferry road crossing and identify potential mitigations including grade separation of this intersection crossing. LRT mitigation must address queue spillback issues across proposed LRT crossing of SW Upper Boones Ferry, queue spill back across existing WES railroad crossing of SW Durham Road, and queue spillback from and onto Interstate 5 at Carmen Drive as a result of the added LRT gate-down events and traffic on SW Upper Boones Ferry.	The Final EIS includes additional traffic analysis at SW Upper Boones Ferry Road. The Preferred Alternative presented in the Final EIS includes an at-grade crossing of SW Upper Boones Ferry Road. Potential mitigation measures, including potential projects to provide grade separation, are documented in Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, specifically Section 3.6, Potential Mitigation Measures, of this Final EIS.
A316	Washington County	Steve Kelley	Not specified	Perform additional study of traffic and safety impacts of the greater Bridgeport area, inclusive of the expected traffic diversion via Nyberg Road, Tualatin-Sherwood Road, and Lower Boones Ferry Road to access the proposed park and ride terminus. This study should include trips with an end outside of the Portland Metro region (eg south of Wilsonville).	The traffic analysis is based on traffic volumes generated from Metro's regional travel model. The traffic analysis is therefore inclusive of regional travel. Study area intersection operations and queuing are consistent with the <i>Analysis Methods for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Environmental Impact Statement</i> (Metro, 2017) (please see <a href="https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf">https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf</a> ).
A317	Washington County	Steve Kelley	Not specified	Traffic analysis will continue with particular focus on conditions near highway ramp terminals, park and ride accesses, and at-grade light rail crossings of streets, and identification of potential solutions that can be implemented with the project or as betterments to ensure safe and reliable park and ride access from the freeway, reduced safety conflicts with railroad crossings reduced queueing on arterials and back-ups on I-405 and I-5 ramps.	The Final EIS traffic analysis addresses these issues consistent with the <i>Analysis Methods for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Environmental Impact Statement</i> (Metro, 2017) (please see <a href="https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf">https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf</a> ).
A318	Washington County	Steve Kelley, Chris Deffebach	Not specified	Continued identification of opportunities to integrate new technologies for shared vehicles, autonomous vehicles, traffic signal coordination and more into station access and design.	TriMet will continue to seek opportunities to integrate new technologies into station access and design as appropriate.
A319	Washington County	Steve Kelley	Not specified	Additional analysis would be conducted to confirm and mitigate potential traffic back-ups on I-405, the US 26 ramps and Barbur Blvd.	The Final EIS traffic analysis addresses the I-405/U.S. 26/SW Barbur Boulevard location consistent with the <i>Analysis Methods for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Environmental Impact Statement</i> (Metro, 2017) (please see <a href="https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf">https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/18/EIS-MethodologyJune2017.pdf</a> ). The grade separation of the light rail through SW Caruthers Street and SW Sheridan Street would also significantly lessen the project impact at this location.
A320	Washington County	Shaun Quayle	Chapter 3, page 3-7	Under queuing, please note that traffic queuing results in additional conflicts, negatively impacting roadway safety.	. Queuing is one factor in safety; however, there are other factors such as speed, complexity and design that also influence safety. Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS includes updated discussions covering queuing and safety in more detail, and the associated impacts are addressed in the mitigation commitments.
A321	Washington County	Shaun Quayle	Chapter 3, page 3-9	Under railroad freight, show a map of railroads in Segment C? Identify WES rail line in close proximity and influence area to the draft LPA crossing of Carmen/Upper Boones.	The Final EIS does not include this map, because the Preferred Alternative does not impact the existing freight railroad network.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
A322	Washington County	Steve Kelley	Chapter 3, page 3-9	Under Freight Facilities show a map of roads designated as freight routes. Please note that Washington County defines both 99W and 72nd Ave as "over-dimensional" truck routes - which should include consideration for larger than standard vehicles.	The Final EIS does not include this map. The Preferred Alternative is located primarily along two facilities that are designated freight routes: Pacific Highway (99W) and SW Barbur Boulevard. The project team will continue to coordinate with ODOT and Washington County regarding over-dimensional freight routes.
A323	Washington County	Steve Kelley, Julie Sosnovske	Chapter 3, page 3-13	text says ridership would increase by 17,800 to 18,600 average weekday trips. Table 3.2-3 shows change from No-Build as 17,100 to 17,800. Seems to be inconsistent or an error.	The text in this section of the Draft EIS is referring to the final row of Table 3.2-3, Average Weekday Total System-wide Southwest Corridor Transit Trips – Year 2035, which shows <i>total system-wide</i> transit trips, whereas the change from the No-Build Alternative referenced in this comment refers to the change in <i>corridor</i> transit trips. This is also the case in the Final EIS.
A324	Washington County	Shaun Quayle	Chapter 3, page 3-22	Segment C Queuing, the bulleted list lacks magnitude, duration, and thus context around the statement "would have queues". Are the queues meaningful to safety and operations? Too generic for a critical operational impact.	The queuing discussion has been updated in Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to provide additional details on Segment C queuing.
A325	Washington County	Shaun Quayle	Chapter 3, page 3-24	Railroad Freight, last paragraph, I am not comfortable with the wording assuming at-grade crossings of SW Hall Blvd, SW 72nd Ave and SW Upper Boones Ferry. Wording should be revised to present at-grade as an option and grade-separation as an option at these locations.	The Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS includes at-grade crossings of SW 72nd Avenue and SW Upper Boones Ferry Road. Potential mitigation measures, including potential projects to provide grade separation at SW 72nd Avenue and SW Upper Boones Ferry Road, are documented in Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, specifically Section 3.6, Potential Mitigation Measures, of this Final EIS. The Preferred Alternative evaluated in the Final EIS does not have an at-grade crossing of SW Hall Boulevard.
A326	Washington County	Shaun Quayle	Chapter 3, page 3-24	Safety impacts, last paragraph, wording should be added to recognize that at-grade crossings of LRT frequent service, have the potential to increase queuing and crash exposure. Cost-benefit analysis should be undertaken to carefully consider at-grade versus grade-separated solutions on the preferred alignment.	Additional design review and detailed traffic simulations have been performed at this location as part of the Final EIS process. Additional traffic controls are proposed, as well as commitments to coordinate with local jurisdictions to resolve the existing congestion and queuing issues at this location, which are further described in the discussion of Segment C in Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS. The Final EIS analysis does not identify safety issues that would require grade separation.
A327	Washington County	Shaun Quayle	Chapter 3, page 3-27	Table 3.3-1, Potential Motor Vehicle Mitigation. SW Upper Boones Ferry Rd west of SW Sequoia Pkwy; potential mitigation of managing queue with preemption and timing optimization is infeasible without (1) significant widening of Upper Boones Ferry and Durham Road, and (2) substantial enhancements to the reliability of Interstate 5 traffic flow. Propose modifying potential mitigation to "grade separation of rail crossing" only.	The Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS includes an at-grade crossing of SW Upper Boones Ferry Road. Potential mitigation measures were evaluated, and several mitigation options are included in Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS. Analysis conducted for the Final EIS indicates that multiple mitigation solutions, both grade-separated and at-grade, are possible.
A328	Washington County	Julie Sosnovske	Chapter 3, page 3-27	Upper Boones Ferry Rd west of SW Sequoia Pkwy (signal preemption and timing optimization vs. grade separation of rail crossing) –signal preemption would worsen existing delays in the Carmen/Upper Boones Ferry Road corridor, even with timing optimization (which can only help so much)	As stated in the comment, traffic analysis in the Final EIS indicates that signal preemption will worsen existing delays in the SW Carman Drive/SW Upper Boones Ferry Road corridor. The Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS includes at-grade crossings of SW 72nd Avenue and SW Upper Boones Ferry Road. The Preferred Alternative has a split station design at the Upper Boones Ferry Station to allow for a visual safety check before light rail crossings; traffic in this location already successfully manages to safely avoid backups onto the existing freight train and WES tracks. Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, specifically Section 3.2.8, Safety Impacts, of this Final EIS discusses how TriMet will address motor vehicle safety with at-grade light rail crossings. The Final EIS finds the potential for a traffic impact on the I-5 southbound off-ramp onto SW Upper Boones Ferry Road due to the at-grade crossing. The Final EIS identifies grade-separation of SW Upper Boones Ferry Road over the light rail tracks and existing freight tracks as a potential mitigation measure to address the existing conditions and potentially to mitigate the I-5 ramp impact. For more details, see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, specifically Section 3.6, Potential Mitigation Measures, of this Final EIS.
A329	Washington County	Shaun Quayle	Chapter 3, page 3-27	Table 3.3-1, Potential Motor Vehicle Mitigation. SW Lower Boones Ferry Rd at I-5 and Travelers Lane; mitigation should include treatments to address diversion impacts along Lower Boones Ferry to the south into Tualatin and Nyberg Road and I-5 interchange in particular.	The park and ride distribution was revised in the Final EIS in cooperation with Washington County and local agencies to better predict traffic routing to and from the park and ride, including at the locations mentioned in the comment.
A330	Washington County	Shaun Quayle	Attachment B, page 179	Consider using Washington County's continuous travel time data collection system (BlueMAC) to validate travel times to calibrate for FEIS, preferred alignment analysis to increase confidence in results reported.	Models were calibrated with Metro and TriMet, and all assumptions are documented in the attachments to Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, in the Final EIS. The BlueMAC system was not used to validate travel times in the Final EIS.
A331	Washington County	Julie Sosnovske	Attachment B, page 193	There should be some consideration of freight trains crossing SW Carman Drive / SW Upper Boones Ferry Road	Freight train traffic is considered in the queuing and mitigation discussion for this intersection in the Final EIS.
A332	Washington County	Steve Kelley, Julie Sosnovske	Attachment B, page 193	Several intersections along SW Carman Drive/SW Upper Boones Ferry Road were not evaluated during a.m. peak hour and some volumes are higher than p.m. peak hour (e.g. I-5 NB to WB and I-5 SB to WB), though most volumes are lower. Consider AM traffic in the FEIS.	Both Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS document the additional analysis of the AM peak hour for the area along SW Carman Drive and SW Upper Boones Ferry Road.

**Table J2.1-2. Response to Draft EIS Tribe and Agency Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Agency Name	Commenter Name	Draft EIS Document Location	Comment Text	Response
A333	Washington County	Julie Sosnovske	Attachment B, page 194	Why was C17 – SW 65th Ave/SW Haines St/I-5 northbound ramps not evaluated for signal warrants? It was the only intersection that failed in segment C under Existing 2017 conditions. [This intersection is addressed later on p. 232]	The Final EIS recommends a traffic signal at the SW 65th Avenue/SW Haines Street I-5 northbound ramps as mitigation for the Interim Terminus. A full signal warrant analysis would be conducted in final design.
A334	Washington County	Julie Sosnovske	Attachment B	comment on queuing results tables – note needed to indicate that measurements shown are in feet – no queue length capacities are indicated or where queues exceed capacities. It makes it hard to determine the significance of the queues. It would be helpful/easier to read if there was some indication of where queues exceed capacities (highlight/bold).	In the Final EIS, Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, queuing impacts that require mitigation are explicitly stated for additional clarification.
A335	Washington County	Julie Sosnovske	Attachment B, page 198	reports that queue sometimes extends across the existing railroad crossing (at Upper Boones Ferry Road) during the p.m. peak– this is a concern! Figure (5.2-7) looks like it could be in both directions (coming from both Sequoia Parkway eastbound and from 72nd Ave (north) westbound).	The Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS includes at-grade crossings of SW 72nd Avenue and SW Upper Boones Ferry Road. The Preferred Alternative has a split station design at the Upper Boones Ferry Station to allow for a visual safety check before light rail crossings; traffic in this location already successfully manages to safely avoid backups onto the existing freight train and WES tracks. Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, specifically Section 3.2.8, Safety Impacts, of this Final EIS discusses how TriMet will address motor vehicle safety with at-grade light rail crossings. The Final EIS finds the potential for a traffic impact on the I-5 southbound off-ramp onto SW Upper Boones Ferry Road because of the at-grade crossing. The Final EIS identifies grade-separation of SW Upper Boones Ferry Road over the light rail tracks and existing freight tracks as a potential mitigation measure to address the existing conditions and potentially to mitigate the I-5 ramp impact. For more details see Chapter 3, specifically Section 3.6, Potential Mitigation Measures, of this Final EIS.
A336	Washington County	Julie Sosnovske	Attachment B, page 219	Figure 5.3-4 – there are discrepancies between figure and Synchro/SimTraffic at C27, C28 and C29	Synchro analysis and relevant figures have been updated for all study intersections in Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS.
A337	Washington County	Julie Sosnovske	Attachment B	No queuing diagrams provided for downtown Tigard or Tigard Triangle subareas. Hall Blvd. and 72nd Ave. could be issues and are more easily visualized with a graphic (especially since queue capacities are not shown), particularly for double train event.	In the Final EIS, Appendices B51 and B54 to Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, include figures depicting No-Build Alternative queuing versus Preferred Alternative queuing.
A338	Washington County	Julie Sosnovske	Attachment B	Preliminary Signal Warrant Analysis - why weren't the following (failing in 2035) intersections considered? 65th/Haines/I-5 NB ramp (p. 230-1); Travelers Lane/ Lower Boones Ferry Rd (p. 239); 68th/Atlanta (p. 230-1); Hall/Commercial (p. 230-1); Commercial/Main (p. 230-1)	Signal warrant analyses would be completed later in the process, following the publication of the Final EIS.
A339	Washington County	Julie Sosnovske	Attachment B, page 268	traffic signals are proposed approximately 300 feet from adjacent (fairly significant) intersections, regardless of the many driveways along this stretch: Hall/Clinton (~300 feet from OR 99W); Hall/Knoll (~315 feet from Hunziker)	The Preferred Alternative studied in the Final EIS does not include traffic signals at SW Hall Boulevard and SW Clinton Street or at SW Hall Boulevard and SW Knoll Road.
A340	Washington County	Julie Sosnovske	Attachment B, page 274	Report does not explain why the Upper Boones Ferry - Park & Ride sizes so different between alternatives? 600 vs. 50? The ridership numbers from the station is reported as similar.	The Preferred Alternative studied in the Final EIS does not include a park and ride at the Upper Boones Ferry Station.
A341	Washington County	Julie Sosnovske	Attachment B, page 234	Figure 5.3-7a – Intersection C23. is missing EB and WB volumes	Synchro analysis and relevant figures have been updated for all study intersections in Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS.
A342	Washington County	Julie Sosnovske	Attachment B, pages 222 and 238	Figure 5.3-5 and 5.3-8 – Intersection C34. a.m. volumes (2035 No Build and Build) exactly the same as Figure 5.2-5 - Existing (2017)	Traffic volumes and relevant figures have been updated in Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS.
A343	Washington County	Julie Sosnovske	Attachment B	No a.m. volumes available for Segment C: Tigard intersections. No a.m. issues in this area? Is it known that p.m. is overall worse? A.m. mitigation/turn lane needs should be checked or addressed in FEIS.	Section 4.3.2, Segment C Future Intersection Operations, of Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS describes AM and PM intersection operations for the Tigard subarea. Volume figures are included in Appendix B1 to Attachment B.
A344	Washington County	Steve Kelley, Julie Sosnovske	Attachment B	It's notable how little the volumes increase overall between the base year and the future year – perhaps due to peak spreading model or maybe because the corridor is mostly built out already? OR 99W – shows little to no growth, Hall Blvd +200 each way, 72nd - +100-150 or so. Double check assumptions with jurisdiction partners before FEIS analysis	In the Final EIS traffic analysis, volumes are based on the Metro traffic model, which includes local jurisdiction projects. Assumptions were verified with project partners, including Washington County. There is little room for growth in volumes in the area, because the network is mostly built out.
A345	Washington County	Julie Sosnovske	Attachment B, page 217	Figure 5.3-3b: intersection C20a. Hall Blvd at Rail Crossing – shows almost no growth (+15 SB, +3 NB) compared to Figure 5.2-3b (Existing 2017). Other Hall Blvd intersections show significantly more growth (+200 SB, +200 NB).	In the Final EIS traffic analysis, volumes are based on the Metro traffic model. The volume difference may be from vehicles turning on and off of SW Hall Boulevard.
A346	Washington County	Steve Kelley	Appendix E, page E-17	Additional evaluation of the Hall / Hunziger / Scoffins intersection, the WES rail / Hall intersection and considerations for drop-off / pick-up of transit riders at the Hall station is needed in the FEIS with this design refinement	The Final EIS includes further traffic analysis of these intersections surrounding the Hall Station. The Final EIS does not analyze drop-off or pickup analysis at the station, but it does include analysis related to a surface park and ride lot.
A347	Washington County	Chris Deffebach	Chapter 2, page 2-7	Add additional project elements for station improvements at Bridgeport to reflect the unique needs of an end-of-the line station serving a large and diverse area. Consider potential for a mobility hub that allows the station to connect with all modes and takes advantage of new technologies.	To learn more about potential design elements at the Bridgeport Station, please see TriMet's Conceptual Design Report for the Project to see illustrations of the Project's urban design principles (find the Conceptual Design Report at: <a href="https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm">https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm</a> ). Following publication of the Final EIS, TriMet will continue to work with the relevant local jurisdictions to refine designs at stations.

## J2.2. ORGANIZATION COMMENTS

This section includes an index of organizations that submitted comments during the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Draft EIS comment period (Table J2.2-1) and the text of all of those comments paired with responses (Table J2.3-2). The comment text in Table J2.2-2 omits addresses, headings, salutations, signatures, footers, images and supplemental attachments that do not contain substantive comments. For the full content of each comment in its original format, see Appendix J3, Original Copies of Draft EIS Comments. Many responses refer to master responses, which are provided in Appendix J1, Introduction to Draft EIS Comments and Responses.

**Table J2.2-1. Index of Draft EIS Organization Comments**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name
O01	Ashcreek Neighborhood Association	Jerry Rundorff
O02	Cascade Policy Institute	John Charles
O03	Cascade Policy Institute	John Charles
O04	Coalition for SW MAX Railroad Options	Mark McGirr and Dick Clark
O05	Crestwood Neighborhood Association	Tony Hansen
O06	DoCoMoMo Oregon	Iain MacKenzie
O07	Friends of Terwilliger	Anton Vetterlein
O08	HAKI Community Organization & Community Alliance of Tenants	Saalim Saalim
O09	Hillsdale Business and Professional Association	Mike Roach
O10	Hillsdale Neighborhood Association	Matt DeRosa
O11	Homestead Neighborhood Association	Ed Fischer
O12	Multnomah Neighborhood Association	Martie Sucec
O13	National University of Natural Medicine	David Schleich
O14	National University of Natural Medicine	David Schleich
O15	OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon	Vivian Satterfield
O16	Oregon and Southern Idaho District Council of Laborers	Chris Carpenter
O17	Oregon Health & Science University, Portland State University and Portland Community College	Connie Seeley, Dan Zalkow and Sylvia Kelley
O18	Oregon Walks	Roger Averbeck
O19	Oregon Walks	Roger Averbeck
O20	Oregon Walks	Roger Averbeck
O21	Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee	Rithy Khut and Elliot Akwai-Scott
O22	Portland Business Alliance	Dave Robertson
O23	Portland Freight Committee	Pia Welch and Raihana Ansary
O24	Portland Historic Landmarks Commission	Kristen Minor
O25	Portland Pedestrian Advisory Committee Members	Kenzie Woods, Tiel Jackson, Zoe Klingmann and Elaine O'Keefe
O26	Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission	Katherine Shultz
O27	Restore Oregon	Peggy Moretti
O28	South Portland Neighborhood Association	G.L. Michon, Jr.
O29	Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc.	Leslie Hammond
O30	SW Trails PDX	Doug Rogers
O31	Tigard Chamber of Commerce	Debi Mollahan
O32	Tigard Town Center Advisory Commission	Carine Arendes
O33	Tigard Town Center Advisory Commission	Kate Rogers
O34	Tigard Town Center Advisory Commission	Kate Rogers
O35	Tualatin Aging Task Force	Susan C. Noack
O36	Tualatin Chamber of Commerce	Linda Moholt
O37	Urban Design Panel	Brian Campbell

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
O01	Ashcreek Neighborhood Association	Jerry Rundorff	<p>Our preferred route would be route B1, however we understand that option may not be financially viable, and could result in a no-build scenario. The Ashcreek Neighborhood Association can only support SW Corridor Light Rail alignments or refinements which improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility through and around the Capitol Highway crossroads area, while mitigating vehicle congestion. This area is currently a disaster for all modes of transportation, but is especially dangerous for bicyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>A center running light rail down Barbur Boulevard would have addressed these issues, but Refinement 2, the Taylors Ferry refinement, as currently proposed, lacks any kind of bicycle or pedestrian improvements in the area. That makes the refinement unacceptable to the Ashcreek Neighborhood Association. However, by adding a multi-modal path to the I-5 over-crossing, and adding at least a multi-modal path (or sidewalks and bicycle lanes) along Taylors Ferry from Capitol Highway to at least 48th Avenue, would allow us to support this refinement.</p> <p>That said, our past president, Dean Smith, has suggested what we feel is a better route than Taylors Ferry. Namely, to take the light rail track down Barbur Boulevard until just before Capitol Highway, then veer off at, or just north of, the I-5 on-ramp (between I-5 and Walgreens). We believe that would result in fewer property acquisitions, would be less unsightly, would be less disruptive to traffic flow, all while achieving the overall objectives of Refinement 2. This may also decrease traffic congestion on Taylors Ferry and Capitol Hwy. This option would still require the aforementioned pedestrian and bicycle enhancements in order to receive the endorsement of the Ashcreek neighborhood association, however.</p> <p>Please see “Dean Smith’s refinement” image attached.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS; support for a new “Dean Smith refinement” as described in your comment; and opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near Barbur Transit Center, which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle mobility and station access improvements.</p>
O02	Cascade Policy Institute	John Charles	<p>Cascade Policy Institute is a non-profit policy research organization based in Portland. We represent over 700 individuals, and many of them reside within the Portland metro region. We have reviewed relevant chapters of the Draft EIS for the SW Corridor Light Rail Project, and offer the following comments.</p> <p><u>Route selection</u></p> <p>We have no preference as to the various proposed routes. All of them suffer from the same fatal flaws, and none are likely to attract sufficient ridership to justify the enormous expense of construction.</p> <p><u>Substantive flaws in the DEIS</u></p> <p>According to the “Purpose and Need” statement, the purpose of the SW Corridor Project is to “directly connect Tualatin, downtown Tigard, southwest Portland, and the region’s central city with light rail, high quality transit and appropriate community investments in a congested corridor to improve mobility and create the conditions that will allow communities in the corridor to achieve their land use vision.”<sup>1</sup></p> <p>Most of this sentence is meaningless, but there is one clause that is measurable: “improve mobility.” In order to accomplish that goal, Metro and TriMet must be concerned with various components of a mobility analysis, including: traffic movement through congested intersections; effects of the project on I-5 ramps; levels of service and peak-hour frequency; cost of construction; estimated travel speed of light rail trains; and forecasted ridership.</p> <p>We will focus our comments on those elements of the project.</p> <p><u>Ridership projections are not plausible</u></p> <p>The Draft EIS builds on more than 30 years of light rail construction and operation in this region, which provides a rich empirical record that can be used to help guide the decision about whether to expand the rail system in the SW Corridor.</p> <p>In many previous projects, Metro/TriMet made MAX ridership projections for 2020. Since we are now mid-way through 2018, it’s useful to re-examine those predictions and compare them with reality.</p> <p>Figure 1 is a side-by-side of the 2020 average weekday daily ridership forecast for each previous rail line (including WES):</p> <p>As Figure 1 shows, previous EIS predictions have all been inflated. Actual ridership has never even reached 60% of projected ridership on a specific rail line; the Orange line is the closest at 59%. Total average weekday ridership is less than half the predicted ridership for MAX in 2020.</p> <p><u>EIS ridership predictions for 2035:</u> Given these consistent forecasting errors, the DEIS prediction that MAX average weekday ridership will total 317,2002 in 2035 is not credible. Ridership would have to overcome decades of underperformance and triple between 2017 and 2035.</p> <p>With all lines combined, the through light rail alternative is predicted to have 337,900 average weekday boardings (Figure 2). This is an increase of 174.27% within 18 years from the 2017 fiscal year’s average of 123,200. To put this in perspective, average weekday light rail ridership has increased by 85.85% between fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2018 up till the month of May— also a span of 18 years. Four rail lines were implemented between 2000 and 2018 while the Southwest Corridor DEIS bases its estimation on the implementation of only one light rail line between 2018 and 2035. Current light rail ridership has not been increasing over recent years. Instead, weekday boarding trends have either been decreasing or plateauing as seen in Figure 3. This undermines the plausibility of the estimated number of weekday boardings in 2035.</p> <p>The DEIS predicts that weekday boardings across all lines will more than double, even though individual line trends are either decreasing or plateauing, demonstrated in Figure 4.</p> <p>The percent yearly change (Figure 5) in weekday ridership has been decreasing from year to year, and recently has been dipping into the negative percentage range, which demonstrates a decrease in boardings. A pattern has developed which shows percent change drastically increasing the year after a new line opened. After that initial first year the percent change tends to decrease up until the implementation of the next line. When a new light rail line is introduced, its percent increase in boardings is marginal - new light rail lines are adding fewer new riders.</p> <p>Light rail ridership is not increasing. It is steadily decreasing, and the number of new riders each new line attracts is shrinking. Based upon these patterns, the Southwest Corridor project will only temporarily increase ridership.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the project.</p> <p>The Project is required to meet FTA’s cost-effectiveness standards in order to qualify for federal funding. While transit ridership nationally has been flat to declining in the short-term, the transportation model used for analysis in the Final EIS projects long-term trends. In the long-term, transit ridership growth is correlated to population growth, and the Portland region is expected to continue to grow.</p> <p>Regarding ridership modeling projections, the FTA requires use of a travel demand model to forecast future ridership. The FTA reviewed and endorsed the travel demand model used for this Final EIS. “Before and After” studies were completed on past projects as required by the FTA to compare predicted versus actual ridership, along with construction costs, service levels, and project scope. Those reports informed the FTA’s decisions subsequent projects, all of which were approved.</p> <p>The originally published light rail line ridership projections did not anticipate construction of subsequent light rail lines that would share the same trackway in the future, and so could not project the distribution of riders between multiple lines. For example, the original ridership projections for the Blue Line could not include the effects of the introduction of the Green and Red Lines, which operate in tandem with the Blue Line over long sections of track. The result of adding these lines increased light rail ridership overall, but decreased ridership of the Blue Line as riders at many stations had three lines to choose from instead of just the Blue Line—it is unreasonable to describe this as an overestimation of Blue Line ridership in the original forecast. Similarly, the Yellow, Green, and Orange Lines share trackway. For this reason the FTA requires each project’s Before and After report to include a comparison of an opening year forecast to actual ridership. These reports show that the Westside Blue Line ridership was 118% of projected ridership; Red Line – 103% of projected; Yellow Line – 84% of projected; Green Line – 95% of projected; and Orange line – 66% of projected. The Orange Line projection was completed before the Great Recession and reflected assumptions in household and employment growth that did not occur. These before and after reports are available on the FTA website (please see: <a href="https://www.transit.dot.gov/funding/grant-programs/capital-investments/and-after-studies-new-starts-projects">https://www.transit.dot.gov/funding/grant-programs/capital-investments/and-after-studies-new-starts-projects</a>).</p> <p>The 2035 forecasts include service frequency increases and route extensions of the Yellow and Red Lines in addition to the construction of the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project as defined in the Regional Transportation Plan. A high ridership growth rate is not unprecedented; starting in FY 2000 light rail boardings nearly doubled in just 12 years.</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>If this project is to move forward, the Final EIS must have a defensible ridership forecast that accounts for the consistent over-estimation of boardings on every single TriMet rail line to date.</p> <p><u>Traffic Congestion</u></p> <p>Reducing traffic congestion is one of the claimed benefits of this project, and the DEIS addresses likely congestion at relevant intersections and I-5 ramps. 3 AM and PM peak periods were studied, with 44 affected intersections during the AM peak and 85 affected intersections during the PM peak being measured. V/c scores for each vehicle direction were given; by adding them together we can see the overall estimated congestion for each intersection under both the No-Build and Build alternatives. The results are in Figure 6:</p> <p>Contrary to claims made by the project’s proponents, the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project is expected to increase overall traffic congestion for both AM and PM peak travel periods. In addition, the same pattern is exhibited in the expected the congestion of I-5 on/off ramps, shown in Figure 7:</p> <p>While the AM peak will be affected by a greater quantity of congested intersections under the Build alternative, both AM and PM peak times will be more congested than they would have been without the project.</p> <p><u>SW Corridor transit ridership</u></p> <p>Present transit ridership trends within the Southwest Corridor suggest that ridership on a new rail line will be low. Nine bus routes service the same route as the proposed light rail line; seven cover the entire route, while two cover fragments of it. As the predictions look 17 years into the future, it would be wise to look at trends 17 years into the past. Since 2001, bus ridership along these routes has decreased, as seen in Figure 8:</p> <p>While showing a downtrend in bus ridership, this graph does not account for population increases along the Southwest Corridor. The populations of Tualatin, Tigard, and Lake Oswego all increased by 16% from 2001-2017, shown in Figure 9:</p> <p>Thus, bus transit ridership measured as a proportion of the relevant population was bleaker, seen in Figure 10:</p> <p>It could be objected that bus transit is not the only type of available transit in the Southwest Corridor – part of the WES route runs between Tualatin and Tigard, and some of these riders could use the proposed light rail in the future. Figure 11 illustrates combined ridership of both WES and bus routes in the Southwest Corridor, beginning with the WES opening in 2009.</p> <p>Only three out of ten routes increased ridership during this period (bus routes 64, 45, WES). As shown, overall ridership decreased. Again, this does not account for the population increase in the attendant locations. Even including WES, total transit ridership as a proportion of population has decreased (Figure 12):</p> <p>The only increase in any of these measurements is the 2001-2017 total transit ridership, as evidenced by Figure 13:</p> <p>Even here, the overall increase is owed to the fact that total ridership from 2009-2017 did not decline as quickly as it increased from 2001-2008. The overall increase (+3.3%) was still outpaced by population growth, which yet again led to a decrease in transit ridership proportional to population, seen in Figure 14:</p> <p>Another way to calculate transit ridership in the Southwest Corridor is to conduct telephone surveys. For several decades the City of Portland Auditor conducted such surveys annually, known as the Community Survey and Service Efforts and Accomplishments reports (these were discontinued after 2016 for cost reasons). Those surveys recorded a steady decline in the percent of individuals in the Southwest Corridor who self-reported public transit as their main mode of transportation, as seen in Figure 15:</p> <p>According to the 2010 US Census, the average household size for each city along the Southwest Corridor (Tualatin, Tigard, Lake Oswego) was between 2.29 and 2.6 with 70-81% of households comprised of three or fewer people. Thus the decrease in ridership proportional to the population cannot be attributed to newly arrived families with several young children (who would not take public transit).</p> <p>There are viable ways to work towards the desired goals of the Southwest Corridor Project without adding light rail. Bus ridership increased from 2001-2008. Population increased by 8% while overall bus ridership increased by 18%, indicating that increased bus access can in fact provide the desired transit options. Increased bus service, whether through more buses, expanded operating times, or additional express service, would also cost far less than \$2.5 billion.</p> <p>Further, this cost-effective option would create less traffic congestion than building the proposed rail line.</p> <p><u>Underestimated Capital Costs</u></p> <p>Table S-5, “Estimated Project Capital and Operating Costs” in Section S.8 “Evaluation of Alternatives” estimates the total capital cost range of the full corridor project to be between \$2.64 and \$2.86 billion dollars in year-of-expenditure (2024) dollars. Past light rail projects have consistently underestimated costs in the projects’ DEIS, SDEIS, or FEIS (Figure 16). The eastside blue line, westside blue line, green line, WES commuter rail, and orange line all demonstrate this.</p> <p>The predicted capital cost of the Southwest Corridor project has already been increased by a billion dollars, from \$1.8 billion in 2016 to its current prediction in 2018. If the pattern of higher actual capital costs on light rail projects continues, then the Southwest Corridor project capital cost will continue to increase throughout this process.</p> <p>This is a problem that has plagued light rail construction for many decades, both in Portland and elsewhere. As noted by Dr. Don Pickrell in his classic study from 1989, “capital costs that differ markedly from their anticipated level can substantially increase the financial burden on the government program and agency funding the project, resulting in postponement or cancellation of other projects competing for its support.”<sup>4</sup></p> <p>The estimated cost in 2016 for the Southwest Corridor project was 1.8 billion dollars. In 2018, the DEIS increased that estimate to \$2.64 - \$2.86 billion. This is an increase of \$1.06 billion within a two year timespan. (Figure 17). Metro claims the earlier estimate was based on 2016 dollars instead of 2024 dollars and has less detail, which is why it was lower. This raises the question of how 10 years of inflation increases the price by over \$1 billion.</p>	<p>Traffic analysis in the Final EIS reviewed impacts to congestion, and the Final EIS recommended mitigations to ensure adequate traffic flow. Project study intersections were selected based on the expected level of impact and are not reflective of overall network benefits. New at-grade light rail crossings will introduce some delay for all vehicles, including freight trucks. Traffic operations for the Preferred Alternative would continue to perform within adopted mobility targets or close to no-build operations, and in some locations would improve compared to the No-Build Alternative. The addition of light rail increases the person capacity of the corridor while retaining most of the existing vehicle capacity for people driving and for freight vehicles, by maintaining four vehicle lanes in the highest-volume segments of SW Barbur Boulevard. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project’s traffic analysis.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail.</p> <p>As the project scope and design progress through the NEPA process, capital cost estimates change. Costs published in the Draft EIS reflect the project described in the Draft EIS, typically at 3-5% design, and not the project that is finally agreed upon and constructed. Initial cost estimates are refined in the Final EIS and ultimately reflect the final proposed project in the Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA). This final cost estimate is what the FTA considers in its project ratings and funding decisions. Comparing a draft cost estimate to a constructed project is not an accurate representation of a study as a whole. All TriMet light rail projects have been built within the budget set through the FFGA.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3 of this Final EIS regarding impacts and mitigations related to parking in the corridor.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS, particularly Section 2.2.4, Preferred Alternative: Segment B, for a description of the connections to PCC-Sylvania.</p> <p>Metro’s regional travel forecasting model produces one and two-hour peak period ridership predictions for MAX lines. The peak headways shown in the Draft EIS are those needed to satisfy those peak ridership loads. A number of design options can affect peak period ridership, such as park-and-ride size and demand, the number and location of stations, and alignment alternatives that may be faster or slower than others. Analysis of the Preferred Alternative predicts that peak ridership demands will require a 2-hour peak period service frequency of 7.5 minutes between downtown Portland and Tigard Transit Center. Service frequency between Tigard Transit Center and Bridgeport Village would remain at 15 minutes throughout the day.</p> <p>With regard to past MAX service frequency predictions, actual peak period headways are close to predictions for most MAX lines when examined on the applicable 1- and 2-hour peak period. Your comment regarding inaccuracy of peak period service frequency discusses a 3-hour peak period, which has never been used in the regional travel demand forecasting model in this region. Planning and NEPA documents for the Westside Corridor in the early 1990s predicted a need for 5 minute peak period headways east of Beaverton Transit Center by 2005. The Red Line was extended from downtown Portland to Beaverton Transit Center to handle peak period ridership demands in 2009. The current actual peak period frequency is approximately 6 minutes between</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>WES Commuter Rail</p> <p>The year-of-expenditure (YOE) prediction for the project consistently underestimated the actual costs of the WES commuter rail, which turned out to be \$162 million dollars in YOE dollars. Predicted cost at the preliminary engineering stage (August 2001) was \$84.8 million (48% below actual); at final design (May 2004) \$103.5 million (36% below actual); and at full funding grant agreement (October 2006) \$117.3 (28% below actual). These numbers are compared below in Figure 18.</p> <p>Blue Line</p> <p>East Side: The Banfield EIS (1980) estimated the project costs to be \$208.1 million in 1980 dollars. The actual cost of the project was \$214 million in 1978 dollars, or \$270.45 million in 1980. Both costs are well above what TriMet originally projected.</p> <p>West Side: The westside SDEIS (1991) predicted that the light rail to 185th in Hillsboro (the original destination) would cost \$439.5 million - \$501.6 million in 1990 dollars. YOE cost estimates for the project were \$703 million. The actual cost of the project was \$963.5 million in 1998. TriMet’s decision to extend the line to downtown Hillsboro after the release of the SDEIS accounts for some of the increased cost.</p> <p>The difference in capital costs for both sides of the Blue Line are shown below in Figure 19.</p> <p>Green Line (South Corridor: I-205 to Mall)</p> <p>The proposed cost for the green line project in 2004 was \$489.12 million (\$532.24 million in YOE). The actual cost for the project when it was implemented in 2009 was \$575.7 million (Figure 20).</p> <p>Orange Line (Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail)</p> <p>The South Corridor SDEIS (2008) estimated costs for the Orange line from LPA - Park at \$942.5 million in 2007 dollars or \$1.4 billion in the year of expenditure (YOE). The FEIS (2010), released 2 years later, predicted the Subtotal LPA - Park Ave would cost \$1.15 billion in 2010 dollars (or roughly \$1.08 billion in 2007 dollars). The total for YOE was estimated to be \$1.55 billion (Figure 21). The actual cost of this project was \$1.49 billion. The actual cost was less than the prediction in 2010, but was \$90 million greater than the predicted capital cost in 2008.</p> <p><u>Loss of Parking</u></p> <p>Section 3.2.6, “Street Parking,” claims that “demand for parking would be expected to increase” (3-22), however the Southwest Corridor plan would eliminate 166 number of parking spaces in the corridor to accommodate light rail. In locations where the alignment alternative would operate near street rights of way, on-street parking would be eliminated. Residents in the corridor predominantly drive cars rather than public transportation, so they rely on the availability of parking.</p> <p>Segment A would take away either 16 parking spaces on Duniway Park or 21 parking residential zone permit parking spaces on SW Naito depending on the alternative chosen, even though the DEIS states that “eliminating the spaces would increase demand for remaining on-street spaces on nearby streets” (3-23).</p> <p>Segment B would see 61 on-street parking spaces on SW Barbur eliminated with the preferred alternative along SW Multnomah Boulevard.</p> <p>In segment C, 89 spaces would be eliminated with the preferred alternative on SW 70th, SW Beveland Street, and SW Ash Avenue.</p> <p>If the preferred alternative is chosen for all three segments, then a total of 166 parking spaces will be eliminated. This would induce parking on side streets or in residential neighborhoods.</p> <p>The DEIS claims that this wouldn’t be an issue as “the combination of improved transit and improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities could help offset the impact” (3-23). However, this seems unlikely as light rail ridership is declining and the majority of those traveling in the corridor do so in a motor vehicle.</p> <p>Similar claims were made by local transportation officials in the Sellwood Bridge EIS regarding the deliberate under-building of road capacity by Multnomah County. The DEIS asserted multiple times that congestion in the Tacoma Street-Sellwood Bridge corridor would be mitigated by substantial increases transit use, biking and walking, due to the bridge design. In fact, that never happened, and traffic congestion in the Tacoma Street corridor is worse today than it was a decade ago.</p> <p><u>Loss of Road Capacity</u></p> <p><u>Segment A:</u> The loss of traffic lanes is discussed in detail in Attachment B - Transportation Impacts Results Report. In segment A, one northbound lane on SW Barbur between SW Naito Pkwy and SW Broadway would be converted to a transit-only lane. There are only two northbound lanes on SW Barbur in this segment, thus drivers heading towards the city center would be restricted to only one lane.</p> <p>Along this segment, the plan would also convert all bike lanes (which are five - six feet wide) currently along Barbur to eight foot bike lanes on either side of the street, taking away four to six feet of vehicle roadway. The EIS claims that Barbur would be widened south of SW Hooker Street to accommodate the addition of sidewalks and bike lanes, but nowhere does it state by how much.</p> <p>A total of seven intersections in the preferred segment A alternative will be negatively affected by the light rail project. Six left turn lanes will be eliminated (SW 4th @ SW Lincoln, SW Grant, SW Bancroft, SW Sheridan, SW /Caruthers/Broadway, and SW Barbur @ SW Hamilton), two through lanes will be eliminated (SW 4th @ Sheridan and SW Barbur @ SW Bancroft), one right turn lane will be eliminated (SW Barbur @ SW Bancroft), and the access to both View Point Terrace Street and eastbound SW Hamilton will be eliminated from Barbur due to light rail stations.</p> <p><u>Segment B:</u> Changes made to Segment B, described in Attachment B section 4.3.1 and 4.3.4, include widening SW Barbur in order to accommodate light rail in the center. 8-foot-wide bike lanes would be added in both directions between SW Brier Place and SW 60th Avenue. Bike lanes on Barbur are currently between 5-6 feet. If bike lane is currently 6 feet either way, they will take away 4 feet from the road the entire length of Barbur. If the length is 5 feet, 6 feet will be taken away from drivers. While the DEIS</p>	<p>downtown Portland and Beaverton Transit Center. TriMet’s “Better Red” project will extend Red Line service to Fairplex Station by 2024, resulting in improved frequencies west of Beaverton Transit Center to better meet peak period ridership demand.</p> <p>The Orange Line MAX currently provides 10-minute frequency during the peak period and 15-minute service during the remainder of the day, as predicted for opening year in NEPA documents for that project. The Yellow Line MAX currently provides 15-minute frequency throughout the day, including peak periods. Initially the Yellow Line MAX provided 10-minute peak period frequency using single-car trains, but these were replaced with double-car trains to increase capacity with 15-minute headways. The Green Line MAX also currently provides 15-minute frequency throughout the day, including peak periods. The regional travel forecasting model version used for Green Line predicted higher than actual park-and-ride usage, which heavily influenced predicted Green Line ridership. Improvements in the park-and-ride model over the past decade provide greater confidence in park-and-ride use projections.</p> <p>Light rail speeds are estimated based on grades, curves, operating environment, and distance between stations. Final speeds sometimes vary from what is assumed in the study. Light rail travel times, though, are more reliable than bus travel times, which are impacted by traffic conditions. Further, an express bus with limited stops serves many fewer people than light rail.</p> <p>Hourly operating cost is not the same as cost effectiveness. The FTA’s measure of cost effectiveness includes capital costs, operating costs and ridership. The figures provided in your comment do not account for the number of riders each vehicle carries. While light rail costs more to operate hourly than buses, trains carry more riders than buses. TriMet’s cost per boarding ride for light rail is 20% less than for bus (FY 2019).</p> <p>Future year models cannot accurately predict conditions such as gas price and economic demand. The transportation model predicts VMT with a light rail project relative to a no-build scenario. Relative differences would still apply even if the future baseline turns out to be different from what is modeled. While the absolute VMT may differ, the impact of light rail on that VMT may be reasonably accurate.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and displacements.</p> <p>While Project-related acquisitions would reduce the overall acreage of developable residential land in the corridor, the presence of fixed guideway transit and permanent station areas would also provide new opportunities to concentrate residential density within transit oriented communities. Such densification would be less likely without the Project. Thus, the overall residential unit count is likely to be higher with light rail in place than without.</p> <p>Zoning changes near light rail generally increase the maximum allowable densities of a site, but do not require that property owners pursue higher densities. Property owners may choose to do many things with their property, including making no changes, making small alterations or renovations, redeveloping at maximum allowable densities, or redeveloping at lower densities than allowed by zoning.</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>claims that SW Barbur would be widened to accommodate new bike lanes and sidewalks, nowhere does it say how much Barbur will be widened nor how wide the sidewalks are expected to be.</p> <p>Three intersections would be affected in Segment B. The left turn lanes onto SW Barbur from SW 22nd in both directions will be eliminated (at the intersection SW Barbur @ SW 22nd). The right turn lanes from SW Barbur in both directions onto SW Custer and SW Multnomah as well as the right turn lane onto SW Barbur from Multnomah will be eliminated due to the proposed construction of a light rail station at the SW Barbur @ SW Custer/Multnomah intersection. Finally, the access to Barbur from SW 3rd will be eliminated due to the placement of the light rail route (at the intersection SW Barbur @ SW 3rd).</p> <p><u>Segment C:</u> The changes to segment C are described in 5.3.1 and 5.3.4 in Attachment B to the DEIS. Segment C extends from the intersection of SW 68th Parkway and SW Atlanta Street to near Bridgeport Village. The preferred alternative would run along existing or new roads between the Tigard Triangle and downtown Tigard, and then would follow the freight rail and WES tracks before turning east to run along I-5 to Bridgeport. 2 stations would be in the Tigard Triangle, one would be in downtown Tigard, one along I-5 at SW Bonita Road, SW Upper Boones Ferry Road and Bridgeport Village.</p> <p>The only intersection change in segment C between the no-build and light rail options would come at SW Hall Blvd @ Ash/Knoll. Here the turn from Hall onto Knoll would be eliminated due to the light rail route cutting across the entrance of Knoll Dr. The light rail will continue across Hall, through the buildings across from Knoll Dr. and down Ash Avenue. There will only be one through lane in either direction on Hall at this intersection with the light rail alternative.</p> <p>In all three proposed segments, the DEIS proposes creating 8-foot-wide bike lanes where there are none or increasing the width if such a lane already exists. It also proposes adding in sidewalks where there are none along SW Barbur. There is no mention as to how wide the sidewalks will be, nor does it mention how much SW Barbur will be widened to accommodate these new additions. It is critical to calculate these changes so that motor vehicle drivers know how much of the current roadway will be taken from them. Taking away a motor vehicle lane on a heavily used road (SW Barbur) to serve light rail would increase traffic in the corridor, not reduce it as the DEIS claims.</p> <p><u>PCC Sylvania-Shuttle</u></p> <p>The proposed PCC Sylvania-Shuttle described on page 2-20 in section 2.3 of the DEIS would provide a small amount of ridership for a high cost based upon similar shuttle services in the region. One of the proposed shuttles would transport riders from the 53rd light rail stop to PCC-Sylvania, a distance of .5 miles. Table 4.4-3 of the DEIS admits that the impact from the addition of this shuttle would be offset by improved sidewalks, bike lanes and street lighting.</p> <p>Clackamas Community College has run their own version of the proposed shuttle between their Harmony and Oregon City campuses and the Green Line station at the Clackamas Town Center since 2011. The CCC shuttle is fully funded by the college and is operated by a private business.</p> <p>On average, only 217 individual trips were taken per day on the three shuttles by students during the spring of 2018. There were 7,974 students at both the Oregon City and Harmony campuses during that same time period. If each individual trip was completed by a different student than the shuttle was utilized by 2.72% of the student population. If each trip was part of a round trip, then the shuttle would have only been used by 1.36% of the student population. The cost to run three shuttles was \$180,000 for the 2017-2018 school year.</p> <p>The proposed shuttle from the Barbur Transit Center would use five standard 40-foot TriMet buses to operate, which would have a higher cost than the three van-sized shuttle buses used by CCC. CCC has demonstrated that a community college can run their shuttle service without the involvement of TriMet or the use of taxpayer dollars. Based upon the CCC shuttle, the PCC-Sylvania Shuttle would benefit very few people for at high cost to taxpayers.</p> <p><u>Frequency of Service</u></p> <p>The Draft EIS for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project states that the through route configuration would include nine trains per hour traveling to downtown Tigard during peak periods in 2035, with headways as low as 6.7 minutes in between operation of trains<sup>5</sup>. However, these predictions are implausible given the performance of current light rail installations. Even the less ambitious projections of 7.5 minute headways for previous lines are currently nowhere close to being met.</p> <p>By averaging the times between stops at a single station in both directions between peak hours of 6:00 a.m.-9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m.-6:00 p.m. according to weekday MAX schedules on Trimet’s website, we gain the best estimation of actual MAX headways during June 2018. Based on these calculations, light rail service operation has consistently fallen short of the frequencies promised in past environmental impact statements.</p> <p>The Orange Line EIS predicted that by 2030, trains along the corridor would operate every 7.5 minutes<sup>6</sup>, requiring 8 trains per hour to stop during peak periods. In the opening year 2016, the Orange Line was intended to operate with 10-minute headways<sup>7</sup>. In 2018, that frequency has not been met, with MAX schedules showing average weekday peak-hour headways of 13.1 minutes.</p> <p>Figure 22 shows Orange Line headways during peak periods based on June 2018 schedules at the SE Park Ave MAX Station contrasted with earlier predictions of service frequency.</p> <p>In similar fashion, TriMet promised FTA that the Green Line would operate every 7.5 minutes by 2025<sup>8</sup>, but has failed to live up even to promises of 10-minute headways in its opening year<sup>9</sup>. An FTA Before-and-After Study of the Green Line’s performance stated that “[t]he project opened with 15-minute intervals throughout the day and 35-minute intervals in the evenings,”<sup>10</sup> in sharp contrast to initial projections. 2018 MAX schedules at Clackamas Town Center TC MAX Station confirm that the Green Line has been operating with an average of 15.1 minutes between stops, as shown in Figure 23.</p> <p>MAX service frequency has consistently underperformed for nearly its entire history. The only MAX line that has been living up to its projections is the Red Line, with a much lower bar of 15 minute headways by 2015<sup>11</sup>.</p> <p>The 1991 SDEIS for the Westside Corridor Blue Line project stated that “[t]wo-car trains would operate every five minutes east of the Beaverton Transit Center”<sup>12</sup> by the year 2005, but in 2018, these trains only operate every 9.1 minutes.</p>	

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>Likewise, the Yellow Line EIS promised headways of 7.5 minutes during peak travel periods in 202013 and 10-minute headways in opening year 200514, but Yellow Line trains offer only half that level of service in 2018, with trains at N Prescott St Station operating every 15 minutes on average. Figure 24 shows the consistent failure of MAX lines to offer the level of frequency promised during the planning process.</p> <p>It is unreasonable to expect light rail along the Southwest corridor to operate at 6.7 minute headways during peak periods. No previous light rail installation has met the benchmark of 7.5 minutes, and only the Blue Line has managed to offer even 10 minute headways. MAX has yet to live up to expectations of service frequency, and the promise of nine trains per hour in the Southwest Corridor has no basis in reality.</p> <p><u>Travel Times</u></p> <p>According to the EIS, light rail in the Southwest Corridor “would reduce the PM peak-hour in-vehicle transit travel time from Portland State University to Bridgeport Village from 38 minutes (via TriMet bus line 96 Tualatin Express) to 29 minutes with the Branched Route or 33 minutes with the Through Route.”<sup>15</sup> This prediction is implausible given the track record of current MAX lines.</p> <p>Table 1 shows the travel times between selected Orange Line stops according to TriMet MAX schedules in 2018 compared to EIS predictions for 2030.<sup>16</sup> Assuming 100% on-time performance, Orange Line travel times are currently 4.8 minutes longer on average than predicted in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project EIS.</p> <p>Similarly, Green Line has lagged behind in travel times, with actual travel times 4.7 minutes longer on average than predicted for 2025 in the South Corridor FEIS.<sup>17</sup> Table 2 shows Green Line travel times compared to EIS predictions.</p> <p>If MAX lines increased in speed over the next few years, perhaps these gaps could be closed in time to meet projections. However, given trends since 2000, this is highly unlikely. The average speed of light rail has been steadily decreasing,<sup>18</sup> as seen in Figure 25.</p> <p>Taking the data into consideration, the Southwest Corridor EIS projections for transit travel time are likely overestimated. If the new light rail line has travel times nearly 5 minutes longer than predicted, as current lines do, the advantage over bus service will be negligible.</p> <p><u>Service Efficiency</u></p> <p>A stated purpose of expanding light rail to the Southwest Corridor is to “provide light rail transit service that is cost-effective to build and operate with limited local resources,”<sup>19</sup> but statistics have shown TriMet light rail operation to be less cost effective than bus. While measures of Operating Expense per Vehicle Revenue Mile and Operating Expense per Vehicle Revenue Hour have increased at roughly the same rate for light rail and bus, light rail consistently ranks above bus in both measures, as seen in Figure 26 and Figure 27.<sup>20</sup></p> <p>Operating Expenses per Unlinked Passenger Trip are higher for bus than light rail, likely due to the higher carrying capacity of MAX cars, but as Figure 28 shows, Unlinked Passenger Trips per Vehicle Revenue Hour have been trending downward for light rail while staying steady for bus.<sup>21</sup></p> <p>Light rail has not shown itself to be comparatively cost-effective in operation. Why assume that the Southwest Corridor Project will perform significantly better than light rail already present in the Portland Metro region?</p> <p><u>Overestimation of VMT Reduction</u></p> <p>In Chapter 4, the Draft EIS claims that the Light Rail Alternative would result in total driving of 51,415,071 daily vehicle miles traveled (DVMT) for passenger vehicles in the Metro Region in 2035, down from a projected 51,474,286 daily VMT for the No-Build Alternative.<sup>22</sup> Through increased mode-sharing, the Southwest Corridor Project is anticipated to reduce car travel by 59,215 daily miles. However, light rail in Portland has yet to yield the significant passenger vehicle travel reductions initially hoped for.</p> <p>The 1991 SDEIS for the Westside Corridor Blue Line project claimed that the light rail installation would reduce Total Highway-related VMT by 153,000 in 2005, projecting 25,419,000 VMT compared to 25,572,000 VMT for the No-Build Alternative.<sup>23</sup> However, information from the Federal Highway Administration shows that actual DVMT surpassed both these projections, with DVMT in the Portland Federal-Aid Urbanized Area reaching 29,217,000 and the greater Portland-Vancouver region (including most of the Metro area) displaying 35,143,000 DVMT.<sup>24</sup> EIS projections for the Blue Line compared to actual results from 2005 are displayed in Figure 29.</p> <p>The projections of more recently constructed MAX lines cannot be accurately examined until DVMT statistics from 2020 onward are published, but current results show insufficient reduction in VMT to meet Blue Line estimations. If a goal of light rail is to get people out of their cars, this hasn’t worked as well as expected.</p> <p>Actual VMT in 2005 was 3.8 million higher than what the Blue Line’s SDEIS promised. If the Blue Line couldn’t reduce VMT in the Portland Region by 153,000 (or seemingly at all), how can the Southwest Corridor Project reduce VMT by 59,215?</p> <p><u>Affected Properties</u></p> <p>According to the draft EIS, a full-corridor project would “acquire and displace 78 to 293 residential units” and “have acquisitions affecting 106 to 156 businesses or institutions and 961 to 1,990 employees.”<sup>25</sup> The plan for the Southwest Corridor includes compensation and relocation assistance for displaced businesses and property owners, but fails to address the full costs of the light rail’s displacement.</p> <p>Regardless of compensation, the proposed property acquisitions will negatively impact homeowners with significant financial and personal investments in their property, as well as businesses who may have clientele, local connections, or other factors that are dependent on their current location. Condemning these properties introduces an unnecessary shock to residents’ stability.</p> <p>The planners of the project seem confident in their ability to successfully mitigate the effects of lost property, but cannot possibly understand the needs of residents and businesses better than these residents and businesses themselves. By what standard are the proposed transit improvements better than allowing people to stay where they currently live?</p>	

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>In considering the effects of acquiring these properties, we must also consider the effects on opportunities for future development. Converting private property to public property is likely to make it harder for future homeowners and businesses to find space - these acquisitions would reduce the overall supply of property available in the area, and with no guarantee of future availability, we lose the opportunity for private development in these areas. The costs of lost property will be felt most immediately by current property owners and renters, but the opportunity costs for the area as a whole reach much further into the future.</p> <p>Reducing the supply of property in the Southwest Corridor may result in increased housing prices, given that less space will be available to live in. In the midst of a housing crisis, how can demolishing residential property do anything but exacerbate the situation?</p> <p>These effects are even more prominent considered alongside zoning requirements that mandate high-density projects near light rail. These requirements will increase the cost of new housing, further reducing supply and raising prices.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>An EIS by definition consists almost entirely of forecasts, most of which are destined to be wrong because predicting the future is difficult. However, when key forecasts are consistently skewed in the same direction for over 30 years, it suggests a troubling trend: that transit planners are deliberately creating forecasts that are most favorable to procuring political and financial support necessary to proceed with the project.</p> <p>Specifically, TriMet rail construction projects have consistently over-estimated ridership and peak-hour service levels, while under-estimating construction and operating costs. They also claim to reduce traffic congestion and increase the use of alternative modes; yet none of those things has occurred after more than three decades of light rail operation.</p> <p>It's unlikely that these flaws can be addressed in the FEIS. For those and other reasons, we urge TriMet, Metro, and JPACT to adopt the no-build alternative.</p>	
O03	Cascade Policy Institute	John Charles	<p>Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is John Charles, President of Cascade Policy Institute, a non-profit policy research organization. I'm also a homeowner here in Tigard.</p> <p>When I came before you started, you were running the loop of the PowerPoint slide above. And one of the slides was a standard talking point that's been going on about 30 years suggesting that light rail is so much more reliable than bus service. And that's intuitive, I get it. It has its own reserved right-of-way and buses are stopped on those roads that are all getting more and more crowded. So I can understand how you might think that if you really, really have to get somewhere on transit, you better take light rail not the bus.</p> <p>Sadly there's very little evidence to support that long-time assertion. TriMet itself produces monthly performance reports measuring hundreds of metrics quite assiduously. If you read your own performance reports and you plot them, you can see about 15 years ago light rail did have a bit of an advantage for on-time performance over buses.</p> <p>And for me as a transit user, on-time performance is a pretty important metric. Since 2003, the on-time performance of light rail has more or less consistently gone down to the point where three years ago, bus and light rail had the exact same on-time performance. Both have rebounded recently, but as of today, light rail is on time 88 percent of the time, and the bus 86 percent of the time. Okay. Seriously, \$2.5 billion for a tiny fraction of a gain? I mean, that's highly questionable.</p> <p>Second common assertion is the light rail doesn't require very many people to operate it because, of course, you see one person up front operating it, two cars pulling people. It must have a labor advantage over buses. Again, very intuitive. I've heard Neil McFarland say on more than one occasion over the last decade, we can't -- "we" -- TriMet -- we can't afford not to build more light rail because we save so much money in operating costs.</p> <p>Sadly, there's very little evidence to support that claim. Reports show that light rail has about 80 percent more demands for full-time equivalent operators per peak vehicle than buses, and again, the gap is growing. It's going in the wrong direction. So you might have some rationalizations ultimately for picking one of the build alternatives, but in terms of reliability and savings in operations costs, those are not reasons to go forward with this light rail project. Thank you.</p>	<p>To learn more about transit travel time and reliability, please see Attachment A, <i>Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report</i>, of this Final EIS. Light rail operates in exclusive right of way in the busiest and most congested corridors, while buses operate in all types of areas—some congested, some not. Providing dedicated right of way for light rail and for buses operating on the shared transitway is expected to increase reliability compared to existing service that operates in mixed traffic, which is subject to traffic congestion and delay. Additionally, as documented in Attachment A of this Final EIS, under the No-Build Alternative, in-vehicle transit travel time by bus from Portland State University to Bridgeport Village would be 63 minutes in 2035, while under the Preferred Alternative, light rail travel time would be 30 minutes. The increased travel time by bus is in large part due to operating in mixed traffic in a highly congested corridor.</p> <p>Additionally, improving transit reliability is only one element of the Project among many. Please see Chapter 1, Project Introduction, of this Final EIS regarding the Project's Purpose and Need.</p> <p>The data source for the claim in this comment related to operators is unclear. TriMet reports that the number of operators per light rail vehicle (one) is the same as the number of operators per passenger bus.</p>
O04	Coalition for SW MAX Railroad Options	Mark McGirr and Dick Clark	<p>The Coalition for SW MAX Railroad Options appreciates the commitment and analysis conducted to recommend alignment options for the proposed light rail line through Tigard and onto Tualatin. We are pleased that the project partner staff have recommended a Railroad route (C2) within Segment C – Tigard and Tualatin - in the Initial Route Proposal ("IRP") that was incorporated into the DEIS. The I-5 route would have resulted in significant economic and social impacts to Coalition and other neighboring businesses.</p> <p>The 12 businesses represented by the Coalition unanimously support the recommendations included in the DEIS. With the IRP, staff recommended the "through" route which travels alongside existing rail tracks. Our review of the DEIS and its attachments fully and accurately support this IRP recommendation included in the DEIS. The railroad route (C2), which we have been a proponent of all along, is the best route for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Faster travel time</li> <li>o Most cost effective to operate</li> <li>o Lowest capital costs</li> <li>o Displaces fewest employees and businesses and provides for significant economic development</li> <li>o Maintains projected ridership as anticipated</li> <li>o Most comprehensive multimodal transportation plan with Tigard-Tualatin connectivity</li> <li>o Most accessible to the residents and transit dependent people of Tigard</li> <li>o Best support of the Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan</li> <li>o Lowest impact on City of Tigard property tax base from displacements</li> </ul>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the initial route proposal and the Project in general.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for the railroad alignment (as opposed to the I-5 alignment) in the southern portion of Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which is part of Alternative C2 studied in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>o Least number of acres of land use conversion  o Avoids a critical traffic impact at Hall Blvd. near Pacific Highway</p> <p>Our support is consistent with Metro, TriMet and other jurisdictional planning staff &amp; engineers for this important project for the region.</p> <p>On behalf of the Coalition for SW MAX Railroad Options, we request all deciding parties from this point forward support the IRP; the DEIS and its findings, in making the IRP the Preferred Alternative (PA), and moving this work into the FEIS (Final EIS) and the Regional Transit Plan.</p>	
O05	Crestwood Neighborhood Association	Tony Hansen	<p>Crestwood Neighborhood Association is one of seventeen neighborhoods within Southwest Portland. We had been in favor of the SW Corridor Light Rail Transit Plan until the most recent Initial Route Proposal that destroys livability within our residential neighborhood and West Portland Town Center. Please consider these comments as you deliberate on the future alignment of the SW Corridor Plan.</p> <p>Crestwood Neighborhood Association supports Alternative B1 (Center Barbur) and reconstruction of the intersection of SW Barbur and SW Capitol Highway.</p> <p>To meet the stated goals of the DEIS in 1.3 “Need for the Project”, Metro and its partners must make the complex changes to the many intersections of Barbur Blvd, I-5, SW Capitol Highway, SW Taylors Ferry and SW Huber to make it safer for everyone—motor vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists, transit and freight—that travel through the West Portland Crossroads Town Center. In 2010 residents renamed West Portland Town Center the “West Portland Crossroads” to reflect the dominance of transportation issues that inhibit the Town Center from realizing its potential. The Barbur Concept Plan vision for the Crossroads focus area is that the congested intersections of the Crossroads are redesigned to improve traffic flow, but also with improved pedestrian and bike safety. The Barbur Concept Plan is referenced heavily in the SWC DEIS Project Introduction and as a key document in the SWC DEIS Planning and Policy Framework.</p> <p>The Barbur Concept Plan notes that there is no way to solve the transportation circulation in the Crossroads one intersection at a time. In 2015 ODOT’s Barbur Road Safety Audit recommended a long list of improvements needed at one of the least safe intersections in the City of Portland (Vision Zero). One of the long-term recommendations is the need for an intersection/interchange preliminary design study to identify future needs at this location and identify property impacts. Instead ODOT decided to implement a near-term “jughandle” solution that reroutes traffic from Barbur onto local streets that will surely make conditions less safe at the SW Taylors Ferry and SW Capitol Highway intersection.</p> <p>Because of all of these complex transportation issues within Crossroads, the DEIS motor vehicle traffic analyses in Chapter 3 must study all seven intersections in order to assess traffic impacts in the Crossroads and consider long term investments needed for the safety of all people traveling through this intersection.</p> <p>The Crossroads intersection was constructed in 1959 and is not likely to survive an earthquake even of less magnitude than the predicted Cascadia earthquake. The Crossroads intersection does not have safe sidewalks and bike lanes that would allow people to walk and bike to the Barbur Transit Center and other services within the Town Center, and the Barbur Concept Plan recommended addressing the deficiencies that are preventing the Crossroads from achieving its potential as a Town Center. The Initial Route Proposal does not include improvements on SW Barbur or SW Capitol Highway within the Crossroads station area that would accomplish that long term goal.</p> <p>Alignment B1 offers a full minute less travel time (Table 5.2-2), better supports the Barbur Concept Plan and redevelopment within the Crossroads, and would create a safe overcrossing for motor vehicles, light rail and people in the event of an earthquake and weather-related conditions. Please reconsider the Initial Route Proposal and adopt Alignment B1 as the Locally Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Crestwood does not support Refinement 2, Taylors Ferry Road due to the following concerns. If Refinement 2 is selected in Metro’s SWC Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA), Crestwood insists on having in-depth discussion of these concerns with our residents and businesses during the next phase of the project.</p> <p><u>Traffic:</u> Traffic congestion in our neighborhood in the vicinity of SW Taylors Ferry Road and SW Capitol Highway and at the I-5 ramps is really bad during commute hours and when Portland Community College’s Sylvania campus is in session, and it is unsafe to walk or bike through this area today. The proposed at-grade crossing through the SW Taylors Ferry and SW Capitol Highway intersection will make traffic and safety conditions worse. The traffic analysis in Chapter 3 studied only one intersection (Taylors Ferry at the I-5 off-ramp) and not all seven intersections as noted above. The Taylors Ferry Road Vision Plan adopted by Portland City Council in 2004 recommends removal of I-5 exit ramp and numerous changes to this area, as does the 2015 ODOT Barbur Road Safety Audit. The proposed mitigations—a traffic signal, a motor vehicle “storage lane” and a marked crosswalk—are not sufficient to alleviate our traffic congestion and safety concerns. The DEIS must also consider the current effort to implement Congestion Pricing on I-5 between SW Multnomah Blvd and downtown Portland and the additional motor vehicle traffic this will add to SW Taylors Ferry Road, SW Capitol Highway, SW Barbur Blvd. and other roadways in our neighborhood.</p> <p><u>ODOT jughandle project:</u> ODOT has funded but not provided detailed information to Crestwood on their proposal to eliminate the left turn from northbound SW Capitol Highway to I-5 southbound other than the 2015 Barbur Road Safety Audit description (Page E-6, key assumptions). Crestwood objects to this “jughandle” proposal because it will add more motor vehicle traffic to many neighborhood roadways at multiple intersections without adding needed safety improvements for all people traveling through the Crossroads. Crestwood recommends a much simpler solution to ODOT’s safety concerns at SW Barbur and SW Capitol Highway: add a left-turn signal where northbound SW Capitol Highway enters the I-5 southbound ramp.</p> <p><u>Safe Walking and Biking Needs:</u> There is a narrow path next to the eastbound travel lane on SW Taylors Ferry Road that was constructed as a bike path in the 1980s. This narrow path is constrained where it crosses Woods Creek and terrifying for pedestrians and bicyclists trying to access the transit service and facilities in West Portland Crossroads. SW Taylors Ferry Road needs to be transformed into safer access between our neighborhood and the Barbur Transit Center. Project SA16, Taylors Ferry Sidewalks and Bikeway, must be constructed concurrently with the light rail project to allow people to safely walk and bike through this intersection. Refinement 2 includes additional “storage lanes” and retaining walls and sound walls that will make it more complex and expensive to add pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the future. If Refinement 2 moves forward, Project SA16 must be included as part of the SW Corridor Project Plan and not an optional project that would be assumed to be constructed some time between now and 2035. If Refinement 2 moves forward, the light rail structure over I-5 must also include bicycle and pedestrian facilities that allow people to cross I-5 more safely than the current conditions on SW Capitol at Barbur.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), and support for rebuilding the intersection at SW Barbur Boulevard and SW Capitol Highway (the “Crossroads intersection”), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS; opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near Barbur Transit Center, which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS; and support for the Barbur Undercrossing alignment, which was studied as Refinement 4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B, including information regarding the Crossroads intersection.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.2, Land Use, of this Final EIS for more information on consistency with the Barbur Concept Plan.</p> <p>Regarding your comments about traffic analysis, in 2013–2014, the Southwest Corridor Plan underwent a “Refinement” phase that included analysis of key intersections in the corridor, including the intersections in the Crossroads area. The purpose of the Refinement phase was to learn more about the potential impacts of the conceptual high capacity transit options. All seven intersections of the Crossroads were modeled in that analysis, with metrics reported for the critical intersections. The findings of that analysis were used to inform the scoping and study area definition of the EIS, which includes five of the seven intersections. The intersections of SW Huber Street with SW Capitol Highway and the northbound I-5 on-ramp are not included as study intersections in the EIS traffic analysis, because they are not expected to have adverse effects based on the previous analysis.</p> <p>The I-5 congestion pricing project was developed subsequent to the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project. It is that project’s responsibility to consider earlier projects, including the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project, in its analysis.</p> <p>Construction of the Project would not include modifications to vehicular movements at the intersection of SW Barbur Boulevard and SW Capitol Highway, such as a left-turn signal from northbound SW Barbur Boulevard to SW Barbur Boulevard and I-5 South. However, a separate ODOT project is being advanced in coordination with the Southwest Corridor. That ODOT project would modify the Crossroads intersection area to direct traffic from northbound SW Capitol Highway to turn right at SW Taylors Ferry Road, then turn right again onto SW Barbur Boulevard to head south or to access I-5 South. ODOT considered adding a left-turn signal from northbound SW Capitol Highway to SW Barbur Boulevard and I-5 South instead; however, the traffic analysis for this scenario showed a substantial increase in congestion on streets surrounding this intersection.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project’s traffic analysis.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle mobility and station access improvements.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding property acquisitions and business displacements.</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p><u>Property Displacement Impacts:</u> Crestwood is extremely concerned about the loss of residential housing in our neighborhood so close to the West Portland Town Center. Crestwood is also concerned about negative impacts to Barbur World Foods, a popular grocery destination for many residents and key to the town center’s success. The DEIS does not discuss how the alignment would affect access to Barbur World Foods and Walgreens. The DEIS Appendix F does not differentiate whether properties would be partially or fully impacted by the proposal and the Refinement maps don’t illustrate the detail of the proposal, making a lot of people very concerned about whether and how this refinement affects their home and livability in our neighborhood. A number of our residents are alarmed about the loss of property value and livability from a light rail alignment running through our neighborhood.</p> <p><u>Noise and vibration, sunlight, trees and livability:</u> Crestwood is concerned about the noise and vibration impacts described in the draft Initial Route Proposal. The proposed light rail structure might be located above existing homes. While sound walls might mitigate against noise and vibration impacts, Crestwood is very concerned about the massive visual impact of the light rail structure and walls, and loss of sunlight and trees in our neighborhood, and livability. The proposed sound walls (and needed retaining walls as well as the train tracks and motor vehicle mitigations) may make it impossible to construct needed pedestrian and bicycle facilities on SW Taylors Ferry Road in the future.</p> <p><u>Station Access Over I-5:</u> Crestwood has advocated for over 20 years for a pedestrian/bicycle overpass over I-5 in the vicinity of Markham Elementary School to make the neighborhood more accessible to schools, shops and services as well as the proposed LRT stop at SW 53rd and Barbur. Projects SA19 and SA20 are essential Station Access Projects for our neighborhood. These are also Safe Routes to Schools and other services in our neighborhood. At a minimum, if Refinement 2 and/or Refinement 4 are pursued then each of the LRT I-5 overcrossings must include facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists.</p> <p><u>Environmental Concerns:</u> The proposed location of the Taylors Ferry alignment is at the headwaters of Woods Creek. Crestwood is concerned about existing stormwater issues within the nearby neighborhoods and water quality impacts that would be exacerbated by this proposal. Woods Creek and Woods Park are not discussed in Chapter 4 and only briefly mentioned in Refinement 2. The impacts on the Woods Creek watershed and Woods Memorial Park must be addressed in the SW Corridor Plan.</p> <p><u>Park and Rides:</u> The IRP proposes to add as many as 2200 parking spaces at the three park and rides in the vicinity of Crestwood (825 at Barbur Transit Center, 950 at SW 53rd and 425 at SW 68th). This additional motor vehicle traffic driving through our neighborhood to access the park and rides will compromise livability and safety in our neighborhood. Station Access Projects such as SA16 and SA22 need to be constructed at the same time as light rail construction to make it safer to travel through our neighborhood by foot, bike, car or transit. The motor vehicle analyses and mitigations in Chapter 3 only discuss intersections directly at the entrance to the park and rides and must address the safety on the roadways that access the park and rides.</p> <p><u>Bus Transit Service:</u> The DEIS does not discuss what would happen to bus #43 which travels along SW Taylors Ferry Road. Over the last 20 years TriMet has cut service to the #43 and eliminated direct service to the Barbur Transit Center which resulted in lower transit ridership and increased motor vehicle traffic accessing the park and ride. Crestwood recommends that the SW Corridor Plan enhance transit service along SW Taylors Ferry Road and directly connect #43 with the Barbur Transit Center station and add weekend transit service. This is especially important because TriMet’s Service Enhancement Plan calls for bus #43 to cross the Sellwood Bridge to connect with the Orange Line rather than traveling to downtown Portland, making it essential that #43 riders directly connect with transit service to downtown Portland and Tigard at the Barbur Transit Center station.</p> <p>Crestwood Supports Refinement 4, Barbur Undercrossing, with some concerns.</p> <p>The proposed SW 68th station in Refinement 4 would improve access to SWC light rail for the western portion of Crestwood, as noted on page E-13, but the undercrossing makes no sense and the maps do not illustrate how this will work. As described above, Crestwood believes Alternative B1 (Center Barbur) provides a more direct route and faster travel times than Alternative B2. Alternative B1 should continue the alignment along Center Barbur from the vicinity of the Barbur Transit Center to the station at SW 68th and NOT tunnel under Barbur. Refinement 4 must also include bicycle and pedestrian facilities to infill the many gaps in the pedestrian and bicycle network on 99W to access the station near SW 68th.</p> <p>The Barbur Undercrossing as proposed may negatively impact the low-income housing at Ash Creek Commons and other residents nearby through vibration and noise; Ash Creek Commons residents are already subject to toxic exhaust fumes from the I-5 off-ramp that would be worsened by added congestion on 99W. Table 3.2-5 indicates that the intersection of Barbur, SW 64th and the southbound I-5 off ramp does not meet mobility targets and mitigations must be included in the SWC plan.</p> <p>In summary, Crestwood neighborhood Association supports the concept of Light Rail Transit on Barbur but does not support some of the cost-cutting refinements that lack long-term vision for our region.</p> <p>The existing bridges at SW Barbur/SW Capitol Highway Crossroads and the Barbur I-5 Overcrossing between SW 60th and SW 64th were substandard when they were built in 1959 and 1985, respectively, lack safe pedestrian and bicycle facilities and are highly likely to be destroyed in an earthquake less severe than the predicted Cascadia earthquake. The Initial Route Proposal lacks the vision to support projected growth in our region by avoiding needed pedestrian and bicycle improvements to access transit. The proposed refinements 2 and 4, if they are selected for further study, must include pedestrian and bicycle facilities on the light rail structures to enable people to walk and bike safely to the light rail stations and other services in our neighborhood.</p> <p>Please support Alternative B1, Center Barbur, reject Refinement 2 Taylors Ferry, and amend Refinement 4 Barbur Undercrossing to design the SW Corridor project in a way that anticipates long-term growth in our region and safety of everyone who travels through our neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration Impacts, of this Final EIS regarding concerns about noise and vibrations, including concerns related to Ash Creek Commons.</p> <p>Regarding your concerns about impacts to Woods Creek and Woods Memorial Natural Area (Woods Park), please see Section 4.7, Parks and Recreation Resources, Section 4.9, Ecosystems, and Section 4.10, Water Resources of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and Chapter 3 of this Final EIS regarding traffic analysis related to park and rides.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project.</p> <p>Please reference TriMet’s Conceptual Design Report for illustrations of the Project’s potential improvements to access for the 68th Station, and additional description and illustrations of the undercrossing approaching the 68th Station (find the Conceptual Design Report at: <a href="https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm">https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm</a>).</p>
006	DoCoMoMo Oregon	Iain MacKenzie	<p>Dococomo Oregon understands that TriMet recently purchased Congregation Ahavath Achim synagogue at 3225 SW Barbur Blvd as part of the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project, and that the site may needed for the construction of the Marquam Hill Connection. We urge you choose an option for this connection that limits any adverse impact on the historic building.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 9 regarding the Marquam Hill Connection and the Congregation Ahavath Achim synagogue.</p>

Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>In 1962 the South Auditorium urban renewal project forced Congregation Ahavath Achim to move from South Portland. They attempted to relocate their their Moorish-inspired synagogue to SW Barbur Blvd, however the building did not survive the move. From 1965 to 1966 they constructed a new synagogue on the site that was set to be the home of their old building.</p> <p>The distinctive modernist building was designed by noted Oregon architect John Storrs. When the City of Portland conducted its Historic Resources Inventory in 1984, less than 20 years after the building was completed, it was classified as a Rank II resource, indicating that it was potentially eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. Now that the building is over 50 years old its historic significance has only grown. The building could be included on the National Register for its design, as well as for its association with the history of urban renewal and the Jewish community in Portland.</p> <p>Given the history of the building it would be incredibly unfortunate if government actions resulted in the destruction of the synagogue for a second time. Docomomo Oregon opposes any option for Marquam Hill Connection that would require the demolition of the building, as we understand may be the case with Connection 2 (Full Tunnel). Options that do not require the demolition of the synagogue should still carefully consider what impact they will have on the building and its setting.</p>	
O07	Friends of Terwilliger	Anton Vetterlein	<p>The early elimination of the LRT route that would have tunneled under Marquam Hill and provided a station at OHSU was premature. The current justification for a “Marquam Hill Connection” between Barbur Blvd. and OHSU – that Marquam Hill is a critical destination with 10,000 potential daily riders – was downplayed at the time. Now this justification is being used to push another connector across Terwilliger Parkway that will greatly alter the character and quality of this historic and much-used linear city park. We don’t agree with the planners and politicians who have decided that it’s worth sacrificing a portion of Terwilliger Parkway in order to avoid the potential (and poorly studied) costs and complications of the Marquam Hill LRT Tunnel option. Friends of Terwilliger would like to support light rail to Marquam Hill in order to reduce traffic in the parkway and neighborhood, but the elimination of the underground OHSU station option leaves us with no acceptable alternatives.</p> <p>Regarding the initial route proposal:</p> <p>The description of the Marquam Hill Connection in the Project Introduction on page 1-4 states: <i>“The connection between the medical complex on Marquam Hill and SW Barbur Boulevard is critical for the project. Approximately 10,000 daily MAX line transit riders are expected with this improved access to the main campus of OHSU and the Veterans Affairs (VA) Portland Health Care System and Shriners hospitals.”</i> This clearly shows the need for a LRT connection to Marquam Hill, especially given that it comprises 22% of projected daily ridership. But, according to Appendix I, the Marquam Hill Tunnel options were removed <i>“due to the relatively small travel time and ridership gains compared to the high capital cost of the tunnel, the substantial construction impacts at portals and station areas, and the high engineering risk”</i> and that <i>“Instead, a pedestrian and bike connection to Marquam Hill from the nearby surface HCT station on Barbur or Naito will be part of the project.”</i> How can a 22% increase in ridership be a “relatively small ridership gain”? The capital costs and construction impacts are not quantified in any detail and have not been adequately studied. It appears that it was easier to sacrifice a portion of the historic and environmentally significant Terwilliger Parkway rather than undertake that study.</p> <p>According to the discussion of Section 4(f) Resources in Appendix D, the impacts to Terwilliger Parkway of all the Marquam Hill Connection options are significant: <i>“The impacts to Terwilliger Parkway from the vegetation removal and ground disturbance will be long lasting and will result in a severe visual change to this park. These impacts cannot be mitigated down to de minimis, and the Marquam Hill connection is therefore assumed to be a permanent use regardless of the option selected.”</i> In spite of this evaluation, the Connection options have moved forward and no alternatives that don’t significantly impact the parkway have been adequately studied. As the record will show, Friends of Terwilliger testified or provided comment on several occasions and implored project staff and leaders to find a LRT connection that does no harm to Terwilliger Parkway, but it appears we have been ignored.</p> <p>DEIS Comments RE: Marquam Hill Connection:</p> <p>All four <u>Marquam Hill Connection</u> options have significant and unacceptable impacts on Terwilliger Parkway in the vicinity of Campus Drive. <i>It is important to point out that the bulk of the infrastructure and impacts of the Connection will be on public park property (not on OHSU property or city right-of-way) and that this park property will be acquired from Portland Parks and Recreation and taken out of park use.</i> Options 1A, 1B, and 1C will all place an elevator tower and bridge in what is now a scenic canyon east of Terwilliger Blvd. that is full of Oregon white oaks, douglas firs, and other mostly native trees, many of which will be removed. They will also require the removal of native trees and plantings on the west side of Terwilliger and replace them with ramps, steps, retaining walls, and other construction that will destroy what few park-like qualities that remain in that area. These west side trees were planted in the 1990s to screen new OHSU buildings in accordance with the Terwilliger Parkway Corridor Plan which calls for a “forest corridor” in this location and they are only just now reaching a size where they can actually screen OHSU buildings from view. Connection Option 2 – a pedestrian tunnel – seems preferable because it connects people most directly from Barbur to OHSU and would have no physical presence at Terwilliger, but the proposed cut-and-cover construction method would remove even more trees than the other options; it would also leave a significant section of parkway hillside denuded and would expose an extensive conglomeration of OHSU buildings to direct view from Terwilliger Blvd. and pathway. Promising to re-plant trees is a hollow promise in that it will take several decades – under ideal conditions – to mature enough to screen buildings from view and recreate the forest corridor called for in the Terwilliger Parkway Plan. Other trees planted at Terwilliger and Campus Dr. in the last couple decades have not grown in as expected because of later OHSU construction projects requiring their removal, or because they were not planted in proper conditions and they ended up dying. So if history is any indication, we should keep the trees we have and not remove them.</p> <p>The Terwilliger Parkway Corridor Plan (TPCP), adopted by Portland City Council ordinance no. 155241 in 1983, is the governing planning document for the area proposed for the Marquam Hill Connection. Some of its goals relevant to this project are:</p> <p>Goal A. <i>“To preserve and enhance the scenic character and natural beauty of Terwilliger Parkway and Boulevard.”</i></p> <p>Goal B. <i>“To maintain and enhance unobstructed views from Terwilliger Boulevard and Trail”</i></p> <p>Goal D. <i>“To guide the siting, scale, landscaping, traffic impacts and design of new development to enhance the aesthetic experience of Terwilliger.”</i></p> <p>Goal E. <i>“To manage the location and design of new vehicular and pedestrian access to Terwilliger in order to reduce traffic hazards and incompatible visual impacts.”</i></p>	<p>Please see Master Response 12 regarding the decision to remove a tunnel alignment beneath Marquam Hill from consideration for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 9 regarding the Marquam Hill Connection and Terwilliger Parkway, including information related to the federal Section 106 and Section 4(f) processes.</p> <p>Friends of Terwilliger was a part of the Marquam Hill Connection Green Ribbon Committee, which was convened following publication of the Draft EIS and provided a recommendation to TriMet’s Southwest Corridor Steering Committee on the Marquam Hill Connection decision.</p> <p>In the Final EIS, references to the Terwilliger Parkway Corridor Plan, the Terwilliger Parkway Design Guidelines and the Marquam Hill Plan have been included in Section 4.2, Land Use. Additionally, Section 4.4, Communities, has been updated to include more information regarding the impacts of the Marquam Hill Connection on Terwilliger Parkway.</p> <p>The City of Portland’s permitting of the Project, including the Marquam Hill Connection, is a separate forthcoming process that will take city policies and statutes into consideration.</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>All four of the connection options violate one or more of these goals and, as stated in the 4(f) evaluation, will have “long lasting impacts” that “will result in severe visual change” and that “cannot be mitigated”.</p> <p>TPCP Land Use Policy C. states: “Allowable uses within the Terwilliger Parkway and Boulevard shall be limited to recreational uses such as walking, bicycling, jogging and picnicking, and other forms of passive recreation; supportive development such as restrooms; and viewpoint parking...” The proposed connection is clearly not a recreational use.</p> <p>Landscape Policy A. of the TPCP states: “Develop, through plantings and improved maintenance, the Landscape Concept shown on Map 1 and illustrated in Figures 3 through 10...” Map 1 shows a “Forest Corridor” for the west side of Terwilliger Parkway around Campus Drive where the connection is proposed. Figure 3 defines a Forest Corridor as “A continuous, visually uninterrupted segment of the roadway which is heavily enclosed by native forest plantings and hillsides. Development is completely screened from view.” Yet the DEIS states on page 4-77: “With the connection options, developed infrastructure would displace the mature vegetation. However, because the OHSU campus is directly uphill of Terwilliger Parkway here and is the dominant feature experienced by parkway users in this location, the change to the setting would be localized and reduced by the existing presence of large buildings and transportation infrastructure.” This statement contradicts both the aforementioned Goals of the TPCP and the Landscape Policy. The fact that OHSU campus buildings are dominant in this location is because of negligence and oversight. Trees were required to be planted to screen OSHU buildings as mitigation for tree removal and use of the parkway during construction of the aerial tram (see Land Use Review #05-122007 EN.) The trees subsequently died because the rock construction access road where they were planted was not removed. If those trees had been planted in favorable conditions and had survived they would be starting to screen the buildings as required in the TPCP and OHSU buildings would not be the “dominant feature”. Justifying a new harm on the basis of an old harm should not be a valid argument. Also on page 4-77 it states that the removal of trees and shrubs “would be negligible, because many acres of forested parkway would remain unchanged and largely inaccessible for public use, similar to existing conditions.” This statement does not make any sense that we can discern and should be omitted.</p> <p>Map 1 of the TPCP also shows a “Major View” to the east over the connection project area. While that view is currently partially obstructed by trees, many of those trees are deciduous and the view improves in the winter. The placement of an elevator tower and connecting bridge in the view shed would need to be sensitively handled to not block or mar the view, especially given that the project will open up this view by removing trees. There is little information in the DEIS that indicates how connector options 1A, 1B, and 1C will impact this view.</p> <p>Landscape Policy B. of the TPCP states: “Re-landscape the major entrances and focal points of Terwilliger Boulevard (including...Campus Drive...) using, where possible, larger plant materials and ground-cover.” This was undertaken in the 1990s as mitigation for construction of the Casey Eye Institute and the Doernbecher Children’s Hospital, but much of those plantings were removed during construction of the Kohler Pavilion and aerial tram and not properly re-planted. The few trees that have survived would likely be removed under all four connection options. Much of the planting area would be displaced by transportation infrastructure and there would be little room for planting larger plant materials and ground cover.</p> <p>Why is there no mention of the historic importance of Terwilliger Parkway? The DEIS says that “Terwilliger Parkway is recommended as eligible for listing on the NRHP” but there is no mention of its “Historic Characteristics and Significant” in Table D-1 or elsewhere. Terwilliger Parkway holds an important position in the history of park development in Portland. It was conceived and partially designed between 1903 and 1912 by the most famous and sought-after landscape architecture firm of the time, Olmsted Brothers Landscape Architects, who were sons of the illustrious Frederick Law Olmsted. The elder Olmsted designed Central Park in NYC and many parks throughout America, the US Capitol grounds, Stanford University grounds, the Biltmore Estate, Riverside, Illinois, and the 1893 Chicago Worlds Fair grounds, to name just a few. He is a colossal figure in American Landscape Design and his sons continued his illustrious practice throughout the USA. John C. Olmsted came to Portland in 1903 to design the 1905 Lewis and Clark Exposition grounds and a master plan for Portland parks. Of the numerous parkways that they recommended to the Portland Park Board, only Terwilliger Parkway was actually constructed. This history and its connection to broad national currents make it the most historically significant park property in the entire DEIS study area, yet it gets virtually no mention. Additionally, Table 4.6-1 should show all four connection options as having “Full: Presumed Adverse Effect” due to acquisitions and easements.</p> <p>Additional Miscellaneous DEIS Comments:</p> <p><u>RE: Table 4.2-3 Segment A: Summary of Local Plan Compatibility:</u> There is no mention of the Terwilliger Parkway Corridor Plan, Terwilliger Parkway Design Guidelines, or the Marquam Hill Plan. These plans are relevant and should be included.</p> <p><u>RE: Table 4.4-2 Long Term Community Impacts: Segment A:</u> The table ignores or understates the impacts of the connection options on Neighborhood Cohesion, Neighborhood Quality of Life, and Community Facilities. The Homestead Neighborhood, where the project area is located, considers Terwilliger Parkway to be an important asset to the neighborhood. The Homestead Neighborhood Association regularly expresses support for the maintaining the “Character of Terwilliger”. A recent survey by Friends of Terwilliger on a Saturday morning of pedestrians and runners found users from throughout the city, but the greatest numbers were from the surrounding neighborhoods. Many residents walk or run or bike on Terwilliger daily without the need to get in a car. Terwilliger Parkway offers a cool, forested respite from urban intrusions, but the Marquam Hill connection options will all bifurcate the parkway with tree removal and an intrusion of urban infrastructure. Terwilliger Parkway is an especially valued resource to citizens from throughout the city during hot summer weather because it can be 5 or 10 degrees cooler than the city at large due to its east-facing aspect and the cooling effect of the forest canopy. Removing more of that tree canopy, especially on the west side, would affect the value of Terwilliger as a destination for runners, walkers, and bikers.</p> <p>Finally, it’s important to note that a “parkway” is a linear park (often with a road or pathway running through it) rather than a well-landscaped highway (as is often thought.) One of the prime characteristics of a linear park is its continuity. Terwilliger’s continuity is characterized by its well-designed grades and curves, its minimal infrastructure of roadway, pathway, and light poles, and by its natural setting that alternates between forest corridors and scenic viewpoints. Any Marquam Hill Connection option that interrupts the park continuity with urban infrastructure or that exposes more OHSU buildings to view degrades this valuable and historic city resource.</p>	

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
O08	HAKI Community Organization & Community Alliance of Tenants	Saalim Saalim	<p>Hi, my name is Saalim Saalim. I live in southwest Portland. I represent the HAKI Community Organization and CAT, Community Alliance of Tenants.</p> <p>Many of our families live in Tigard. We're so happy for the light rail line, I might also move to Tigard. Yeah. So many has already been said but I want to support the Ash modified option. And yeah, this will make the housing rent go high, but the most important thing here, please keep resident housing -- houses rent fair and low into whatever you guys do.</p> <p>But please keep resident housing rent as low as possible and fair. Make it low. Yeah. I think that would be it, because many of everything has already been mentioned, yeah. So that will be it. Thank you.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed support for the "Ash modified option," which is the initial route proposal in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), including the SW Ash Avenue alignment, as well as the Barbur Undercrossing, Elmhurst and Tigard Transit Center East of Hall, which were studied as Alternative C2, Refinement 4, Refinement 5 and Refinement 6, respectively, in the Draft EIS, and which span both Segment B (Outer Portland) and Segment C. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to gentrification and affordability of housing.</p>
O09	Hillsdale Business and Professional Association	Mike Roach	<p>At our July 18th monthly meeting, we passed the following motion:</p> <p>Maintaining the access between the Hillsdale Town Center and Barbur Blvd via SW Capitol Highway is very important to the commercial health of Hillsdale. HBPA supports "Design Refinement 1" which will provide continuous access by not requiring construction at the ramps between SW Barbur Blvd and SW Capitol Highway. This refinement provides new bridges with pedestrian and bicycle facilities connecting to SW Slavin Road and SW Barbur Blvd over the Vermont and Newbury (Iowa Street) gullies, and in addition, provides a two-lane bridge adjacent to the new bridges.</p> <p>Were "Refinement 1" to be the chosen alternative, HBPA believes it would and could enthusiastically support the SW Corridor Project.</p> <p>Please note that HBPA appreciates the accommodation of allowing bus line 54 to use the light rail tracks where applicable to decrease travel times to downtown Portland from Hillsdale.</p> <p>We wish planners the best of luck with the project. HBPA looks forward to playing a constructive role in shaping the final design and finished product.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail to the east of SW Barbur Boulevard in the Woods portion of Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Refinement 1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle improvements included in the Project.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS, specifically Section 3.3, Short-Term Impacts, to learn more about impacts to the SW Capitol Highway flyover.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project.</p>
O10	Hillsdale Neighborhood Association	Matt DeRosa	<p>The below comments is made on behalf of the Hillsdale Neighborhood Association, of which I am the current President. If you email me, I can provide this document as a beautifully formatted PDF (it will look a lot better, trust me).</p> <p>-----</p> <p>What are Hillsdale's values?</p> <p>Simply put, it's complicated. They are as complex as those of any such community which is as diverse as Hillsdale strives to be. Hillsdale is a collection of multiple perspectives and opinions, including, among others, those of: mothers and fathers; doctors and mechanics; sons and daughters; students and entrepreneurs; retirees; Jews, Muslims, Christians, and members of other faiths or no faith at all; Republicans, Democrats, Libertarians, Independents; and other sociological components of society everywhere. Except for a few residents, we are neither 21st-century civil engineers nor modern city planners. In general, these are not our collective areas of expertise. What Hillsdale Neighborhood Association (HNA) Members and the Board do understand--as a result of our meetings, presentations, and general discourse--are the values expressed by many of our 8,000 residents. Our area of expertise, as a Neighborhood Association, is the character of our community, developed over decades by concerned citizens who constitute our civic institutions. Our interests are as wide as our population is intellectually diverse. Through discussion, the HNA has drawn out themes expressing our values and interests, ones especially relevant to the Southwest Corridor Project (SWC), the 12-mile construction and development project which will impact our 17-Southwest neighborhoods for current and future generations. The SWC will be physically built according to the standards of state-of-the-art scientific engineering and design criteria. But, it must reflect--at the conceptual level--the human values of those who will be most affected by its physical components. Below is a description of the values of Hillsdale residents as they have been expressed in our Neighborhood Association forum and in other public and private ways. We hope to see them reflected in the design and implementation of the SWC--not only in Hillsdale but throughout the entire corridor. In no weighted order, our values are:</p> <p><b>Affordable Housing and Anti-Gentrification</b></p> <p>Repeatedly, the City of Portland and other government entities have felt compelled to make budgetary considerations, and not public need and aesthetics, primary when deciding which of the competing designs will best suit the human and natural environment. It is no secret, for example, that the City, Hillsdale included, has a problem with establishing and maintaining truly affordable housing. The HNA supports collaborative government and private sector efforts to address this complex but not intractable matter. We want to see public works projects planned with affordable housing as an important objective, and minimize the negative impact of development for tenants whose reliance upon affordable housing is economically essential.</p> <p>Also, when decisions cannot be avoided which will force the relocation of individuals on a long-term or permanent basis, the HNA wants to see the City make anti-gentrification efforts a proactive priority. Specifically, we want to see protocols in place which allow relocated residents to have the "first right of refusal" when it comes to moving back into the community once construction is finished. There exist examples of how such a goal can be met by both the public and the private sectors, and we, the HNA, stand ready to offer our assistance to achieve this worthwhile objective.</p> <p><b>Livability and Beautiful Design</b></p>	<p>Overall, please note that while many of your comments are addressed to "the City," the project sponsor is TriMet, which has different jurisdiction and legal powers than the City of Portland. That said, TriMet is working in partnership with local jurisdictions, including Portland, on the planning, design and implementation of the Project. Additionally, these comments have been shared with the City of Portland.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to affordable housing and gentrification. Your comments regarding a desire for local statutes designating "first right of refusal" for relocated residents have been shared with project partners.</p> <p>Regarding your comment on livability and beautiful design, please reference TriMet's Conceptual Design Report for the Project to see illustrations of the Project's urban design principles (find the Conceptual Design Report at: <a href="https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm">https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm</a>).</p> <p>Current FTA policy does not allow money for transit projects to be spent on art. However, TriMet would continue to seek opportunities to incorporate art within the existing restrictions.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding bicycle and pedestrian improvements included in the Project.</p> <p>Within Portland, the project design follows the city's modal hierarchy, which places bicycles, pedestrians and transit ahead of personal vehicles. Where light rail is planned to run in the street right of way, such as along SW Barbur Boulevard, signals are required to ensure operation that is safe and complies with rail requirements. Walking and bicycling facilities are included in the project design, with the addition of numerous signals to manage the conflicts between people walking and biking, vehicles and trains. However, the Project</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>The residents of Hillsdale want to live in an aesthetically beautiful space. Murals, statuary art, trees, and green-spaces are important expressions of our community's personality and already on display in the center and at the periphery of Hillsdale. They make the difference between having to go somewhere, wanting to be there, and wanting to stay there. Designing spaces for this aesthetic appeal are important and necessary to community support of any project.</p> <p><b>Pedestrian/Bike Connectivity and Vehicular Traffic Flow</b></p> <p>Human-powered travel is our top priority in and around Hillsdale. In general, Hillsdale believes in a future which brings the built environment to "human scale" where the arrangement of roadways, railways, greenery, and buildings, all support the spontaneous movement of people outdoors individually and in groups. Historically, the major roadway on its eastern edge (Barbur Boulevard) has not received focused attention to bring it to scale, nor to improve its use by means any other than automobiles, trucks, and buses; thus in its current state, it departs from the principle of human scale.</p> <p>Another priority is optimal vehicular traffic. Often design for public right-of-way drastically favors vehicles in terms of space and traffic-flow design. We want to optimize vehicular traffic, but more so we want to optimize safe and efficient passage for pedestrians and bicycles. When weighing decisions, our preference favors pedestrians and bicycles. With respect to vehicular traffic, our preference is continuous-flow intersections rather than signalized intersections. We would like design to incorporate continuous-flow models into human-power designed streets. As a note, this preference is said with safety and convenience in mind for human-powered traffic with aims to facilitate shorter trips in the neighborhood and to access mass transit. We believe that this must take precedent over automobile speeds.</p> <p><b>Proactive Infrastructure Improvements</b></p> <p>Residents of Hillsdale have repeatedly expressed concerns about the Cascadia Subduction Zone earthquake. We recognize that our viaducts and buildings are a low priority for the City when compared to bridges over the Willamette River for example, especially after an earthquake occurs. Since opportunities to improve our infrastructure are rare, we view the SWC Project as a chance to make needed seismic upgrades ahead of "The Big One" or even "The Lesser Ones".</p> <p><b>Affirming Support of these Values Across the Corridor</b></p> <p>We want to affirm these values across all aspects of the SWC and other future Tri-Met/PBOT/ODOT projects within Hillsdale and beyond. We recognize that each person benefits from living in a city which holds these values above the financial cost of a project. We stand in support of the residents of other neighborhoods who share our values.</p> <p><b>Applying Hillsdale's Values to the SWC Project</b></p> <p>Based on our common ideals, the HNA supports increased mass-transit projects including the SWC, assuming that each project conforms with our values. We recognize that there are practical cost burdens associated with any public-works project, but we want to make it clear that any project or proposal which addresses each of our values will be seen positively. Livability, anti-gentrification, connectivity, and proactive infrastructure improvements outweigh cost-saving measures which reduce the relevance of our values. Of course, we want to be fiscally responsible, but the HNA weighs the above Socially Responsible Values higher than fiscal concerns when pitted against one another.</p> <p>With respect to the 12-mile SWC, there are two stretches that directly fall within our geographic boundary. Thus, we feel a special need to express our preferences relating to them.</p> <p><b>Barbur Woods</b></p> <p>The first stretch concerns the portion of the Vermont and Newbury gullies, which we lovingly refer to as the "Barbur Woods". We prefer the option which addresses our values of proactive infrastructure improvements and connectivity and traffic-flow preferences. We recognize that design study is in an early stage across all proposals, but to date we support the option to place the light rail line on Barbur itself, rather than building an alternate structure. Our intention is that this alignment will update or replace the existing viaducts bringing them up to current earthquake standards.</p> <p>Also, where Barbur and Capitol Highway meet (currently at the "flyover"), we prefer a continuous flow interchange as opposed to a signalized one. This does not necessarily need to be the current flyover (closed until late August for repair of a hole) or a similar design. Optimizing vehicular traffic from the Hillsdale Town Center to-and-from Portland is critical. That said, we also prefer a decision which favors pedestrian and bicycle traffic over vehicular traffic. We want to ensure that human-powered traffic has easy flow from Hillsdale all the way to Barbur, especially to the light rail stations.</p> <p><b>Barbur Boulevard</b></p> <p>The second stretch of the SWC concerns the choice between an I-5 adjacent alignment and a Barbur alignment. The HNA prefers the light rail line on Barbur. In its current design, this alignment has the potential to address the following values: anti-gentrification, livability, and connectivity. It is our priority to preserve and promote truly affordable housing by minimizing residencies which will require relocation, as well as encouraging new high-density affordable housing along the corridor, especially near light rail stations. When removal is necessary, which we recognize will be the case, we prefer removing businesses as opposed to removing housing. Lastly, we would like to encourage METRO to explore options for local statutes to be written which go beyond the Uniform Relocation Act and which would allow relocated residents and businesses to have the "first right of refusal" when new construction is completed in the corridor. We want to minimize relocation, and show support for those who were relocated to be able to return.</p> <p>In terms of livability and beautiful design, the Barbur alignment is preferred. The community recognizes in this is a rare opportunity to bring the Boulevard to human scale, and to dramatically increase its safety for pedestrians and cyclists. Design aspects we want to see include (but are not limited to): continuous sidewalks, continuous bike lanes, street trees (both maintaining what we have and adding new trees), adding green space, encouraging community-designed art, as well as going above and beyond the standards required by the Americans with Disabilities Act. We want to see Barbur become a revitalized community hub where people of all ages, physical abilities, and travel preferences feel safe and welcome as shoppers, employees, and travelers.</p>	<p>is also required to consider mitigation when it adversely affects traffic operations beyond certain thresholds. Within the constraints of the traffic impact requirements, the Project would improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities and crossings along the corridor in order to improve safety and access to the Project.</p> <p>Regarding your comment on proactive seismic improvements, where the Project replaces structures, the new structures would be built to the latest seismic standards. These structures include the SW Capitol Highway flyover, the SW Barbur Boulevard viaducts, and bridges on SW Barbur Boulevard at SW Multnomah Boulevard and SW 26th Avenue.</p> <p>Regarding your comments on values, the intention of the Project is to enhance the livability and quality of life for existing and future residents of and visitors to the Southwest Corridor. Please see Chapter 1, Project Introduction, of this Final EIS for more details on the Project's Purpose and Need. Note that the Project would require federal funding in order to be constructed, which would be acquired through a national competitive process that includes an evaluation of the Project's cost-effectiveness.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied under all three alternative alignments (Alternatives A1, A2-BH and A2-LA) in the Draft EIS, instead of on a separate structure to the east of SW Barbur Boulevard, which was studied as Refinement 1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS, specifically Section 3.3, Short-Term Impacts, to learn more about impacts to the SW Capitol Highway flyover.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard.</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>Pedestrian and bicycle connectivity from the Hillsdale interior is important. Placing the light rail on Barbur means that those wanting to use the light rail will not have to cross over a major arterial in order to utilize that service, especially since Barbur would not have benefited from the street improvements if it was not the chosen option. We strongly desire that two lanes of traffic remain available so that vehicular traffic is not impeded.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>We want the focus of the light rail to be optimal for people rather than for vehicles. When corridors are designed for the people who live in the homes, work in its businesses, and shop in those businesses, it creates a strong sense of community that cannot be formed when designing a passageway for vehicles alone. We support the viaduct and Barbur alignments because we support pedestrian-designed communities and transit ways. In the event that these are not the final alignments, we expect that our values are expressed in whichever alignments are chosen. We support this from Naito to the Barbur Woods, from those woods to Barbur Crossing, and from there until the eventual terminus in Bridgeport Village. Recognizing that other communities and neighborhoods will have different goals and preferences, we want to support all project decisions which are congruent with Hillsdale's values. We recognize that our preferences have a higher price tag, but we believe that the additional cost is a promise to ourselves and future generations that METRO will promote: anti-gentrification efforts, livability and beautiful design, optimizing traffic with the pedestrian and cyclist in mind, and proactive mitigation of earthquake damages. We believe that it is a true sign of community to plant the seed so that another may enjoy the shade of the tree. We commit ourselves to the benefit of future generations.</p>	
O11	Homestead Neighborhood Association	Ed Fischer	<p>At a meeting of the Homestead Neighborhood Association on July 3, 2018 a discussion of elements of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project that most affected our neighborhood resulted in a vote of the neighbors in attendance to take positions as follows:</p> <p>Homestead NA supports Alignment Alternative A1: Barbur since it provides the closest pedestrian connection to Marquam Hill and would most encourage transit ridership to the hill.</p> <p>2. Homestead NA opposes Marquam Hill Connection 1A because it would require an at-grade crossing of Terwilliger Boulevard involving a traffic signal for a pedestrian crossing. We believe the visual and operational impacts of a traffic signal on Terwilliger would have an unacceptable and detrimental effect on the parkway experience. We support a below grade (separated) crossing of Terwilliger and look forward to working with the City to determine the best means for accommodating all users of Terwilliger Boulevard.</p> <p>3. Homestead NA opposes Design Refinement 1: Barbur Woods East Side Running as presented because of the negative impact on traffic flow as the light rail crosses traffic canes. The impact to northbound vehicle traffic on Barbur Boulevard would be significant causing long traffic queues, increased energy consumption, and degraded air quality. Specifically we are concerned that the back-ups caused by these at-grade crossings would divert more traffic onto local neighborhood streets.</p> <p>Thank-you for the opportunity to comment. We hope that you give serious consideration to our neighborhood's concerns about the items noted above.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, and opposition to a separate structure to the east of SW Barbur Boulevard in the Woods portion of Segment A, which was studied as Refinement 1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 9 regarding the Marquam Hill Connection.</p>
O12	Multnomah Neighborhood Association	Martie Sucec	<p>The Multnomah Neighborhood Association supports the purposes and goals of the SW Corridor Light Rail Project, and we strongly advocate for an LRT alignment down Barbur Boulevard (Alternative B1). Like other SW neighborhoods, especially those directly affected by the SWC project we want the intersection repaired at SW Barbur Blvd and SW Capitol Hwy—the Crossroads—Town Center repaired as has long and repeatedly been promised, since at least 1989. It's a disgrace that its repair and updating has been repeatedly delayed for one reason or another—and even more disgraceful that it is being neglected in the SWC LTP plan.</p> <p>Since the SWC planners have opted to finance the Ross Island Bridge improvements outside the plan so that the South Portland Neighborhood and others switch support from the Naito alternative to the Barbur route, Metro and the City of Portland and others should also deal with and separately finance the SW Barbur Blvd and SW Capitol Hwy crossroads. After all, the two areas are both onramps to I-5 South and both are in dreadful disrepair.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Crossroads area, specifically West Portland Park, has been designated a Town Center in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan—is the City serious about this designation? If so, the Crossroads cannot and should not be neglected in the SWC LRT plan.</p> <p>Multnomah adamantly opposes the Taylor's Ferry Road alignment (Alternative B2, Refinement 2) and any alignment that encroaches on Woods Memorial Park and the adjacent environmental protection zones, including any flyover in these areas.</p> <p>Aside from these objections, the traffic patterns at the multiple intersections of the Crossroads confluence have not been adequately analyzed and addressed. Multnomah also opposes Alternative B2 that would significantly encroach upon West Portland Park.</p> <p>Alignment B1 is the logical route for the light rail, and if it discarded because it will put the federal funding out of reach, then the Crossroads should be removed from the plan and funded separately, just as the Ross Island Bridge situation is being planned and funded separately, and the B1 alignment should go forward. It will be much more likely to recapture the support of SW neighborhoods.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS, and opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near Barbur Transit Center, which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Regarding your concerns about impacts to Woods Creek and Woods Memorial Natural Area (Woods Park), please see Section 4.7, Parks and Recreation Resources, Section 4.9, Ecosystems, and Section 4.10, Water Resources, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Regarding separate funding for a reconfiguration of the Crossroads area and its relationship with the West Portland Town Center designation, that comment has been shared with the City of Portland and ODOT. The Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration is included in the financially constrained project list of the <i>Regional Transportation Plan</i> (RTP), which allows it to receive regional, state and federal funding. The Crossroads project does not appear in the RTP's financially constrained project list and would likely need to be added to the RTP by ODOT or the City of Portland in order to qualify for adequate funding. The City of Portland is currently undertaking planning work for the West Portland Town Center, including community engagement (please see <a href="https://beta.portland.gov/bps/wpdx-town-center">https://beta.portland.gov/bps/wpdx-town-center</a>).</p> <p>Regarding your concerns about the adequacy of the traffic analysis, in 2013–2014, the Southwest Corridor Plan underwent a “Refinement” phase that included analysis of key intersections in the corridor, including the Crossroads intersections. The purpose of the Refinement phase was to learn more about the potential impacts of the conceptual high capacity transit options. All seven</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
				<p>intersections of the Crossroads were modeled in that analysis, with metrics reported for the critical intersections. The findings of that analysis were used to inform the scoping and study area definition of the EIS, which includes five of the seven intersections. The intersections of SW Huber Street with SW Capitol Highway and the northbound I-5 on-ramp are not included as study intersections in the EIS traffic analysis, because they are not expected to have adverse effects based on the previous analysis.</p> <p>Your comment does not specify what is inadequate about the Draft EIS analysis of Crossroads traffic, so it is not possible to respond with any further detail.</p>
O13	National University of Natural Medicine	David Schleich	<p>For more than a decade, NUNM has worked with PBOT, Metro, TriMet and ODOT to resolve safety and access concerns caused by the heavy, fast-moving traffic that completely surrounds the footprint of our South Portland campus, particularly on Naito to our west, and the Ross Island Bridge to our east. City engineers have documented the steadily increasing traffic impacts affecting our university and our Lair Hill neighborhood. Due to the complexity of street configurations, no viable solutions previously have been formulated. Recently, though, the Southwest Corridor project and the release of the Draft Environment Impact Statement (DEIS) Initial Route Proposal present opportunities and potential answers.</p> <p>NUNM has long supported the Naito Parkway alignment option for light rail. Today we want to build on our past and current collaboration with city and regional planners to provide context for our support of the DEIS recommendation for the Barbur Boulevard alignment. That support depends strongly on your approval to include the Ross Island Bridgehead project as a part of Metro’s 2020 regional funding measures for the SW Corridor and regional transportation projects. The Bridgehead, if approved and funded, could not only finally fix the increasing congestion of commuter traffic build-up on Kelly and Water, but would generate sustainable traffic-calming effects and other benefits on Naito for the Lair Hill community, our campus, our students, our patients and our employees.</p> <p>Improvements on Naito and the Bridgehead have been needed for many years and the Bridgehead reconfiguration offers a singular opportunity to fix longstanding traffic problems in our area. They address the safety issues that have long posed dangers to those accessing our campus. It will also finally knit the Lair Hill community together again, which has been sadly bifurcated since Naito was constructed in the ’40s.</p> <p>Impacts to the Future of NUNM</p> <p>In this regard, it is important to the NUNM community and its many stakeholders in this neighborhood and all over our city and region that the Committee, the City of Portland and SW Corridor planners are aware of the critical impacts that the SW Corridor/Bridgehead Reconfiguration may impose on the promising, albeit vulnerable future of NUNM in South Portland. The potential disruption to our Master Plan and to current operations, most particularly to our campus clinic, the Lair Hill Health Center, are quite real given the possible acquisition of NUNM properties as outlined within the DEIS.</p> <p>Indeed, the possibility has already begun to materially disrupt current and future campus planning, creating questions with donors and others about the future viability of NUNM’s campus in South Portland.</p> <p>Specifically, due to the proposed acquisition of our clinic on Corbett and Water, and the potential acquisition of part of our large parking lot adjacent to our Academic Building abutting Naito, there would not only be serious interruption of ongoing and growing healthcare services to the 20,000 annual patient visits at our Lair Hill Health Center, but major impacts to medical training and certification of our student interns at the heart of our educational curricula.</p> <p>It may be valuable for the Committee to know that our Lair Hill Health Center is one of two NUNM clinics recognized by the Oregon Health Authority as Tier Four Patient-Centered Primary Care Homes (PCPCH), a designation attesting to NUNM’s high quality standards, access to and continuity of care, accountability for patient outcomes, and coordination of treatments that are patient- and family-centered. The PCPCH designation is a badge we wear proudly as we work toward providing our patients Oregon’s Triple Aim of better health, better care at lower cost.</p> <p>Our clinic is intrinsic in the clinical skills education of our students. Here we produce and provide excellent primary care for our patients—many of whom are Medicaid recipients or are otherwise uninsured. The Lair Hill Health Center is an enduring and valuable conduit for NUNM’s long-term relationships and partnerships with OHSU, Pacific University, more than a dozen community clinics, numerous FQHCs, and other essential educational organizations in the city. Our clinic and our Helfgott Research Institute, for example, have partnered for many years with OHSU in attracting millions of dollars in NIH-funded research grants supporting key studies of mutual medical interest.</p> <p>Thus, while we recognize the viability of the recommendations under consideration for the SW Corridor in South Portland, we realize that long-term resolution of these important transportation, access and safety concerns for our city will require transformations that depend on careful management and communications with our stakeholders—not just current students, faculty, staff and patients, but also with prospective students, donors, campus partners and many others. NUNM plays a significant national leadership role in integrative and natural medicine, which reflects well on our City and its reputation for progressive-, people- and planet-centered design and rollout.</p> <p>So, we need to rely on pragmatic, reliable and deliberate thought and planning by the SW Corridor engineers, and transportation and land use planners to “leave NUNM whole” in order to keep our campus in its current footprint at the base of the Ross Island Bridge. For without our Lair Hill Health Center, the coherence of our own campus planning and our future revenues are quite literally at risk. That these potential changes could force relocation of our entire campus enterprise—an option that would be formidable to the future of our institution and, we believe, a loss to the City of Portland, necessitates such care.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to our comments regarding the DEIS as it relates to the proposed Barbur alignment and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p> <p>Regarding your request that Metro include the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in a regional transportation funding measure, that decision is separate from this Project and outside the purview of FTA. In July 2020, the Metro Council referred the Get Moving 2020 plan (transportation funding measure) to voters. The Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration is identified for funding in the Get Moving 2020 plan. Please note that evaluating the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration is an important step in the ability of the City of Portland and ODOT to acquire federal funding toward that improvement.</p> <p>The Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration would support the NUNM Master Plan by reconnecting streets and increasing pedestrian and bicycle access across SW Naito Parkway and improving connectivity in the neighborhood.</p> <p>The design of the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration has been adjusted to avoid displacing a NUNM health clinic, which would be displaced by Alternative A2-BH.</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
O14	National University of Natural Medicine	David Schleich	<p>Thank you so much for the opportunity to contribute to the DEIS comment window. I represent as President of National University of Natural Medicine and our stakeholders, which include not only employees, who are faculty and staff and support folks at the university, but also, of course, our students and our patients.</p> <p>The National University of Natural Medicine is accredited by the regional accrediting body of the Department of Education, and also, of course, by the Higher Education Coordinating Commission of the State of Oregon. We worked with PBOT and Metro and ODOT for a dozen or years or so to address safety and access issues caused by the heavy and fast-moving traffic, which with we are all familiar, that completely surrounds our campus footprint, particularly Naito on our west side and Ross Island Bridge to our east.</p> <p>We support the Southwest Corridor Draft Environmental Impact Statement and project, which if approved and funded could finally remediate the increasing congestion of commuter traffic build-up on Kelly and Water, as well as provide traffic-calming effects on Naito, all of which are directly adjacent to our university property which is evolving. These proposed improvements to South Portland have been needed for many years and the proposal offers an opportunity to remedy those long-standing difficulties.</p> <p>However, it's important that we, for the record, indicate that the future of NUNM in South Portland is affected by some of the proposed changes. These property acquisitions, in particular, that might be necessary for the bridge gap really slam into our master plan, and unfortunately create questions about the future viability of the campus in South Portland. Specifically, due to the proposed acquisition of our clinic on Corbett and Water, and the potential acquisition of a part of our larger parking lot adjacent to the academic building. There would be disruption not only to healthcare services, of course, which include 20,000 patient visits now a year, but also impact the medical training of our students.</p> <p>So without our Lair Hill health center, we'd be obliged in the interest of our students and patients to -- in particular, to rethink our master plan. So we entreat planners and decisionmakers to work closely and earnestly with us to leave us whole so that we can continue our mission in Portland and beyond. Thank you very kindly.</p>	Please see the response to Comment O13, above.
O15	OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon	Vivian Satterfield	<p>Founded in 2006 by and for people of color and low income, OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon (OPAL) organizes our communities to achieve a safe and healthy environment where we live, work, learn, play, and pray. Environmental Justice (EJ) operates at the intersection of economic, racial and social justice. Our community-driven, multiracial movement challenges mainstream advocates and decision-makers to address systemic, historic causes of injustices in the built and natural environment: racism, settler colonialism, white supremacy and socioeconomic oppression. These factors leave a legacy of inequality in our neighborhoods and communities: polluted air, soil and water; unsafe, unaffordable housing; inequitable investments in housing, green spaces, active transit and mass transit we can access; disproportionate impacts due to climate change and inequitable climate action investments; and lack of action to prevent displacement in our communities. Decision-making on these policies often excludes historically marginalized peoples' meaningful involvement, perpetuating the inequality we experience.</p> <p>I. THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT IS INADEQUATE.</p> <p>The Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project is inadequate and flawed. To fully comply with the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, we encourage Metro, TriMet and the Federal Transit Administration (collectively "Metro") to amend the EIS as specified in this document.</p> <p>Any increased investment in transit in the Southwest Corridor has great potential to improve access to employment, education, and other opportunities. Community members with whom we have engaged consistently reference the need for transit access in the form of additional bus service and lines beyond the current proposed light rail alignment. Particularly given the demographics of the proposed alignment area - more diverse than the region more broadly - we want to ensure that low-income households and communities of color share in these benefits, through increased affordable housing, economic mobility, and community capacity. The Environmental justice compliance report (Appendix C) has old data and while the current numbers are estimates, several variables can still be compared to Census 2010. The usefulness of comparing 2010 to 2016 is that it will indicate the changes and shifts to the low income population. In addition to looking at number of people, it is also important to look at "average household size" and also poverty level by race, not just look at the percentage of low income as one single group. There are changes in where and how environmental justice populations are residing is already happening and so stated impact could be rather different. Current demographics data is attached to this comment for consideration.</p> <p>Historic precedent from past transit projects (particularly the Yellow Line MAX) and our current affordable housing crisis make clear that, without community-led intervention, we cannot expect equitable outcomes. Stability and predictability for the two largest household costs - housing and transportation - are priorities for the communities directly impacted by this proposal. The Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project will indirectly cause population growth and gentrification—an impact not addressed by the Draft EIS. Over time, the region will look more appealing to property buyers and will result in reduced affordability,<sup>1</sup> resulting in the long-term displacement of low-income individuals and people of color. Metro has an obligation to properly address the lasting impact the project will have on environmental justice communities through additional mitigation measures. Moreover, the currently proposed mitigation measures are lacking and require supplementary detail into their effectiveness.</p> <p>The Draft EIS chose an arbitrary 0.5-mile buffer for its Environmental Justice analysis. Metro should clarify why a 0.5-mile radius was selected. Most importantly, the Draft EIS' failure to recognize and mitigate the project's disproportionate impact on low-income and minority communities may constitute a violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Draft EIS must be amended as noted to comply with NEPA.</p> <p>A. The Alternatives in the Draft EIS are Unreasonably Narrow and Preclude Consideration of Alternatives Which Would Not Displace Vulnerable Populations.</p> <p>The alternatives in the Draft EIS focus solely on light rail transit. Light rail construction will result in gentrification and displacement of low-income individuals in the Southwest Corridor. We know the default outcome of inaction to address impacts of transit investments on non-subsidized, market-provided affordable housing is total displacement. In the case of the SW Corridor, we anticipate that residents in existing naturally-occurring affordable housing will face displacement out of Tigard and SW Portland, potentially out of the metro area entirely. We also know that these units of housing will become less affordable if they remain at all following the project. The potential for physical displacement of low-income households, and prime locations for stations are already increasing expectations of landlords and landowners for greater revenues from their properties, leading to economic displacement.</p>	<p>The Draft EIS is compliant with both NEPA and the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Please see below for responses to the individual concerns raised in your comment.</p> <p>Regarding your comment on the need for additional bus service and lines, TriMet plans to improve service on connecting bus lines with the addition of light rail to the Southwest Corridor. Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 18 regarding desire for more affordable housing, concerns related to gentrification and information regarding the Southwest Equitable Development Strategy.</p> <p>Appendix C, Environmental Justice Compliance, of this Final EIS includes updated analysis that utilizes 2014-2018 American Community Survey 5-year estimates.</p> <p>It is not reasonably foreseeable that light rail construction will result in gentrification and displacement of low-income individuals. In the Southwest Corridor, many efforts are underway to stabilize communities, reduce displacements, and provide affordable housing. These efforts are detailed below in response to specific points raised by this comment.</p> <p>The data source for the charts provided in this comment is unclear, and it is unclear from the data provided whether rents are increasing disproportionately along the Yellow Line or Orange Line compared to the city as a whole, or whether increases along the MAX lines are a result of property speculation.</p> <p>Challenges faced by tenants such as evictions, repairs, rising rents, retaliation and fair housing issues are beyond the scope of the light rail project. However, these concerns are addressed in Master Response 18.</p> <p>While the Purpose and Need for the Project focus on a light rail alternative, they also identify broader project objectives, including housing, equity and environmental improvements.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding your support for studying additional mode alternatives, such as bus improvements or bus rapid transit, besides light rail.</p> <p>FTA considers the Draft EIS to be adequate. Bus rapid transit is not considered a viable alternative due to the rigorous public process undertaken to analyze and ultimately eliminate it from consideration, as documented earlier in this</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>The chart below shows the average square footage of housing and the average rents along both the Yellow light rail line (Interstate MAX, opened May 4, 2004) and Orange (Milwaukie MAX, opened September 12, 2015) light rail line in the City of Portland compared to the Citywide Average during the same years:</p> <p>Property speculation ahead of the light rail opening date and increased investments as a result of the light rail have contributed to the displacement of households unable to afford the increase in rents and the lack of a diversity of housing units in new construction.</p> <p>SW Portland and Washington County tenants experience housing issues similar to those found in Multnomah County. In 2016, Community Alliance of Tenants (CAT) Hotline calls in the SW Corridor area<sup>2</sup> indicated that the greatest needs of tenants in the corridor are support for evictions related issues (no-cause and for-cause), repairs (i.e. environmental health concerns, mold, bedbugs), rising rents, retaliation, and fair housing issues. In 2013-14 CAT and Unite Oregon partnered to organize immigrant and refugee tenants in Washington County to illuminate tenant needs. Tenant organizing addresses immediate needs, building by building, while educating and organizing tenants to exercise their rights for community change. This effort builds the next step towards systemic change, addressing the organizational and information gaps that can leverage people power and the resources of local, regional, state, and federal dollars to build complete and livable communities without displacement.</p> <p>Consequently, we request that Metro feature a wider range of alternatives to light rail that have less community impact, specifically increased bus operations and services.</p> <p>1. Supplemental alternatives are congruent with the project’s Purpose and Need statement.</p> <p>Broadening the alternatives analysis is consistent with the Purpose and Need of the project. An EIS must state the underlying purpose and need for the proposed action.<sup>3</sup> The Purpose and Need statement cannot be so “unreasonably narrow” that only one alternative could accomplish the goals of the project. <sup>4</sup> Although courts have upheld statements which call for a specific purpose, like expanding a light rail system, <i>broader</i> project objectives must be considered. <sup>5</sup></p> <p>Besides “provid[ing] light rail transit service,” the Draft EIS Purpose and Need statement includes providing travel options that promote community equity and advancing projects that are sensitive to the environment.<sup>6</sup> The Purpose and Need statement importantly prioritizes cost-effectiveness, reliability, frequency, and efficient travel times.<sup>7</sup> These objectives may be accomplished without light rail expansion by a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) alternative and increased bus services. This alternative could fulfill the transit gap while preventing cumulative displacement.</p> <p>The Draft EIS states that the Southwest Corridor’s transit demand is projected to increase 81 percent in the next 25 years,<sup>8</sup> and it subsequently eliminates BRT as an alternative for “lack[ing] the long-term capacity to meet the corridor’s projected demand.”<sup>9</sup> The Draft EIS does not describe in detail why this increase cannot be met by the BRT alternative. We request data and information on how Metro concluded that the 81 percent increase in transit-demand could not be met by BRT. Metro also alleges that the BRT alternative would have “higher long-term operating costs than light rail.”<sup>10</sup> We request data demonstrating that the light rail project would cost less than BRT over time. Without any additional explanation in the DEIS on these points, the public has no way to understand how the agencies reached their conclusions.</p> <p>Additionally, we demand consideration of multi-modal forms of transportation which do not focus solely on light rail construction. For example, a variety of transit options can include an increase in regular bus services in addition to BRT. As the Draft EIS stands, the elimination of BRT excludes an entire mode of alternative mass transit for the Southwest Corridor. Effectively, the elimination of BRT prior to the Draft EIS also eliminated public involvement in the decision-making process.</p> <p>Operational services are viable alternatives to the light rail capital project. Proper alternatives to the light rail are not different routes to the same overarching project; rather, they are different modes of transportation which fulfill the proposal’s underlying goals. In short, the Draft EIS’ “Light Rail Alternatives” are not alternatives at all—they are different routes for the same project. Consequently, we request a multi-modal transit alternative that aligns with the project’s Purpose and Need statement.</p> <p>2. The current alternatives are insufficient and must be broadened to consider operational services.</p> <p>The Final EIS must include supplementary alternatives, such as operational services, which achieve the project’s underlying objectives while mitigating environmental impacts. NEPA requires Metro to rigorously explore alternatives to the proposed project.<sup>11</sup> The alternatives analysis is “the heart of the environmental impact statement.”<sup>12</sup> An EIS is inadequate when it fails to examine a viable alternative.<sup>13</sup> In this case, the Draft EIS is inadequate because it fails to consider viable projects that will fulfill the transit need while mitigating environmental impacts.</p> <p>Although the EIS does not need to include alternatives of “speculative feasibility,”<sup>14</sup> the proposed expansion of bus services and BRT is feasible and practical. The expansion of transit services on existing capital is a <i>clear alternative</i> to building new infrastructure and potentially displacing vulnerable communities. The Draft EIS states that a BRT alternative was eliminated from detailed study,<sup>15</sup> but a more detailed analysis is warranted when long-term displacement of communities is a known risk.</p> <p>The Final EIS must include a wider range of alternatives which allow for “informed decision-making and informed public participation.”<sup>16</sup> This broadened range should include a variety of transit services, including BRT. Based on OPAL’s research, bus services may more effectively serve the transit-dependent community, contrary to the Draft EIS’ determination that such a proposal lacks public support.<sup>17</sup> Such an alternative would mitigate the project’s potential of gentrification and long-term displacement of low-income individuals and people of color. In short, broadening the alternatives analysis would conform to the project’s Purpose and Need statement and would also certify Metro’s compliance with NEPA.</p> <p>B. The Draft EIS Fails to Address the Light Rail Project’s Indirect and Cumulative Growth-Inducing Effect.</p> <p>The EIS must consider the “direct, indirect, and cumulative effects” of the proposed action and alternatives.<sup>18</sup> Metro must take a “hard look” at these environmental consequences to fulfill the requirements of NEPA.<sup>19</sup> Metro has failed to address the indirect, cumulative effects of the project as it relates to long-term displacement and population growth.<sup>20</sup> The light rail project would increase the property value of surrounding areas and would result in displacement of more residential homes than are assessed currently. The Final EIS must feature analysis on the indirect and cumulative effects of gentrification and population growth, which would result from rising property values in Southwest Portland and Tigard.</p>	<p>response. Bus rapid transit is not considered to be feasible or practical for meeting the Purpose and Need of the Southwest Corridor.</p> <p>Regarding your request for additional data on why bus rapid transit cannot meet the corridor’s projected demand or why it would have higher long-term operating costs than light rail, Appendix I of the Draft EIS included a reference to the <i>Southwest Corridor High Capacity Transit Mode Comparison</i> (Metro, 2015). This report contains detailed information comparing the ridership and operating considerations of light rail and bus rapid transit.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 for more information on multimodal improvements as part of the Project, including station access improvements.</p> <p>Additionally, the Project would provide bus improvements through the shared transitway, which would allow up to 2 miles of paved light rail transitway in South Portland to be shared with buses traveling between downtown Portland and Hillsdale. This would allow buses to bypass traffic congestion on SW Barbur Boulevard. The shared transitway would include one station for buses located near SW Gibbs Street for access to Marquam Hill and the South Waterfront.</p> <p>Indirect effects are speculative in nature, and while they are documented in this Final EIS, they do not require mitigation as part of the Project. This is consistent with FHWA and FTA guidance and with the EIS analysis done by previous projects in the region.</p> <p>The Final EIS is compliant with Executive Order 12898. Please see Appendix C, Environmental Justice Compliance, of this Final EIS for the environmental justice analysis.</p> <p>Table C-3, <i>Long-Term and Short-Term Impacts of the Preferred Alternative on Minority and Low-Income Populations</i>, in Appendix C of this Final EIS documents the impacts and benefits of the project on minority and low-income populations.</p> <p>Despite a generally consistent (but typically moderate) positive linkage between transit and property values, there is little direct empirical evidence to suggest that transit investments worsen displacement problems for already at-risk populations. Furthermore, while there are disadvantaged populations present throughout the city of Portland, none of the U.S. Census tracts traversed by the proposed Preferred Alternative alignment are among those identified by city staff as either currently undergoing or at-risk for gentrification and displacement. Therefore, in combination with the proposed mitigation measures related to displacement and actions undertaken by project partners since the publication of the Draft EIS, the project is not required to further consider the cumulative effect of the proposed project with regards to displacement and gentrification.</p> <p>The City of Portland’s housing and displacement policies are outside the scope of the Project. Your comments regarding City of Portland policies have also been shared with the City.</p> <p>A 0.5-mile radius buffer was used for the environmental justice analysis based on a review of similar projects in the region and literature on best practices for transit analysis. The utilization of the 0.5-mile buffer aligns with the FTA Circular 4702.1B service availability standard denoting passengers will generally walk up to one-half mile to a light or heavy rail station. Moreover, the FTA Circular 4703.1 indicates it is reasonable when analyzing the impacts of the entire rail line to use a geographic unit of a half-mile on either side of the alignment. Every Census block-group that is inside of or intersects the 0.5-mile buffer was included in the environmental justice analysis. Additionally, the overall functions, facilities and characteristics of the</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>An analysis of these indirect and cumulative effects is essential to prevent displacement of low-income residents in the Southwest Corridor. The impact of past projects indicates that the Draft EIS does not <i>seriously address</i> the indirect and cumulative effects of rising property prices on environmental justice communities, such as low-income people and people of color. For example, the construction of the MAX Yellow Line sped up the process of gentrification by making North Portland a more desirable living area for wealthy, white residents.<sup>21</sup> Maxine Fitzpatrick, the Executive Director of a non-profit organization that attempts to preserve and manage affordable, high-quality housing, claims that “significant displacement of low-income families has occurred in the interstate urban renewal area since the start of Yellow Line service.”<sup>22</sup></p> <p>Indirect effects the proposed action will cause are later in time or farther removed in distance <i>but are still reasonably foreseeable</i>.<sup>23</sup> They include growth-inducing effects.<sup>24</sup> Agencies have a duty to discuss growth and development that would result from a project. A prime example is <i>City of Davis v. Coleman</i>, where the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit held that the Environmental Assessment of a highway interchange project had to discuss growth impacts.<sup>25</sup> Additionally, a cumulative impact is “the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action <i>when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions</i> regardless of what agency . . . or person undertakes such other actions.”<sup>26</sup> Cumulative impacts can result from “individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.”<sup>27</sup></p> <p>Executive Order 12898, also known as the Environmental Justice compliance, requires further analysis of these indirect, cumulative effects. Executive Order 12898 provides that “each [f]ederal agency shall ensure that all programs or activities receiving [f]ederal financial assistance that affect human health or the environment do not directly, or through contractual or other arrangements, use criteria, methods, or practices that discriminate on the basis of race, color, or national origin.”<sup>28</sup> Therefore, the Federal Transit Administration (“FTA”) may not intentionally discriminate on the basis of race, color, or national origin.</p> <p>The FTA’s environmental justice policy guidance states that a “disproportionately high adverse effect” is one that is (1) predominately borne by a minority or low-income population; or (2) will be suffered by the minority and/or low-income population and is appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude than the adverse effect that will be suffered by the non-minority population and/or non-low-income population. A project that has a disproportionate effect may only be carried out “if further mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce the disproportionately high and adverse effects <i>are not practicable</i>.”<sup>29</sup> In determining whether an alternative is “practicable,” the social, economic, and environmental effects are considered.<sup>30</sup></p> <p>The Draft EIS states simply that displacement of residents may occur from reduced affordability: “[r]educed affordability of market-rate housing results from increases in property value and demand to live near light rail service.”<sup>31</sup> The Draft EIS recognizes this impact (albeit briefly), and consequently, FTA is on notice that the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project will displace vulnerable residents over time. The Southwest Corridor Equitable Housing Strategy names that the actual need for affordable homes in the City of Portland impacted by the SW Corridor Light Rail is 2,660 homes (910 newly constructed and 1,650 acquired or converted). The need in Tigard is 1,580 homes (730 newly constructed, 850 acquired or converted). Median household income (\$73,000) and educational attainment (56 percent with a Bachelor’s degree) in the corridor is higher than that of the city of Portland. However, for some low-income households, housing costs are eating away at incomes. There are over 8,300 renters and 4,400 low-income homeowners who make less than 80% of the median family income (MFI). Over 70 percent of these households are paying more than 30 percent of their income on housing. Whites and Asians have approximately double the income of Black and Hispanic or Latino households.<sup>32</sup></p> <p>The Draft EIS also claims that the project makes the area an “appealing location[ ] for legally binding affordability-restricted housing.”<sup>33</sup> It fails to further point out that the need for restricted-housing is a significant consequence of light rail itself. Current local jurisdictional policies alone cannot adequately address direct displacement as a result of the light rail construction. The City of Portland has no specific programming or targeted outreach to low-income renters, and while land-banking is identified as one approach to preventing displacement, policy on land banking with transit projects is still to be determined. To address indirect displacement, the only policy the City of Portland currently has is a deterrent; the City’s Mandatory Renter Relocation Assistance Policy places requirements on no-cause evictions (there are several exemptions, however which may be invoked by landlords such as a situation in which a unit is rendered uninhabitable).</p> <p>The Draft EIS also states that “increased levels of activity” and population growth will occur “whether the light rail project is built or not.”<sup>34</sup> Generally, as new residents and businesses move in, market forces push property prices higher. It is inevitable that low-income individuals will be forced out of their communities to seek cheaper homes to rent or buy.<sup>35</sup> Though the region’s population is predicted to increase, it does not follow that the light rail project will not <i>contribute to or exacerbate</i> the pace of displacement. Metro must consider the cumulative effect of the proposed project with the impacts of past, present and reasonably-foreseeable actions. Thus, the Final EIS must articulate the cumulative effects of displacement and gentrification and must articulate what role the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project would play in those impacts.</p> <p>In this case, population growth and gentrification are indirect and cumulative consequences of the light rail project. Given the impact of past projects like the MAX Yellow Line, population growth is a reasonably foreseeable effect of the light rail project. The light rail would heighten the appeal of Southwest Portland, Tigard, and Tualatin to high-income individuals, thus creating an indirect but <i>foreseeable</i> environmental impact. Furthermore, although population growth will be minor on an individual scale, the collective undertaking is a significant environmental impact and is inherently growth-inducing. This constitutes a cumulative impact. Thus, the Draft EIS is currently inadequate because of these deficiencies. To comply with NEPA and Environmental Justice, the Final EIS must address the project’s indirect and cumulative growth-inducing effects on low-income and minority communities.</p> <p>C. The Mitigation Measures Are Inadequate Because They Fail to Address Growth-Inducing Effects and Do Not Outline the Proposed Measures’ Effectiveness.</p> <p>The Draft EIS’ mitigation measures fall short. NEPA requires that proposed mitigation measures provide more substantial detail and evaluate effectiveness. Additionally, new mitigation measures are required for the growth-inducing and gentrifying consequences of the project.</p> <p>1. No mitigation measures were proposed for the long-term impact of population growth and gentrification.</p> <p>Because the Draft EIS has failed to analyze core impacts of the light rail project, the mitigation measures are inadequate. The Draft EIS does not address mechanisms to prevent the growth-inducing consequences of the light rail project. An EIS must include mitigation measures for “any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided.”<sup>36</sup></p>	<p>neighborhoods along the Project were considered, even though many have boundaries that extend beyond the 0.5-mile buffer. Appendix C of this Final EIS provides additional documentation on the study area and data sources used in the environmental justice analysis.</p>

Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>Generally, “[a] mitigation discussion without at least some evaluation of effectiveness is useless in making that determination.”<sup>37</sup> Mitigation measures must be discussed in “sufficient detail to ensure that environmental consequences have been fully evaluated.”<sup>38</sup></p> <p>The Final EIS must attempt to mitigate the displacement of communities in Southwest Portland, Tigard, and Tualatin as a result of the light rail project. This analysis should specifically address the impact of population growth and gentrification on low-income individuals and people of color in the region. In addition, the Final EIS must address whether these mitigation measures will truly be effective in preventing long-term displacement of these vulnerable populations.</p> <p>2. The proposed mitigation measures are insufficiently detailed and do not adequately consider effectiveness.</p> <p>The currently proposed measures are inadequate because they are not sufficiently detailed and do not sufficiently consider effectiveness. “NEPA requires . . . that mitigation be discussed in sufficient detail to ensure that environmental consequences have been fully evaluated.”<sup>39</sup> Although NEPA’s mitigation requirements are not substantive, they are an integral part of the environmental review process.<sup>40</sup> Courts regularly require a discussion on mitigation effectiveness because it is “[a]n essential component of a reasonably complete mitigation discussion.”<sup>41</sup> Agencies cannot simply list possible mitigation measures—they must address them in some detail.<sup>42</sup></p> <p>In this case, Metro do not provide “sufficient detail” on their proposed mitigation measures. Instead, the Draft EIS lists potential measures without detail or evaluation of effectiveness. For example, under potential mitigation measures to impacts on neighborhoods and community facilities, the Draft EIS states:</p> <p>TriMet, Metro, the City of Portland and the City of Tigard are coordinating to identify strategies to prevent the indirect economic displacement of residents living near the light rail alignment. These strategies could include banking land for future development of affordable housing, purchasing existing, naturally occurring affordable housing to preserve its affordability; and providing financial assistance to low-income residents.<sup>43</sup></p> <p>Metro does not weigh the effectiveness of these considerations, nor does it explain what the mitigation measures of “banking land,” “purchasing existing . . . housing” or “providing financial assistance” would actually encompass.</p> <p>The Final EIS must offer mitigation measures to the growth-inducing and gentrifying impacts of the light rail project and evaluate their chances of success. Additionally, Metro is legally obligated to expand on the current mitigation measures. The Final EIS must be sufficiently detailed and authentically assist the agency in decision-making. This can be achieved by further detailing each mitigation measure and genuinely considering their effectiveness.</p> <p>D. The Final EIS Must Clarify Why a 0.5-Mile Radius Was Chosen for the Environmental Justice Analysis.</p> <p>The Final EIS should explain its selection of a 0.5-mile radius for its Environmental Justice analysis. An EIS must “succinctly describe the environment of the area(s) to be affected.”<sup>44</sup> The choice of scale “must represent a reasoned decision and <i>cannot be arbitrary</i>.”<sup>45</sup> Although deference is granted to agencies to identify the relevant geographic area for analysis, courts have found standardized buffers to be arbitrary and capricious.<sup>46</sup> For example, agencies may not “gerrymander” to exclude surrounding minority and low-income people by using a default radius.<sup>47</sup> The 0.5-mile radius must still be reasonable.<sup>48</sup></p> <p>Currently, the Draft EIS selects a 0.5-mile radius for the Environmental Justice analysis but does not provide reasoning for its selection. This is concerning when low-income and minority communities are prevalent outside the radius.<sup>49</sup> We request an explanation of the selected distance, and why Metro believes there will not be environmental impacts, especially displacement of environmental justice communities, outside this 0.5-mile boundary. More specifically, why was a 0.5-mile buffer selected when the number arbitrarily cuts through a dense portion of low-income and minority residents?<sup>50</sup> A reasonable explanation for this numerical threshold must be provided to demonstrate that the buffer is not arbitrary. As it stands, the 0.5-mile buffer is unreasonable.</p> <p>E. Metro’s Failure to Address the Light Rail’s Displacement of Minority Communities May Violate Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.</p> <p>The Draft EIS’ obliviousness to displacement and gentrification of low-income and minority communities likely violates Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and subsequent Environmental Justice guidance. The Final EIS must properly address these impacts and provide mitigation measures; otherwise, Metro may be liable for discrimination under Title VI.</p> <p>Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance.<sup>51</sup> Although Title VI does not explicitly include a disparate impact provision,<sup>52</sup> several agencies have regulations that prohibit practices that have the <i>effect</i> of discrimination based on race, color, or national origin.<sup>53</sup> The FTA is one such agency and is a contributor to the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project. Consequently, Title VI requires that a facially neutral program, which has a discriminatory impact on minority populations, only be carried out if (1) the recipient can demonstrate a substantial legitimate justification for the program policy or activity; (2) there are not comparably effective alternative practices that would result in less disparate impacts; and (3) the justification for the program, policy or activity is not a pretext for discrimination.<sup>54</sup></p> <p>In addition, the FTA’s Environmental Justice compliance pursuant to Presidential Executive Order 12898 requires the avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority and low-income populations. The Department of Transportation is responsible for Title VI and Environmental Justice compliance and <i>must ensure</i> that the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project does not subsidize discriminatory practices.<sup>56</sup></p> <p>Although the Draft EIS recognizes that Title VI and Presidential Executive Order 12898 are binding, Metro has failed to address the disproportionate impact the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project will have on low-income and minority communities. In its current state, the Draft EIS ignores long-term, cumulative impacts on minority and low-income populations resulting from population growth and displacement.</p> <p>The Draft EIS admits that the project will indirectly cause property prices to increase through redevelopment around stations, which in turn would impact low-income populations.<sup>57</sup> As a result, Metro is on notice that light rail construction, without legitimate mitigation, will discriminate against low-income individuals in the Southwest Corridor. Moreover, the FTA is held to a higher standard—requiring mitigation of disparate impact. The Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project may not proceed without measures to mitigate this disproportionate and discriminatory impact.<sup>58</sup></p>	

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>Both Title VI and Presidential Executive Order 12898 mandate that the FTA mitigate these disproportionate effects. Otherwise, the agency must demonstrate that mitigation is impracticable and that there are <i>no comparable alternatives</i> which would result in fewer disparate impacts. In this case, the BRT plan proposed herein is a comparable alternative. To comply with Title VI, the Final EIS must seriously address the project's gentrifying and growth-inducing impacts on low-income people and people of color; it must also mitigate the project's consequences and consider legitimate alternatives.</p> <p>II. CONCLUSION</p> <p>Overall, the Draft EIS is inadequate and must be amended as specified. The Final EIS should expand its alternatives analysis to consider less-intensive operational services. It must amend its proposed mitigation measures to be more detailed and delineate their effectiveness. The Final EIS also address the growth-inducing and gentrifying effect of the light rail project and subsequently suggest mitigation measures. Lastly, the Final EIS should expound upon its 0.5-mile radius selection. These modifications will alleviate the disproportionate and discriminatory impact the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project would have on low-income people and people of color.</p>	
O16	Oregon and Southern Idaho District Council of Laborers	Chris Carpenter	<p>Good evening, Members of the Committee. I'll keep it pretty brief. My name is Chris Carpenter. I'm the Political Director for the Oregon and Southern Idaho District Council of Laborers. We focus primarily on construction, but we have a lot of public employees that are a third of our membership -- public employees for the City of Portland and the metro. We have about 3500 members within Oregon and Southern Idaho. Most of them are based in Oregon.</p> <p>I just want to start off, we strongly support the proposal. I will focus more, though -- there's obviously a couple pieces that impact our members, but I want to focus a little bit more on how it directly impacts our members' lives. Within Washington County and Multnomah County, we have just shy of 2,000 of our 3,500, so they're primarily based here. There's kind of two ways that this impacts them. One is that our public employees obviously -- transportation to and from the city, the county or the metro facility is pretty important so they might actually use the light rail system. On the other end of it, though, our construction members with the growth in the Portland metro area -- it's not looking like it's going to slow down anytime soon -- do have to get to and from job sites. I'm not sure how familiar most of you are with the construction industry, but they are long hours and they are often unpredictable hours.</p> <p>So when you spend 10 to 12, potentially 14 hours a day getting the job done on time, and then you have to potentially sit in traffic for three or four hours just to get home, that makes for kind of a long commute. We're really focused on making sure that not only can they be at the job on time wherever it is, but also so they can get home and see their families as quickly as possible. We do think the light rail, adding it into the southwest corridor, is going to help relieve a lot of that congestion that they face, as well as adding on alternative methods for those members who might be able to use it. Again, less so on the construction site, but very true on the train. Outside of that, we do believe it is a big opportunity for the area, and if we are able to move forward pretty quickly, we are also excited to build it for you. Appreciate all you're doing. Thank you.</p>	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
O17	Oregon Health & Science University, Portland State University and Portland Community College	Connie Seeley, Dan Zalkow, Sylvia Kelley	<p>This letter expresses the consensus thoughts of Oregon Health &amp; Science University (OHSU), Portland Community College (PCC) and Portland State University (PSU) on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the SW Corridor Light Rail project. While each of our institutions have unique perspectives and needs that we may share independently from this letter, we think it is important to note our collective support.</p> <p>As a starting point, we want to make it clear that this is an extremely important project for our institutions and those we serve. Collectively, we represent 105,000 students, 23,000 employees and 250,000 patients. These community members have many different backgrounds, different socioeconomic status, and differing abilities - all of whom have a common desire to better their lives and the lives of others through education and health care. Regardless of whether they live directly along the future SW Corridor Light Rail alignment or not, this transportation investment will provide a critical transportation link for many. This is true of transit users as well as those who would benefit from associated bicycling and pedestrian facilities along the route.</p> <p>As you know, OHSU, PCC and PSU strongly encourage transit usage and have robust travel demand management programs (reduced-rate transit passes for employees and students, and various programs promoting bicycle transportation). These programs help keep thousands of vehicles off the road each day and decrease the use of fossil fuels. But there are limits to what we can do on our own -we need safe and convenient infrastructure in place to successfully encourage people to get out of their cars. The SW Corridor Light Rail line would provide significantly improved access to our academic facilities, hospitals and clinics.</p> <p>There are three specific issues we are tracking which are extremely important to us. First, although the PSU campus would be directly served by the SW Corridor project, the light rail station locations identified in the DEIS are near but not directly connected to OHSU or PCC. It is important to note that robust connections to OHSU and PCC are critical to making the project a success. Second, we support the SW Barbur alignment (versus the Naito alignment) as the most convenient route for most of our users. Lastly, we strongly support a project design that achieves significant bicycling and pedestrian improvements throughout the corridor.</p> <p>Thank you for providing this opportunity to share our feedback on this important project.</p>	<p>See Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project specifically and public transportation in general.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 9 regarding the Marquam Hill Connection.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS, particularly Section 2.2.4, Preferred Alternative: Segment B, for a description of the connections to PCC-Sylvania.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle improvements included in the Project.</p>
O18	Oregon Walks	Roger Averbeck	<p>Oregon Walks is the state's pedestrian advocacy organization. We work to make walking a safe, convenient, and accessible transportation option in every community, for all Oregonians. We appreciate having representation on the SW Corridor (SWC) Citizen's Advisory Committee and the opportunity to comment on the SW Corridor DEIS.</p> <p>In Segment A (Inner Portland), Oregon Walks recommends Alignment A2-BH (Naito with Bridgehead Reconfiguration).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Naito alignment is preferred because Naito Parkway and the western interchange of the Ross Island Bridge are long overdue for safety and accessibility improvements for all modes. This alignment better serves the National University of Natural Medicine (NUNM) and Portland's South Waterfront. Much of the future growth of the Oregon Health Science University (OHSU) research and training facilities will be in the South Waterfront. OHSU's faculty, staff and students are more likely to use LRT than medical patients and their families accessing the OHSU and Veterans Administration facilities on Marquam Hill.</li> <li>Oregon Walks supports either of the proposed Marquam Hill Connections: Connection 1B (Elevator/Bridge and Recessed Path); or Connection 1C (Elevator/Bridge and Tunnel), whichever option provides the best and safest access for OHSU patients and staff.</li> </ul>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for the SW Naito Parkway alignment with the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p> <p>To learn more about changes to streetscape and access as a part of the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration project, please see Section 2.2.7, Related Transportation Improvements, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Regarding your comment about the need for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration project to be a regional priority and be competitive for funding, in July 2020, the Metro Council referred the Get Moving 2020 plan (transportation funding measure) to voters. The Ross Island Bridgehead</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If Alignment A1 (Barbur) is selected, it should include the Ross Island Bridgehead Option (A1 - BH). The Locally Preferred Alternative must include a recommendation that the Ross Island Bridgehead project becomes a regional priority, to initiate additional planning and design work in the South Portland Focus Area, to be competitive for funding and successful in meeting city, county, regional and state goals.</li> <li>• Alignment A1 - BH must include crossing safety improvements on Naito Parkway at Gibbs Street to improve access to the pedestrian bridge over I - 5, as well as crossing improvements on Naito at SW Hooker St to access NUNM.</li> <li>• Segment A must include complete active transportation facilities through the "Woods" section of Barbur, even if Design Refinement 1 (Barbur Woods EastSide Running) advances. Since the Newberry and Vermont Viaducts will need eventual replacement, consider adding a north bound vehicle travel lane as well as a multi-use path to the new LRT bridges, creating space for active transportation on the existing viaducts.</li> </ul> <p>In Segment B (Outer Portland), Oregon Walks recommends Alignment B1 (Barbur). This alignment best supports the City of Portland's land use vision embraced by the Barbur Concept Plan and Comprehensive Plan designation as a Civic Corridor; offers the opportunity to transform Barbur Blvd into a complete street that serves all modes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If Alignment B2 (1-5 Barbur TC to 60th) is selected, active transportation safety improvements to the West Portland Crossroads must be included to improve access to the Barbur Transit Center and surrounding businesses.</li> <li>• If Design Refinement 2 (Taylor's Ferry) advances, the new crossing over I-5 must include a multi-use path for bicycles and pedestrians. This option must include active transportation improvements on Taylor's Ferry Road west to SW 48th Ave and be proven to mitigate traffic congestion in the Crossroads.</li> <li>• In both Segments A and B, we support jurisdictional transfer of Barbur Blvd from ODOT to PBOT.</li> </ul> <p>In Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), Oregon Walks recommends Alignment C2 (Ash to Railroad); including Design Refinements: 4 (Barbur Undercrossing); 5 (Elmhurst); and 6 (Tigard Transit Center Station East of Hall).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The City of Tigard should reassess the station access project list for a new proposed station at SW 68th Ave, to provide active transportation improvements at SW 68th, along Hwy 99W and north into the community.</li> <li>• The new overpass of Hwy 217 in Design Refinement 5 (Elmhurst) should include a multi-use path to connect the Tigard Triangle with downtown Tigard.</li> <li>• Oregon Walks supports station access improvements to Hall Blvd; and recommends that pedestrian access from the Hall Station to the WES Station and downtown Tigard be brought up to modern standards.</li> <li>• We support the Railroad alignment south to Bridgeport Village; it better serves the underserved residential communities to the west of the Bonita Station.</li> <li>• Throughout the SW Corridor, we support median or center platform LRT station locations that are fully visible and accessible, not hidden behind park and ride garages or isolated from nearby businesses and public view.</li> <li>• Oregon Walks recommends that all active transportation improvements in the SW Corridor be designed &amp; built using best practices and modern guidelines.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you very much for considering these comments on the SW Corridor DEIS.</p>	<p>Reconfiguration is identified for funding in the Get Moving 2020 plan. Please note that evaluating the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration is an important step in the ability of the City of Portland and ODOT to acquire federal funding toward that improvement.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 9 regarding the Marquam Hill Connection.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS, and opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near Barbur Transit Center, which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle mobility and station access improvements.</p> <p>Regarding jurisdictional transfer of SW Barbur Boulevard, the City of Portland and ODOT have signed an intergovernmental agreement to transfer ownership and maintenance responsibilities of a portion of SW Barbur Boulevard from ODOT to the City of Portland. This agreement is conditional on the Project's reconstructing the roadway as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>In your comment, you also expressed support for the Ash to Railroad alignment, including the Barbur Undercrossing, Elmhurst and Tigard Transit Center East of Hall, which were studied as Refinement 4, Refinement 5 and Refinement 6, respectively, in the Draft EIS, and which span both Segment B and Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin). The Ash to Railroad alignment was studied as Alternative C2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p> <p>Regarding your support for median or center platforms, the Preferred Alternative includes center platforms or roadway-adjacent platforms at a majority of stations in the corridor, with the exception of the 53rd Station, which is adjacent to I-5.</p>
O19	Oregon Walks	Roger Averbeck	<p>I am Roger Averbeck. I trust it's a coincidence that I am the 13th speaker tonight. I am representing Oregon Walks -- Thank you. So I am representing Oregon Walks, the statewide pedestrian organization. We do appreciate the opportunity to comment tonight as well as the representation on the CAC. Due to the time limits tonight, I am forced to use acronyms, and for that I apologize. We do want to provide you with written comments as well my verbal testimony. And we will just go through these very quickly by segment.</p> <p>In segment A, which is inner Portland, we recommend alignment A2/BH, which is Naito with the bridge head configuration. We'd prefer that, because the Naito Parkway and the western interchange Ross Island Bridge is long overdue for safety and accessibility improvements. We believe that this alignment better serves the NUNM and Portland south waterfront. We expect that much of the future growth of OHSU research training facilities will be in south waterfront. And their faculty, staff, and students are more likely to use light rail than actually the medical patients and families trying to access the facilities at OHSU and the VA on Marquam Hill. Oregon Walks will support either of the proposed Marquam Hill connections, connection 1B and 1C, which need further study to sort out how those are going to work. If alignment A1 is selected, which is on Barbur, it definitely should include the Ross Island bridge head option, A1/BH. The locally preferred alternative must include a recommendation that the Ross Island bridge head project becomes a regional priority to initiate the additional planning and design work in the South Portland focus area to be competitive for funding and successful in meeting the city, county, regional, and state goals. A1/BH must also include crossing safety improvements in that bridge head area.</p> <p>Also in segment A, it must include complete active transportation facilities throughout the wooded section of Barbur, even if design refinement 1, which is the Barbur eastside running advances. Since the Newbury and Vermont viaducts will need eventual replacement, we've asked ODOT to provide what their useful life is. You should consider adding the northbound vehicle lane as well as a multi-use path to the light rail bridge on the east side, which would create space for active transportation on the existing viaducts.</p> <p>In segment B, Portland Oregon Walks recommends alignment B1 on Barbur. This alignment best supports the City's land use vision embraced by the Barbur concept plan and the City's comp plan designation as specific corridor offers the opportunity to transfer Barbur Boulevard into a complete street. If alignment B2, I-5, Barbur TC to 60th is selected, then we need active transportation safety improvements in the crossroads area. And if designing refinement Taylors Ferry advances, the new crossing over I-5 must include a multi-use path for bikes and pedestrians.</p> <p>The rest of my testimony is in the letter, and I appreciate you considering that. Thank you very much.</p>	<p>Please see the response to comment O18, above.</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
O20	Oregon Walks	Roger Averbeck	<p>Hi, I'm Roger Averbeck representing Oregon Walks, a statewide pedestrian advocacy organization. I was here last week and only got halfway through my testimony due to time limits so hopefully I'll finish tonight. And I appreciate the second opportunity to cover page two of my testimony, which has already been submitted in writing, yes.</p> <p>And to quickly overlap, I was in segment B, outer Portland, and Oregon Walks represents alignment B1, which is in Barbur. We understand the difference from the IRP route proposal, which is B2, but the emphasis should be on if that's solely to actually make the necessary improvements in west Barbur crossroads that will provide safe access for all modes to the Barbur transit center and surrounding businesses. If design refinement two on Taylors Ferry advances, we do recommend there be a new crossing over I5 that includes a multi-use path for bikes and peds. And we also recommend this option include active transportation improvements on Taylors Ferry Road west all the way to Southwest 48th.</p> <p>And, also, BR2 must be proven to mitigate traffic congestion in the crossroads. You cannot avoid those issues and be successful. Finally, in segments A and B, Oregon Walks supports jurisdictional transfer Barbur Boulevard from ODOT to PBOT.</p> <p>Moving on into segment C, which is in Tigard and Tualatin, Oregon Walks recommends the following alignments, C2, which is Ash to Railroad. And we also support and recommend further study of design refinements, number four, which is a Barbur under crossing, number five, Elmhurst, and number six, Tigard Transit Center station which is east of Hall Boulevard. For the City of Tigard, they should reassess the station access project list for a new station at Southwest 68th. That was a project that was developed several years ago and no station at 68th was considered at that time so we do need additional active transportation improvements that will serve the community around that station location. If there's a new overpass in designing refinement five, Elmhurst, it will include a mutli-use -- it should include a multi-use path to connect the triangle with downtown. Oregon Walks supports the station access around Hall Boulevard and recommends that you bring -- any access for pedestrians from the Hall station to the WES station in downtown Tigard should be up to modern standards. We support the Railroad alignment to Bridgeport Village and that better serves the community to the west of Bonita station.</p> <p>Throughout the corridor we support needing a centered platform. Light rail needs station locations fully visible and accessible and not hidden behind park and ride garages or isolated from nearby businesses.</p> <p>And finally, we recommend that all active transportation improvements in the corridor be designed and built using best practices, modern guidelines. Thank you for your time.</p>	Please see the response to comment O18, above.
O21	Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee	Rithy Khut, Elliot Akwai-Scott	<p>As members of Portland's Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC), we advise the City on matters related to bicycling. We are writing today to provide an endorsement of specific SW Corridor Light Rail Project alignment options reviewed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), and bicycle facilities planned for the SW Corridor in the context of SW Portland.</p> <p>The BAC supports SW Corridor alignment options A2-LA (Naito with Limited Access) or A2-BH (Naito with Bridgehead Reconfiguration) of Segment A (Inner Portland), and alignment option B1 (Barbur) of Segment B (Outer Portland), and recommends they be adopted as the Locally Preferred Alternative for the City of Portland.</p> <p>After reviewing the SW Corridor DEIS in detail, we also write to impress the importance of establishing the safest, most convenient, and contiguous bicycle facility along the corridor, in accordance with the City's adopted transportation plans for SW Portland. Transit and bicycles are complementary modes of transportation, both of which support city and regional transportation, climate, and development goals to create a more livable, safe, sustainable, and efficient Portland Metro region. It is essential that a world-class bicycling facility is established along the entire SW Corridor as a part of this project, or an opportunity to establish critical, long-overdue improvements to bicycling in SW Portland may be lost for decades.</p> <p>In SW Corridor Segment A, alignment options A2-LA and A2-BH bring improvements to address absent bicycle and pedestrian facilities on Naito, and address the maze of ramps connecting the Ross Island Bridge to Naito Pkwy and Barbur Blvd that currently divide the neighborhood while streamlining traffic flows for transit, freight, and other vehicular modes. Disconnecting these improvements from the SW Corridor project will prevent people using light rail from having safe and simple access to the major employment and residential centers in the South Waterfront. Either of the A2 alignment options will improve the ODOT-managed section of Naito Pkwy to a level that will be rideable by bicyclists of all abilities, and link with sections of Naito slated to be improved by planned PBOT projects, especially if Better Naito becomes a permanent fixture of downtown next to Waterfront Park.</p> <p>In SW Corridor Segment B, alignment option B1 will create a more livable Barbur Blvd as center-running light rail calms traffic on the corridor. This alignment would provide bicycle and pedestrian improvements that create safe options for active transportation on the corridor and adjoining streets. As both a local and regional commercial corridor, it is essential that Barbur Blvd have complete and protected facilities for people bicycling and walking. There are few network alternatives to Barbur Blvd in SW Portland due to the disconnected nature of the road system, and most alternatives are unimproved, unsafe or inefficient routes for bicycling and walking. Barbur Blvd represents the only viable route for attracting "interested but concerned" bicyclists to the corridor.</p> <p>The bicycle facility along Barbur Blvd and the SW Corridor overall needs to be designed and built with capacity to handle volumes of bicycle traffic that reflect Portland's transportation mode share goal of 25% of trips made by bicycle. The bicycle facilities on the corridor should reflect this vision, rather than being designed to serve current volumes present on the corridor which features some of the least connected, inconvenient, and neglected bicycle infrastructure in the city. People bicycling along the SW Corridor must be protected from cars and able to connect easily with other bicycling routes in SW Portland. Placing bicyclists in a single lane protected by plastic wands next to multiple lanes of high speed car traffic will not be successful. The gentle elevation change both in and out of downtown means there will be significant variability in bicycle speeds between users, necessitating a passing lane in both directions. Connectivity is critical in SW Portland, where grid simply does not exist as it does in other parts of the city. Alignment B1 will provide as much useful bike infrastructure on Barbur as possible to grow the number of intersecting roads that are part of the bike network.</p> <p>In addition to the specific alignment alternatives, the BAC is concerned about several dimensions of the SW Corridor project shown in the DEIS that are critical to its success as a comprehensive, safe and resilient multimodal transportation facility. Elements of concern include bicycle parking, improvements to the surrounding bicycle network, and the overall cross section of the corridor.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for the SW Naito Parkway alignment in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternatives A2-BH and A2-LA in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p> <p>To learn more about changes to streetscape and access as a part of the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration project, please see Section 2.2.7, Related Transportation Improvements, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle improvements included in the Project.</p> <p>Bicycle parking and amenities would be provided at station areas to meet the requirements of each jurisdiction. TriMet is working to understand the unique access needs at each station as well as the projected use in order to provide an appropriate amount of bicycle parking. Where feasible, TriMet is also looking for opportunities to incorporate bicycle share programs at stations. To learn more about current concepts at station areas, as well as the design of bicycle facilities in the corridor, please see TriMet's Conceptual Design Report for the Project (find the Conceptual Design Report at: <a href="https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm">https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm</a>).</p> <p>Within Portland, the project design follows the city's modal hierarchy, which places bicycles, pedestrians and transit ahead of personal vehicles. However, the Project is also required to consider mitigation when it adversely affects traffic operations beyond certain thresholds. Within the constraints of the traffic impact requirements, the Project would improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities and crossings along the corridor in order to improve safety and access to the Project.</p> <p>See Master Response 8 regarding the decision to retain four through travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard south of SW Naito Parkway.</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>Bicycle parking at light rail stations should be plentiful, free, and secure, to encourage combining transit with active transportation. Car parking spaces at Park and Ride stations are tallied in tables in the DEIS Summary, but bicycle parking spaces are not noted. Planning and design for station areas must allocate space and investment in a way that reflects planning goals, rather than reproducing current auto-dependent travel patterns. In a City that strives to create a transportation system that supports 25% of trips taken by bicycle, and 30% by single-occupancy vehicle, the capacity of supporting infrastructure for transit should reflect ratio.</p> <p>For Segments A and B, all renderings in the DEIS provided show a cross section that maintains full access to auto lanes while adding space for light rail, buses, pedestrians, and bicycles. This design is not reflective of Portland’s Climate Action Plan and Transportation System Plan mode share goals. A decision to maintain the status quo of capacity for single occupancy vehicles adds substantial cost to the project, and counteracts safety improvements on stretches of road where the 85th percentile speed reaches 55 MPH. Transportation is now the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States. Any action to “achieve a 40 percent reduction in carbon emissions by 2030 and 80 percent reduction by 2050 (compared to 1990 levels)” needs to address this head on. Designing roadways that make it easier to drive at the cost of other modes of transportation will prevent achieving these goals regardless of progress made elsewhere. Reducing use of single occupancy vehicles creates positive feedback effects by diminishing emissions, decreasing crashes, and increasing the share of people using other modes of transportation. Maintaining all of the current auto lanes is not in line with Vision Zero goals, as there is a direct link between vehicle miles traveled and incidence or crashes involving autos. Currently one of the City’s High Crash Corridors, the SW Corridor project is an opportunity to transform Barbur Blvd from an urban highway to a neighborhood and regional main street that promotes human access and liveability.</p> <p>Finally, the Vermont &amp; Newbury bridges must be addressed by the SW Corridor project. ODOT has stated that though these bridges are historically significant, they lack the seismic resilience to survive a major earthquake. They also provide little to no refuge for people bicycling and walking. In fact, improvements to these critical choke points in the SW Portland transportation network does not need to wait for the SW Corridor project to start before making safety enhancements to these bridges. In Explored Option #5 for the Vermont &amp; Newbury bridges in the 2015 Barbur Road Safety Audit, ODOT stated that on southbound Barbur Blvd one auto lane could be dropped, creating space for bicycle lanes on both sides of the bridges as there is a “consistent split of traffic volumes between Southbound Barbur Boulevard and Southbound SW Capitol Highway.” Taking this step would also improve pedestrian safety by increasing separation between cars and pedestrians. Neither the Vermont nor Newbury Bridge has bicycle or pedestrian facilities that come close to meeting current standards. Any SW Corridor alignment option that does not directly include the Vermont &amp; Newbury bridges in the project alignment must include corresponding, protected bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure on these bridges if they are not already constructed by a separate, earlier improvement project. Bicycle and pedestrian improvements to the bridges have long been hand-waved and deferred to the SW Corridor project, and now the revelation that a SW Corridor alignment might omit them is of grave concern. Bicycle and pedestrian improvements should be made now across the Vermont &amp; Newbury bridges.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>In your comment, you express concerns regarding compatibility of the Project with the City of Portland’s Climate Action Plan, Transportation System Plan and Vision Zero. The Final EIS documents the Project’s effects on air quality and greenhouse gas emissions in Section 4.12, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, and on transportation in Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report. The City of Portland is a project partner, and City of Portland’s representative on Metro’s Southwest Corridor Steering Committee supported the recommended Preferred Alternative. Your comments regarding these City of Portland plans and policies have been shared with the city.</p> <p>Your comment on the Vermont and Newbury viaducts has been shared with ODOT, which owns and maintains the structures. FTA, TriMet and Metro do not have jurisdiction over these structures and do not have the authority to make immediate alterations.</p>
O22	Portland Business Alliance	Dave Robertson	<p>The Portland Business Alliance (Alliance) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project. As Greater Portland’s chamber of commerce, the Alliance represents more than 1,900 small, medium and large businesses throughout the Portland metro region. We have long been a strong supporter of an efficient multimodal transportation system to effectively move both goods and people. With congestion a growing issue in Portland and in our neighboring cities, the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project presents a unique opportunity to promote mass transit as a viable transportation alternative for our emergent southwest region and to complement the robust economic development already occurring there.</p> <p>The Alliance believes that light rail transit (LRT) poses the greatest opportunity to meet projected ridership demand in the corridor due to greater capacity and more efficient and reliable travel times. We appreciate that TriMet and Metro have partnered with the impacted cities and with the Oregon Department of Transportation to evaluate the best route options through the DEIS. We understand that the initial route proposal, also known as the preferred alternative, is a 12-mile route with 13 stations from downtown Portland to Bridgeport Village via Barbur Boulevard and through downtown Tigard along the existing railroad (respectively known as the A1, B2 and C2 alignment).</p> <p>In coordination with our member businesses in the region, and consistent with project staff recommendations, the Alliance strongly supports the initial route proposal as outlined in the DEIS.</p> <p>While we are supportive of the proposal, we must note that implementation of LRT should in no way result in a loss of existing vehicle capacity on Southwest Barbur Boulevard (Oregon Highway 99W). Barbur is a significant state road that provides crucial access to southwest and downtown Portland for daily commuters and freight vehicles. Cars will remain the preferred mode of transportation for residents in the region and they must be accommodated.</p> <p>Other alternative routes along I-5, studied as part of this evaluation, would require the demolition of several existing buildings and would run counter to economic development goals in southwest Portland and the city of Tigard. For this reason we would like to strongly advocate for the adoption of the C2 alignment option, also known as the Ash-Railroad segment. While all of the options outlined have significant impacts to existing residential units as well as businesses, the initial route proposal appears to have the least negative impact and we encourage TriMet and Metro to be transparent in their approach to necessary displacements and acquisitions.</p> <p>Of course, a capital project of this magnitude presents a significant cost. We appreciate that the preferred Inner Portland (A1) and Tigard and Tualatin (C2) segments are the lowest cost options for the respective segments. Identifying and committing local funds, and requesting matching federal funds, will require the broad support of the community. More clarity on the cost to the region’s taxpayers is needed as the final environmental impact statement is developed and the preferred alternative is adopted.</p> <p>The Alliance looks forward to engaging with Metro, TriMet and other partners as the Southwest Corridor Light Rail project comes to fruition. As this process moves forward, we encourage the government entities leading this project to identify minority- and women-owned businesses to contract with for the development of each phase of the project, or when appropriate. The Alliance also would like to work with Metro and TriMet to convene a business stakeholders listening session once the preferred alternative is adopted.</p> <p>Properly planned and designed, a new LRT line would improve connections to employment and commercial centers, mitigate congestion impacts on the environment, and increase access to quality middle-income jobs, educational opportunities and services for the growing Southwest Corridor.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project and initial route proposal.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard. The addition of light rail increases the person capacity of the corridor while retaining most of the existing vehicle capacity for people driving and for freight vehicles, by maintaining four vehicle lanes in the highest-volume segments of SW Barbur Boulevard. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS for more information on traffic analysis.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed support for the Ash-Railroad alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), studied as Alternative C2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p> <p>Please see Section 5.3, Cost and Funding Evaluation, of this Final EIS for more information related to your concerns regarding costs and funding of the Project.</p> <p>Regarding your comment on engagement of minority- and women-owned businesses, the consultant contract for development of the EIS included an increase in fees to women- and minority-owned businesses from 7% in the Draft EIS to 28% in the Final EIS. Additionally, TriMet has a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) program in accordance with federal regulations. TriMet’s DBE program is intended to guide investment in federal contracts to disadvantaged businesses, which are defined as small businesses owned or managed by individuals who have been subjected to racial or ethnic prejudice or cultural bias within American society because of their identity as members of groups and without regard to their individual qualities. Examples include minority-owned businesses and women-owned businesses. To that end,</p>

Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			Thank you for your consideration.	<p>TriMet establishes goals for each contract on federal projects that a percentage of the contract be performed by DBEs. TriMet has two design contracts for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project. The Transit Design contract has a DBE utilization goal of 20% and is at 21.4% as of July 1, 2020. The Urban Design contract has a DBE utilization goal of 19.5% and is currently at 13.3%; however, that percentage is rapidly increasing.</p> <p>Regarding your request to work with Metro and TriMet on a business stakeholder listening session, business engagement is critical to the Project and is ongoing. A number of business stakeholders serve on the Project’s Community Advisory Committee, and TriMet’s Community Affairs team maintains regular communications with the Tigard Chamber of Commerce. Though there is not currently an organized business association along SW Barbur Boulevard, the project team continues to support efforts to assess interest and strategies for better organizing this community. Community Affairs representatives continue to maintain regular communications with individual business owners along the corridor, particularly those that may be impacted by the Project. Additionally, the Portland Business Alliance can contact TriMet’s Community Affairs team at 503-962-2150 or <a href="mailto:swcorridor@trimet.org">swcorridor@trimet.org</a> to coordinate on convening a business stakeholder listening session.</p>
O23	Portland Freight Committee	Pia Welch, Raihana Ansary	<p>On behalf of the Portland Freight Committee we are writing to express our overall support for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project as identified in the Draft EIS document over the No Build alternative. The Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project has the potential to significantly enhance our region’s existing light rail network by providing high quality public transit service to area residents and businesses and providing a viable alternative to driving.</p> <p>The Portland Freight Committee (PFC) has been serving as an advisory group on freight mobility issues to Portland City Council since 2003 and is comprised of over 30 members that include both public and private sector representatives. Our mission is to enhance the Portland economy by advancing a balanced and well managed multi-modal freight network. Upon reviewing the Southwest Corridor DEIS document we offer the following comments:</p> <p><u>TSP Policy Issues</u></p> <p>Within the City of Portland SW Barbur Blvd/99W is classified as a Major Truck Street in the City’s Transportation System Plan and intended to provide truck mobility and access to commercial and employment uses along the corridor and to accommodate all truck types as practicable. The PFC would like to ensure that truck access and mobility along the Barbur Blvd corridor is maintained and would like further clarity on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What would be the corridor-wide impact to truck travel and access to local businesses on Barbur Blvd?</li> <li>• What would be the impact to truck travel in the single-lane section of Barbur Blvd, north of SW Hamilton?</li> <li>• Will there be any delays to truck movement due to new at-grade LRT crossings along the corridor?</li> <li>• What is the impact to truck travel to and from the off-street loading bays at the Burlingame Fred Meyer and other businesses that require large truck access?</li> <li>• What are the expected delays and out of direction travel for trucks that will not be able to make left turns within the project area? What proposed design solutions are being proposed to ensure adequate truck access and turning movements within the impacted area?</li> <li>• What level of outreach to the businesses along Barbur Blvd have taken place in respect to identifying their truck access and loading needs?</li> </ul> <p><u>Over-Dimensional Truck Issues</u></p> <p>All parts of State Hwy 99W (aka SW Pacific Hwy) up to the I-5 ramps at Exit 294 is identified as a state <i>Reduction Review Route</i> and subject to <i>ORS 366.215</i> guidance which states that the Oregon Transportation Commission may not permanently reduce vehicle-carrying capacity of identified freight routes and that a review of potential Reduction of Vehicle-carrying Capacity is required for all proposed actions on Reduction Review Routes. This segment of 99W has also been identified as a Regional Over-Dimensional Truck Route Corridor in a recently completed Metro planning effort. The PFC would like to ensure that adequate access is maintained for Over-dimensional vehicle movements as required under <i>ORS 366.215</i> guidance and would like further clarification on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What level of coordination has taken place with ODOT’s Region Mobility Liaison to address freight access in respect to <i>ORS 366.215</i> guidance?</li> <li>• What design considerations are being proposed to maintain access for Over-dimensional vehicles along the study corridor, including the intersection of Hwy 217 which is also a state Reduction Review Route?</li> <li>• If jurisdictional ownership of Barbur Blvd is transferred to the City of Portland will <i>ORS 366.215</i> guidance still apply where it connects with Hwy 99W at the I-5 ramps and will an expiration time limit be applied?</li> </ul> <p>Several other roadways within the study area that intersect with Barbur Blvd are also identified as “Preferred wide load routes” by the City of Portland include connections with Capital Hwy and Beaverton-Hilldale Hwy (aka State Route 10) Bertha Blvd and Multnomah Blvd. These facilities were designated as wide load routes based on their direct</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>To learn more about mitigation for short-term transportation impacts, please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS. Specifically, impacts to truck travel and local business access on SW Barbur Boulevard are addressed in Section 3.2.7, Freight Facility Impacts, of this Final EIS and Sections 3.2.7, 3.3.7 and 4.3.8 of Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of the Draft EIS. Additionally, Sections 2.3, 3.3 and 4.3 of Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS document the levels of automobile traffic and traffic diversion that are anticipated under the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard.</p> <p>Regarding your comment related to off-street loading bays, discussions regarding truck access and loading needs at individual businesses would occur as design is finalized, following the publication of the Final EIS.</p> <p>Regarding your comment about business outreach, in March 2017, business owners and property owners along SW Barbur Boulevard were mailed a newsletter that included the following statement: “If the study determines that your property could be impacted by the light rail project, you will be contacted before designs are final. For example, changes to existing driveways may be needed. We will discuss these and other possible changes with those who may be affected.” Additionally, in the spring of 2017, project staff walked the street and went into every business to personally talk to them about the Project. TriMet’s Community Affairs team acts as direct liaisons to property owners, regularly communicating with them about project designs through in-person meetings, phone calls and emails. These discussions can inform the project design and sometimes help to minimize the impacts to properties or business operations. Anyone concerned about a potential impact to their property or business can contact TriMet’s Community Affairs team at 503-962-2150 or <a href="mailto:swcorridor@trimet.org">swcorridor@trimet.org</a>.</p> <p>Regarding your comments related to over-dimensional truck issues, the implications of Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 366.215 have been discussed with ODOT’s mobility liaison, and the Final EIS design reflects freight needs.</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>connections with state Hwy 99W with the expectation that Over-dimensional vehicles will continue to be accommodated on the designated state facility without any disconnected segments that link to a state-owned facility. The PFC wants to ensure direct access to these city-owned wide load routes are maintained from Hwy 99W and other state-owned facilities and would like further clarity on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What assessment has been done to address direct access from Hwy 99W/Barbur Blvd to city designated wide load routes in respect to turning radius, travel lane width and vertical clearance needs to accommodate these type of truck movements?</li> <li>• Have the potential impacts from other area capital improvement projects - such as the S.W. Capitol Hwy: S.W. Taylors Ferry Rd. to S.W. Garden Home Rd roadway improvements, also been incorporated into the DEIS traffic analysis?</li> </ul> <p><u>I-5 and Barbur Blvd/99W Traffic Issues</u></p> <p>Interstate 5 serves as a vital trade link on the national freight network linking all three western states with Canada and Mexico. Traffic congestion on I-5 in the Portland region has been identified by businesses statewide as a major choke point that adversely impacts efficient freight movement and restricting economic growth. Projected regional population and employment growth will further strain the existing roadway network and available vehicle carrying capacity. The segment of Hwy 99W that runs parallel with I-5 within the study area serves as a vital alternative route for freight movement and traffic flow when I-5 is blocked by traffic or other incidents. The PFC would like to ensure that sufficient highway system redundancy is maintained in the Southwest Portland region and that vehicle carrying capacity on Barbur Blvd/99W is not reduced and would like further clarification on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will truck movement on I-5 be adversely impacted with this project and to what degree?</li> <li>• What level of automobile traffic is the project expected to remove from I-5 and Barbur Blvd and what level of traffic diversion is anticipated?</li> <li>• What changes to vehicle carrying capacity on I-5 and Barbur Blvd are anticipated with the proposed LRT alignment?</li> </ul> <p>The PFC appreciated the opportunity to provide our feedback on this important regional transit project and we look forward to your responses to the issues referenced above.</p>	<p>Following publication of the Final EIS, TriMet would coordinate with ODOT freight and the Statewide Mobility Advisory Committee to ensure the design is compliant. No reductions in over-dimensional capacity are proposed or analyzed along Reduction Review Routes in the Final EIS. No change in the limits of ORS 366.215 guidance are proposed or analyzed in the Final EIS.</p> <p>Regarding your comments related to preferred wide load routes, at city-designated wide load routes accessing Pacific Highway (99W)/SW Barbur Boulevard, a WB-67 design vehicle was used to assess turning radius, travel lane width and vertical clearance needs. The WB-67, which is a large interstate semi-trailer, is typically the largest truck type used in Portland's freight analysis. Results of this assessment of turning movements will be submitted upon the completion of the Project's 30% design in late 2020.</p> <p>Improvements from all committed capital improvement projects (funded or under construction by others) in the study area were incorporated into the No-Build Alternative (without the Project) and the Preferred Alternative (with the Project) traffic models analyzed in the Draft EIS and Final EIS.</p> <p>No changes to vehicle carrying capacity on I-5 are anticipated under the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS. Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard. The addition of light rail transit would increase the person capacity of the corridor while retaining most of the existing vehicle capacity for people driving and for freight vehicles by prioritizing the preservation of four vehicle lanes in the highest-volume segments of SW Barbur Boulevard.</p>
O24	Portland Historic Landmarks Commission	Kristen Minor	<p>The Portland Historic Landmarks Commission (PHLC) received a briefing from you regarding the SW Corridor Light Rail Project. We appreciate the opportunity to learn about it and to provide comments regarding this important work.</p> <p>Clearly the project team has already done quite a bit of preliminary study and preparation, including a cultural resource survey of the possible alternative routes and an impact study for resources that may be affected. That survey indicated that 144 resources that may be affected are listed in or are recommended to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and 16 archaeological sites and recommends that 28 archaeological High Probability Areas be further investigated.</p> <p>We understand that the project is still in the process of beginning the Section 106 document and that potentially, a Section 4f will also be required in addition to the NEPA review. Based on the number of properties involved, some of which are individually-listed landmarks, it is highly likely that the Section 4f findings cannot be held to "de minimis" and that there will be some adverse effects determined during the Section 106. Therefore, mitigation will likely be a requirement of the project, and the PHLC would be interested in providing input regarding such mitigation.</p> <p>In general, project alignments are divided into three segments (A, B, C) and then there are some other aspects of the proposal, including station access/ parking options for segments B and C and a few other alterations to the existing conditions that may have the potential to affect historic resources.</p> <p>In segment A, the Barbur alignment seems generally far better in terms of limiting overall historic impacts. The Barbur alignment keeps the route at the periphery of the South Portland Historic District rather than cutting through it along Naito. At the historic district in particular, the District really is the overarching concern and having anything that creates a barrier within the neighborhood itself must be considered a big adverse effect. It is worth mentioning that this "barrier" effect may also come into play at segments further south and be a negative impact to individual resources, even though this upper segment is the only area with a designated Historic District. Appendix A, Sheet 2 in particular is very concerning in terms of the Naito alignment, even with the understanding that some of the impacts to the identified historic resources could be relatively minor. Appendix A, Sheet 4, continuing south on Barbur, shows quite a number of worrisome impacts (especially to one individually-listed National Register property, Jewish shelter home at 4133 SW Corbett) but no real alternative in terms of alternative route. If it is not possible to find an alternate within this portion of segment A, the PHLC would like to see some real effort to highlight, mitigate, or otherwise limit the impact to this resource in particular and to other resources sharing the context of its association with immigrant history. Preservation of historic structures that tell these stories is becoming more important in Portland as they are seemingly more easily "erased" than other cultural stories or backgrounds as the city population continues to grow exponentially.</p> <p>Segments B and C do not seem to create major impacts to historic resources at this point in time. All the Segment C alternatives appear to have the same historic impacts. However, the chart on p83 of the AINW study, Segment B alternatives (B1, B2, B3, or B4) did list some real difference in terms of numbers and allocations of historic resources. The study concludes on the next few pages (85-86) that B4 would have the least number of impacts to historic resources. The PHLC tentatively supports this conclusion, with the understanding that the cultural resources survey does not yet provide any real hierarchy of historic resources or study the rarity of certain types of resources. Again, the PHLC will be interested to read the Section 106, NEPA, and Section 4f documents as the project progresses and would appreciate additional briefings as appropriate.</p> <p>Thank you very much for the briefing and for the opportunity to comment.</p>	<p>Please see Section 4.6, Historic and Archaeological Resources, and Appendix D, Final Section 4(f) Evaluation, of this Final EIS regarding historic resources along the alignment and the Section 106 and Section 4(f) processes. Please see Chapter 6, Community Participation, Agency Coordination and Required Permits, and Appendix E, Agency Coordination and Correspondence, of this Final EIS to learn more about coordination associated with historic and cultural resources. Following publication of the Draft EIS, the project team has continued to share information with and seek feedback from the Portland Historic Landmarks Commission.</p> <p>Additionally, please see Appendix M, Mitigation Plan, of this Final EIS to learn more about mitigation for adverse effects on historic resources.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
O25	Portland Pedestrian	Kenzie Woods, Tiel	<p>As members of the City of Portland Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC), we are submitting this comment letter in support of the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project, with specific support for the project's potential improvements to transportation Portland's Southwest neighborhoods and proposal to improve pedestrian access.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
	Advisory Committee Members	Jackson, Zoe Klingmann, Elaine O’Keefe	<p>We request that pedestrian safety be prioritized and analyzed in the Final EIS, planned for during operations, and certainly during project construction, not only along the proposed light rail alignment in the immediate vicinity of proposed station platforms, but also into the neighborhoods to be served by the proposed MAX line.</p> <p>As all residents of southwest Portland know, and as is shown on Figure 3.1-1, few sidewalks or even road shoulders exist in many of Portland’s southwest neighborhoods. There is a notable lack of existing safe walking routes to the proposed transit stations (or to bus stops that may ultimately bring riders to the stations). Under current conditions, the safest and most practical choice to access the proposed stations for many of the residents in the adjacent and surrounding neighborhoods will be by personal automobile, therefore there will be increased traffic and a need for parking at the stations. We request that the Final EIS evaluate the travel routes of light rail riders expecting to originate from the nearby neighborhoods as well as passing through nearby neighborhoods to access stations, the demand for parking at the station and in neighborhoods along streets near stations, and that the project include safe pedestrian routes of travel to the stations where traffic is expected to increase. Assessing project impacts to pedestrian safety due to increased traffic accessing the stations should be made a top priority in the Final EIS and should be planned for in the project design. We specifically request that the project include pedestrian infrastructure built as part of the project in order for pedestrians to safely access the light rail stations.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of our comments and requests.</p>	<p>Please see Sections 3.1.7 and 3.2.8 in Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of the Final EIS regarding transportation safety. Additional detail is provided in Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report. Details of how TriMet would work to ensure pedestrian safety during the construction of the Project would be developed in coordination with the Cities of Portland, Tigard and Tualatin and with ODOT as project construction draws closer.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 for more information on improved pedestrian facilities included in the Project.</p> <p>Regarding your request that the Final EIS evaluate the travel routes and modes to stations, that effort is included in the transportation modeling and analysis summarized in the Final EIS in Chapter 3 and detailed in Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, and in Attachment B, which is mentioned above. Attachment A includes details on the mode of access anticipated for each station.</p> <p>TriMet and Metro worked with the Cities of Portland, Tigard and Tualatin to identify critical pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure needed to ensure that safe access to stations is included in the Project, a process that has included engagement with the Southwest Neighbors Inc. (SWNI) Transportation Committee on prioritization of investments.</p> <p>Regarding your request that the Final EIS assess impacts to pedestrian safety due to increased traffic accessing the stations, all stations are designed to ensure people can walk safely to and from the stations using signal-protected crosswalks, and to incorporate pedestrian-friendly features such as refuge island, high-visibility markings and improved accessibility features as appropriate. The addition of safety features along the light rail alignment is noted in Section 3.2.3, Active Transportation Impacts, of this Final EIS.</p>
O26	Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission	Katherine Shultz	<p>The Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission (PSC) has responsibility for the stewardship, development and maintenance of Portland’s Comprehensive Plan, Climate Action Plan and Zoning Code. By holding public hearings and discussing issues and proposals, the PSC develops recommendations to share with City Council in hopes of creating a more prosperous, educated, healthy and equitable city.</p> <p>A central feature of Portland’s Comprehensive Plan is directing growth to a network of centers and transit corridors. Over the next 20 years, we expect 70 percent of Portland’s growth to occur in the Central City and along major transit lines. We have also adopted ambitious transportation planning goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, cut vehicle miles travelled, and double the share of commuters who use transit – to 25 percent by 2035. Full build-out of the regional light rail system is a critical element of our land use plans and Climate Action goals. The Southwest Corridor is the last major spoke in this regional system. Development of high-capacity transit in a dedicated right of way in this corridor helps to advance many of the City’s goals.</p> <p>We have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and Initial Route Proposal (IRP) for the SW Corridor project, and respectfully offer the following comments.</p> <p>We generally agree that the IRP meets the project purpose but have significant reservations about elements of the DEIS. While the Southwest Corridor is evaluated as a transportation project, we believe it is fundamentally a tool to shape and manage growth. The PSC was deeply involved in laying the groundwork for this project through our consideration of the Barbur Concept Plan (BCP), adopted by the City in 2013. The IRP in part honors that plan, which emphasized the land use, growth management, and place-making opportunities that should drive the project alignment.</p> <p>We appreciate these project elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The through-route alignment serving downtown Tigard.</li> <li>• Shuttle service and strong pedestrian and bike connections to the PCC Sylvania campus.</li> <li>• The in-Barbur alignment north of the Crossroads.</li> <li>• The shared transitway to facilitate more reliable bus service in Southwest Portland.</li> <li>• The inclusion of important pedestrian and bike improvements for station access.</li> <li>• A strong connection to Marquam Hill.</li> </ul> <p>Environmental Justice Concerns</p> <p>Social justice and equity are at the core of the Commission’s Comprehensive Planning and Climate Action Plan roles. With this context in mind, we are disappointed in the DEIS Environmental Justice analysis, and the lack of attention to housing stability in the indirect and cumulative effects analysis. Given the resources that the cities of Tigard and</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Appendix C, Environmental Justice Compliance, of this Final EIS regarding your concerns about the Environmental Justice analysis. Appendix C has been updated and expanded in the Final EIS compared to the Draft EIS, in part to address concerns raised in your comment and other publicly submitted comments.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 18 regarding housing stability, gentrification and indirect displacement, including discussion of the Southwest Corridor Equitable Housing Strategy.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.18, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts, of this Final EIS for additional information on transit impacts to rents and property values.</p> <p>The transportation impact analysis reflects performance targets adopted by relevant agencies, including Metro, ODOT, Portland, Washington County and cities along the route. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project’s traffic analysis.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding bicycle and pedestrian improvements included in the Project.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding the locations and types of park and ride facilities.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for improvements to the Ross Island Bridgehead in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS, as well as opposition to a limited-access facility on SW Naito Parkway, which was studied as Alternative A2-LA in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>Portland have put into studying housing needs in the corridor, and the potential for displacement, the DEIS analysis of this topic is insufficient and superficial. As written, the analysis is narrowly focused on direct displacement. This analysis needs to be broadened to consider displacement caused by the expected real estate activity and property value changes that will come because of a major light rail investment. Although light rail is not the sole cause of gentrification and displacement, it is well established that major light rail investment will impact property values and rents in a corridor, and therefore, it is an impact that must be analyzed and mitigated.</p> <p>Past transit investments in Portland have contributed to the displacement of low-income households and communities of color. Therefore, we have recommended the Portland City Council plan for housing and transit together. Given that history, we are especially concerned with displacement pressure from rising housing costs and the impact of that pressure on immigrants and communities of color now living in apartments in West Portland near the Barbur Transit Center, and near Downtown Tigard. Residential displacement could also negatively impact important community institutions, such as the Islamic Center of Portland.</p> <p>Through the Southwest Corridor Equitable Housing Strategy (SWEHS) the cities of Portland and Tigard have quantified the number of residents vulnerable to displacement pressures and the number of unregulated but still affordable housing units that could be susceptible to rent increases in the corridor. The SWEHS also includes information about where those risks overlap with communities of color. The data collected by Tigard and Portland should be further analyzed and the final EIS should evaluate appropriate mitigation actions that can be incorporated into the project, many of which have already been identified in the SWEHS.</p> <p>It is essential that the transit project and the housing strategy are funded and implemented in tandem. One cannot be done without the other. We appreciate that TriMet has engaged with other project partners to discuss a Memorandum of Understanding to dedicate and discount TriMet-owned land to support the feasibility of affordable housing development. The project will be stronger with a robust support of the housing strategy because ridership will decline if core riders are displaced and cannot access the benefits of low-cost transit service or new services and amenities that come with the development of the corridor.</p> <p>Transportation Concerns</p> <p>In addition, we are concerned about the scope of transportation impact analysis in the DEIS. While we appreciate that the analysis addresses active transportation, the framework of the technical study is extremely vehicle-centered. This approach is contrary to the adopted policies in Portland’s Transportation System Plan (TSP). Portland’s TSP prioritizes modes of people movement in the following order: walking, bicycling, transit, taxi/commercial transit/shared vehicles, zero emission vehicles; and other single occupancy vehicles at the lowest priority.</p> <p>Most mitigations itemized in the DEIS are aimed at maintaining vehicle movement rather than people movement. While it is helpful that the DEIS identifies the potential impact of vehicle-related mitigation on active transportation modes (Table 3.3-1 for example), the emphasis is on maintaining or expanding vehicle roadway capacity. This is backwards. The transportation analysis should be about how people move through the corridor. The mitigation list should include actions that better manage demand, more efficiently allocate the existing road capacity, or encourage other modes.</p> <p>One specific active transportation concern is how the project could disrupt or improve bicycle network connectivity in the corridor. The project will be more successful if there is a complete network of active transportation options throughout the corridor. The project has an opportunity to think more broadly about how to make all alternatives to driving safer and more convenient. In particular, the alignment options at the West Portland crossroads, and at the historic viaducts need to be evaluated with this lens. More public discussion is needed in both locations.</p> <p>A related concern is the location and size of park and ride lots in places where local land use plans emphasize pedestrian access and walkability. We urge you to look carefully at the relationship between park and rides and planned land uses. In the West Portland Town Center, the vehicle traffic generated by the Barbur Transit Center park and ride facility undermines the land use vision for a Town Center – that it become a walkable human-scale community.</p> <p>Finally, we would like to note our strong support for reconfiguring the Ross Island Bridgehead to re-establish an urban street pattern. That project facilitates significant redevelopment close to the Gibbs station, which supports transit ridership and regional growth management goals. As described in the DEIS, the Bridgehead reconstruction also improves traffic outcomes at this regionally-significant bottleneck. We do not support reconstruction of the Bridgehead as a limited access facility – that alternative is directly at odds with thirty years of land use plans for that area.</p> <p>We the opportunity to comment on the DEIS and IRP for the SW Corridor project. As stewards of the Portland Comprehensive Plan and Climate Action Plan, we will remain engaged as planning progresses, and as designs are refined.</p>	
O27	Restore Oregon	Peggy Moretti	<p>Restore Oregon supports the route recommendations of AINW, trusting their thorough analysis. However, we find their recommendations for mitigation for the adverse effects on historic resources to be entirely insufficient. Documentation and signage do little to make up for the loss or harm to so many resources.</p> <p>Restore Oregon urges that mitigation for the adverse impact on historic resources consist of providing funds for the restoration or seismic retrofitting of other historic structures and sites in the Region. These funds could take the form of matching grants (applicant must match the grant dollar-for-dollar) administered by SHPO or an organization like Restore Oregon. We have served as a fiscal sponsor in the past and are currently negotiating another mitigation agreement that would include administration of grant funds for preservation.</p> <p>We would be happy to discuss this further at the appropriate time. Thank you!</p>	<p>Please see Section 4.6, Historic and Archaeological Resources, and Appendix D, Final Section 4(f) Evaluation, of this Final EIS regarding historic resources along the alignment and the Section 106 and Section 4(f) processes.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 6, Community Participation, Agency Coordination and Required Permits, and Appendix E, Agency Coordination and Correspondence, of this Final EIS to learn more about coordination associated with historic and cultural resources. Restore Oregon was identified as a Section 106 consulting party in the Draft EIS. Following publication of the Draft EIS, the project team has continued to consult with Restore Oregon.</p> <p>Additionally, please see Appendix M, Mitigation Plan, of this Final EIS to learn more about mitigation for adverse effects on historic resources. Mitigation measures were further identified and refined following publication of the Draft EIS as part of the Section 106 consultation process.</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
O28	South Portland Neighborhood Association	G.L. Michon, Jr.	<p>The South Portland Neighborhood Association (SPNA) supports implementation of the basic elements of the Ross Island Bridgehead project. These infrastructure improvements would reconnect the Lair Hill/Corbett areas of South Portland and reduce the impacts of high volumes of vehicle traffic on the livability of the neighborhood.</p> <p>SPNA supports the inclusion of funding for the Ross Island Bridgehead project as an integral part of Metro's 2020 regional funding measure for SW Corridor LRT and other transportation projects in the region. This funding measure represents the best opportunity to complete the Bridgehead project in conjunction with construction of SW Corridor LRT.</p> <p>If Ross Island Bridgehead project funding is included in the 2020 regional measure, SPNA supports the Barbur Alignment (Option A1) as the route for future LRT through the Lair Hill neighborhood. The SPNA Board elects to support the Barbur alignment at this time and to focus our future efforts and energy on working with the City of Portland and other regional partners to secure passage of the 2020 funding measure.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p> <p>Regarding your request that Metro include the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in a regional transportation funding measure, that decision is separate from this Project and outside the purview of FTA. In July 2020, the Metro Council referred the Get Moving 2020 plan (transportation funding measure) to voters. The Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration is identified for funding in the Get Moving 2020 plan. Please note that evaluating the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration is an important step in the ability of the City of Portland and ODOT to acquire federal funding toward that improvement.</p>
O29	Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc.	Leslie Hammond	<p>Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc. (SWNI) supports the purposes and goals for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project. The coalition is pleased to submit the following comments and concerns regarding the initial route proposal described in the June 2018, Southwest Corridor Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The SWNI coalition members consist of 17 member neighborhood associations and these comments reflect the consensus of our committee members and Board of Directors, based on committee motions approved by the SWNI Board on July 25, 2018.</p> <p>Invest in the Ross Island Bridgehead, regardless of the route:</p> <p>SWNI believes that the Ross Island Bridgehead Improvements Project should be included for funding as part of Metro's 2020 regional funding measure and constructed parallel with construction of the SW Corridor LRT Project. The Bridgehead Project should not be part of the SW Corridor LRT application for federal funding.</p> <p>The DEIS traffic analysis demonstrates that a Barbur LRT alignment plus Ross Island Bridgehead Improvements provide the best overall transportation network performance.</p> <p>A regional commitment has been expressed to pursue constructing improvements to the Ross Island Bridgehead and Naito Parkway parallel with construction of the SW Corridor LRT project.</p> <p>Refinement 1 (pages E-3 - E-5), Barbur Woods East-Side Running:</p> <p>SWNI supports the Refinement 1 Alternative, which includes 2 new light rail bridges over the Vermont and Newbury gullies including bicycle and pedestrian facilities connecting the urban trails west and north as well as adding 2 vehicle lanes.</p> <p>Specifically, the following comments need to be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing bridges will be very difficult to replace while at the same time maintaining 2 lanes of traffic due to the modular design of the bridges and the unstable conditions removing half of the structure will likely create.</li> <li>• Contractors may find it difficult or impossible to secure liability insurance for the construction project with traffic continuing to pass over the structurally challenged bridges, which are about 100 feet above the valley floor.</li> <li>• Adding two vehicle lanes to the Light Rail Bridge to be used for northbound Barbur Traffic will provide a safe one-lane each direction detour for traffic at such time as the two bridges are replaced.</li> <li>• The cost of replacing the two bridges will be much lower if traffic is taken off the bridges entirely.</li> <li>• Two vehicle lanes on a bridge designed to withstand severe earthquake stresses will provide vehicle passage after a major earthquake which may disable the existing wooden bridges.</li> <li>• If it is not feasible to replace the bridges while maintaining two lanes of traffic, shutting down Barbur will have a huge impact on SW Portland traffic.</li> <li>• According to the DEIS the rebuilding of the Capitol Highway flyover at Barbur will close Capitol Hwy eastbound from Terwilliger for 2 years. This closure will have a large impact on the Hillsdale Business Community.</li> <li>• The Urban Trail route from Hillsdale to the Hooley Bridge is planned to cross the Newbury (Iowa) gully. It is important that the connections both west to Hillsdale through Himes Park and Parkhill Drive be provided as planned.</li> </ul> <p>Refinement 2 Taylors Ferry I-5 Overcrossing:</p> <p>SWNI <u>does not</u> support the Refinement 2 alternative alignment because of the following concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This option adversely impacts the environmental zone;</li> <li>2. Stormwater needs to be mitigated;</li> <li>3. This option adversely impacts Woods Creek and Woods Park;</li> <li>4. Pedestrian and bicycle access have not been adequately addressed or studied; and</li> </ol>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for investment in the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), regardless of the alignment chosen, separate from the light rail application for federal funding, and support for light rail to the east of SW Barbur Boulevard in the Woods portion of Segment A, which was studied as Refinement 1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p> <p>Regarding your request that Metro include the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in a regional transportation funding measure, that decision is separate from this Project and outside the purview of FTA. In July 2020, the Metro Council referred the Get Moving 2020 plan (transportation funding measure) to voters. The Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration is identified for funding in the Get Moving 2020 plan. Please note that evaluating the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration is an important step in the ability of the City of Portland and ODOT to acquire federal funding toward that improvement.</p> <p>New trestle bridges in the "Woods" area of Segment A would not preclude construction of the Urban Trail (Red Electric Trail) across the Newbury gully.</p> <p>To learn more about the traffic analysis, including traffic impacts and mitigations during construction, please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>In your comment, you also expressed opposition to Refinement 2 in Segment B (Outer Portland). Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Regarding your concerns about impacts to Woods Creek and Woods Memorial Natural Area (Woods Park), please see Section 4.7, Parks and Recreation Resources, Section 4.9, Ecosystems, and Section 4.10, Water Resources of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle mobility and station access improvements.</p> <p>Regarding your comments about traffic analysis, in 2013–2014, the Southwest Corridor Plan underwent a "Refinement" phase that included analysis of key intersections in the corridor, including the Crossroads intersections. The purpose of the Refinement phase was to learn more about the potential impacts of the conceptual high capacity transit options. All seven intersections of the Crossroads were modeled in that analysis, and metrics were reported for the critical intersections. The findings of that analysis were used to inform</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>5. Traffic impacts have not been sufficiently studied</p> <p>Any iteration of Refinement 2 will adversely impact the property lying south of Taylor's Ferry Road that is subject to a City of Portland environmental zone overlay that protects the first portion of upper Woods Creek that flows in its natural channel.</p> <p>Likewise SWNI's board strongly believes that any iteration of Refinement 2 will cause unacceptable environmental impacts such as noise, vibration and light, which will be highly damaging to the character and purpose of Woods Memorial Park, a City of Portland Nature Park, which is located immediately adjacent to the north side of Taylor's Ferry Road.</p> <p>SWNI's board is also seriously concerned that Refinement 2 is even being considered without any evidence of what the proposal's impact would be on the volume and quality of storm water that flows through Woods Creek. Refinement 2 would impact private and public properties including additional City of Portland and TVPRD parks before its confluence with Fanno Creek near the Portland Golf Club and the Oregon Episcopal School in Beaverton. The SWNI board cannot see how, given the substantial and challenging natural character of the area, that such a proposal can be considered without at least evaluating these effects and discussing their mitigation.</p> <p>Specifically, Refinement 2 <u>does not include any</u> bicycle or pedestrian facilities. The proposed traffic mitigation is to add room for motor vehicles but <u>not</u> for pedestrian and bicycle facilities. This would make it less safe for people to walk and bike to the Barbur Transit Center and transit service, shops and services in West Portland Crossroads.</p> <p>Specifically, Refinement 2 assumes "additional storage lanes would be added on SW Taylors Ferry Road and SW Capitol Highway to mitigate traffic impacts from light rail operations (e.g. added wait time at rail crossing gates)", but the refinement doesn't specify adding room for bicyclists and pedestrians as well as motor vehicles</p> <p><u>If Refinement 2 is pursued</u>, then SWNI insists on the addition of Project SA-16, Taylor's Ferry sidewalk and bikeways, in the Locally Preferred Alternative, in order for pedestrians and bicyclists to access the Barbur Transit Center. In addition to adding bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the I-5 overcrossing it will make it safer to walk and bike though the crossroads and access the stations at Barbur Transit Center and SW 53rd.</p> <p>Refinement 4 (pages E-12 - E-14), Barbur Undercrossing:</p> <p>SWNI supports Refinement 4, which shifts the Tigard Triangle station and park and ride to SW 68th Parkway just south of Pacific Highway, with the condition, that bicycle and pedestrian facilities are added to access the station.</p> <p>Specifically, there are significant gaps in the bicycle and pedestrian network on Barbur from SW 60th to SW 68th that need to be addressed in the design; we need to better understand how this newly proposed alignment will be constructed and ensure better walking and bicycling conditions on Barbur to access the station</p> <p>Thank you for considering these comments in your selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative and in the next phase of studies and project development.</p>	<p>the scoping and study area definition of the EIS, which includes five of the seven intersections. The intersections of SW Huber Street with SW Capitol Highway and the northbound I-5 on-ramp are not included as study intersections in the EIS traffic analysis, because they are not expected to have adverse effects based on the previous analysis.</p> <p>Your comment does not specify what is inadequate about the Draft EIS analysis of Crossroads traffic, so it is not possible to respond with any further detail.</p> <p>In your comment, you also expressed support for the Barbur Undercrossing, which spans both Segment B (Outer Portland) and Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin) and was studied as Refinement 4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p>
O30	SW Trails PDX	Doug Rogers	<p>For over 20 years SW Trails PDX volunteers have helped enhance the walking experience in SW Portland. As an all-volunteer non-profit community organization we have mapped, signed, and built connections to expand the walking opportunities within our SW community. We have been following the progress of the SW Corridor Plan closely and must express our concerns for recent design decisions.</p> <p>SW Trails can only support SW Corridor Light Rail alignments or refinements which improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility throughout our region. Three design refinements in the Initial Route Proposal cause concern to us, because they appear to create gaps by removing the pedestrian and bicycle facilities present in earlier alignment options studied in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. In particular, we refer to design refinements for the Barbur Blvd. viaduct bypass, the Taylors Ferry modification, and the proposed tunnel under Barbur (refinements #1, #2, and #4).</p> <p>Please also note that the Red Electric Trail -- the long planned Regional Trail for pedestrians and bikes from downtown and on to Washington County -- is planned to cross Barbur Blvd. at the Newbury Bridge (from SW Slavin Road over to Himes Park). So this trail crossing also needs to be incorporated into your design planning.</p> <p>We encourage the Steering Committee to restore pedestrian and bicycle facilities should it choose any of these design refinements. Specifically, we strongly recommend adding a multi-modal path to each of the proposed structures in the design refinements. Restoring pedestrian and bicycle features, thus ensuring the safe flow of pedestrians and bicyclists throughout the Corridor, would allow us to support these design refinements. Otherwise, we must oppose them.</p> <p>Ideally, one should be able to safely ride light rail, walk, or ride a bicycle along any and all of the SW Corridor rail line, from downtown Portland to Bridgeport Village. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 7 for more information about bicycle and pedestrian facilities included in the Project.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed concerns related to light rail to the east of SW Barbur Boulevard in the Woods portion of Segment A (Inner Portland), a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland) and the Barbur Undercrossing which spans both Segment B and Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin) and were studied as Refinement 1, Refinement 2 and Refinement 4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Additionally, design and construction of the Project would not preclude the Red Electric Trail.</p>
O31	Tigard Chamber of Commerce	Debi Mollahan	<p>Good evening, I'm Debi Mollahan, I'm CEO of the Tigard Chamber, and I'm here on behalf of our member businesses, the larger business community. I would like to speak in support of the southwest corridor light rail overall. We've been actively engaged with this project for the three or four years through participation of various metro committees. And particularly in the last 18 months, as I've been a member of Southwest Corridor Light Rail Community Advisory Committee, also known as CAC, as well as working on local ballot initiatives to support this in Tigard.</p> <p>Since I'm on the CAC, I will not comment directly on the IRP, since our committee will be recommending a locally preferred alternative to the Steering Committee shortly. While the implementation of light rail into and through Tigard will not reduce our current congestion, it will help mitigate future congestion modeled into 2035. Without implementation of alternative transit options, congestion is modeled to change from more kind of normal work hours, two to three hours in the morning and evening, to congestion 13 to 17 hours per day. That was startling to me. So doing nothing is really not an option, and based on years of study, this project seems like the best option. I get constant feedback from residents and business about increased commuting times, increased traffic, congestion and more, which affects quality of life. It impacts our businesses' bottom line and service delivery. It is disheartening that a transportation project of this size will impact residential and commercial business properties. Any large transportation improvement, whether it's light rail, dedicated bus lanes, or new road construction, unfortunately, will have this impact due to our density and build-up.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>To learn more about the traffic analysis, including traffic impacts and mitigations during construction, please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>As a member of Southwest Corridor CAC, I've gotten feedback from both business and property owners. I've met with many, and I've directed them to appropriate contacts at Metro. In the process, I've been pleased in the responsiveness and concern that I've seen by Metro and TriMet. Even as the DEIS was being developed, they began work mitigations to reduce impact where possible. This has resulted in the proposed design modifications, which are currently part of the IRP. And I realize those design modifications haven't had the same level of study, so there may be things that get unearthed, as you just noted, with the change in the station.</p> <p>However, we like the proposed design modifications at a high level, given what we know at this point in time, as they appear to reduce the overall impact to business as well as naturally occurring low-income housing, which is a concern for Tigard, while improving transit times and resident access. A shift of that station up on 68th moves it closer to residents on the other side of 99W. I would encourage both TriMet and Metro to continue to listen to impacted property owners, businesses, and residents, and where possible, continue to modify design. High capacity transit in Tigard and the south metro are vital to managing the future growth that's projected. Multiple modes of transportation are important to commerce and a healthy society.</p> <p>This project is both critical to Tigard and the region to manage our growth and provide our employers, employees, and residents with transit options. Thank you for your time.</p>	
O32	Tigard Town Center Advisory Commission	Carine Arendes	<p>Based on Metro staff comments in the July 30th SWC CAC meeting, the attached document prepared by the City of Tigard appointee to the SWC CAC to be prepared to contribute to the SWC CAC discussion is submitted for your consideration.</p> <p><b>Locally Preferred Alternative Worksheet</b></p> <p><i>Modified for TCAC use to provide feedback to the SW Corridor Community Advisory Committee (SWC CAC) appointee</i>  <i>[Note: numbering based on Metro provided document previously shared with the TCAC]</i>                  Prepared by Carine Arendes, City of Tigard Town Center Advisory Commissioner/SWC CAC appointee                  Revised: 7/16/2018 subsequent to July 12 TCAC meeting</p> <p><b>1. From the available options studied in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, does the group recommend? (Pick one in each category)</b></p> <p><b>c. Ash to I-5 Through (C1), Ash to RR Through (C2), Clinton to I-5 Through (C3), Clinton to RR Through (C4), Ash and I-5 Branched (C5), or Wall and I-5 Branched (C6)?</b></p> <p><b>Through – strongly preferred</b></p> <p>The I-5 or railroad alignment choice is located outside the scope of the TCAC geographically constrained purview. Since there is little to no support or interest amongst the SW CAC to reexamine impacts associated with RR alignment in light of the Hunzinker alignment proposed in the IRP, the TCAC reviewed the remaining alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ash to RR Through (C2)</li> <li>• Clinton to RR Through (C4)</li> </ul> <p><b>TCAC prefers Ash to Clinton</b></p> <p>The environmental and cost differences between the Ash and Clinton alignments make the Ash alignment strongly preferred by Tigard staff; TCAC continues to support with this rationale.</p> <p><b>2. Does the group support continued exploration of the following design refinements/modifications? Why or why not?</b></p> <p><b>c. 99W undercrossing <u>Yes/No</u></b></p> <p><b>Why?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction in travel times</li> <li>• Reduction costs</li> <li>• Preferred station spacing</li> <li>• Opportunity for retail and other active uses at station</li> </ul> <p><b>d. Elmhurst in Triangle <u>Yes/No</u></b></p> <p><b>Why?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction in travel times</li> <li>• Reduce impacts to existing businesses in the Triangle on Beveland Street</li> <li>• Less property acquisitions will likely reduce costs marginally</li> <li>• Preserve existing investment in high quality local roads</li> </ul> <p><b>e. Hall station downtown <u>Yes/No</u></b></p> <p><b>Why?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce travel times</li> <li>• Reduce costs</li> <li>• Reduce impacts on SW Hall Blvd caused by excessive crossings</li> <li>• Avoids impacts to existing downtown businesses</li> <li>• Avoids disruption or cleavage of the downtown area that may arise from light rail bisecting the revitalized downtown area</li> <li>• Minimizes impacts to wetlands (from Clinton alignment)</li> </ul>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for a through-route alignment (Through Configuration) on SW Ash Avenue in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Alternatives C1 and C2 in the Draft EIS, and also support for a Hall Station in downtown Tigard, which was studied as Refinement 6 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding the locations and types of park and ride facilities.</p> <p>Regarding your comment on urban design considerations, please reference TriMet's Conceptual Design Report for the Project to see illustrations of the Project's urban design principles (find the Conceptual Design Report at: <a href="https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm">https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm</a>).</p> <p>Current FTA policy does not allow money for transit projects to be spent on art. However, TriMet will continue to seek opportunities to incorporate art within the existing restrictions.</p> <p>Representatives of the TriMet Community Affairs team will serve as full-time liaisons for businesses in the corridor, working to understand their needs and helping to minimize construction impacts. Through the Southwest Corridor Equitable Development Strategy, project partners have begun to explore strategies to generate economic opportunity for historically disadvantaged communities. Project partners will also look for opportunities and partnerships to encourage small business development around station areas. The Tigard Town Center Advisory Commission can contact TriMet's Community Affairs team at 503-962-2150 or <a href="mailto:swcorridor@trimet.org">swcorridor@trimet.org</a> to coordinate on business needs.</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides bike/ped connection to Triangle</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Are there considerations for these choices that the CAC hopes the Steering Committee will consider?</b></p> <p><b>c. 99W undercrossing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No surface parking- keep any parking structured</li> <li>• Economic Development Opportunities</li> <li>• Supportive of the HWY 99 business corridor</li> <li>• Provision of small scale uses geared to users of the transit system</li> <li>• Encourage locally owned businesses</li> <li>• Opportunity for business incubator</li> <li>• Preference for alignment that results in usable remnant properties along HWY 99 rather than I-5</li> </ul> <p><b>d. Elmhurst in Triangle</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid impacts to existing infrastructure investments</li> <li>• Smoother (straighter) alignment is recognized as shorter and faster</li> </ul> <p><b>e. Hall station downtown</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TCAC supports a Hall Street alignment immediately adjacent to Hall street that minimizes walking time &amp; distance to Main Street and creates a sense of arrival in downtown</li> <li>• Pedestrian access and safety for Hall Street crossing</li> <li>• Potential interest in flyover tempered by concerns about interruption in the urban fabric and oppressive sense of closure</li> <li>• Urban design considerations, such as providing a sense of connection between Main Street &amp; the station must be prioritized</li> <li>• Realignment/improvements to Scoffins/Hunzinker intersection</li> <li>• Potential for redevelopment, including Public Works consolidation in the Hunzinker area</li> </ul>	
O33	Tigard Town Center Advisory Commission	Kate Rogers	<p>Note: The following recommendations have been prepared regarding the SW Corridor Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement by Tigard’s Town Center Advisory Committee (TCAC). The TCAC is an advisory citizen committee charged with advising the Tigard City Council and Board of the Town Center Development Agency on policy related to the City of Tigard’s urban renewal areas. Tigard’s urban renewal areas are colloquially known as Tigard Downtown and the Tigard Triangle. Comments are limited to those portions of the SW Corridor light rail project that are located within the urban renewal areas or will have a significant impact on those areas.</p> <p>Key Considerations:</p> <p>The most important consideration for the TCAC is a light rail alignment that will serve the City of Tigard including the provision of sufficient station locations to serve an expanding population base. Another key factor in our recommendations is the preservation of naturally occurring affordable housing. The TCAC has had project briefings by Metro and Tri-Met staff, studied the DEIS, heard feedback from our liaison to the SW Corridor Community Advisory Committee (SWC CAC), and received input from city staff and city council liaison. These perspectives informed our discussion and this recommendation.</p> <p>Segment C Preferences:</p> <p><i>Line Configuration</i></p> <p>The DEIS studied six route proposals through the Tigard area. The TCAC strongly prefers a through route rather than a branched route. This option ensures regular and frequent service to the Tigard transit center providing access to the area near the transit center and connectivity to areas to the south and west not served by the SW Corridor light rail.</p> <p><i>Route into Downtown</i></p> <p>Ash and Clinton alignments provide access into the downtown area west of I-5 and Highway 217. The TCAC prefers the Ash alignment to the Clinton alignment based on cost and travel time considerations as well as environmental impacts.</p> <p>We strongly urge the Steering Committee to consider the potential for incubating locally owned businesses, developing small retail and services business for commuters, structured parking, and redevelopment opportunities. Another key consideration is the possibility to use property remnants for affordable housing.</p> <p>The TCAC prefers the Elmhurst alignment due to the original alignment’s impacts on the existing roadway and businesses along SW Beveland Road. The TCAC is supportive of further exploration into the 68th Parkway Refinement that promotes better station spacing in the Triangle with the caveat that surface parking is not appropriate at this location, while structured parking is highly desirable.</p> <p><i>Station Placement</i></p> <p>Tigard Triangle Station Locations</p> <p>The TCAC supports a Locally Preferred Alternative that results in two stations in the Triangle; given the size and area of the Tigard Triangle the provision of two stations is necessary.</p> <p>Downtown Tigard Station Recommendation:</p>	<p>Regarding your comment requesting sufficient stations in Tigard, the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS includes six stations within the city limits of Tigard: 68th Station, Elmhurst Station, Hall Station, Bonita Station, Upper Boones Ferry Station and Bridgeport Station.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and residential displacements and Master Response 18 regarding your concerns about impacts to affordable housing and interest in using property remnants for affordable housing.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for a through-route alignment (Through Configuration) on SW Ash Avenue in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Alternatives C1 and C2 in the Draft EIS, and also support for a Hall Station in downtown Tigard, which was studied as Refinement 6 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p> <p>Regarding your suggestion to incubate locally owned businesses, and to develop small retail and service businesses, project partners would look for opportunities and partnerships to encourage small business development around station areas.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding the locations and types of park and ride facilities.</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>TCAC strongly considered a station located on or near Main St as shown in the original alignments studied for the DEIS. However, concerns were raised about crossing Hall Blvd at two locations and the traffic implications of closing the street upward of 300+ times per day were considered too onerous to support. Also, the probable route towards Main St. would result in the destruction of a substantial quantity of naturally occurring affordable house, which the TCAC opposes.</p> <p>The TCAC instead prefers a station on the east side of Hall Blvd immediately adjacent to the street frontage to minimize walking time and distance to Main Street. Our preference is based on the understanding that all parties involved will work toward creating a station to serve downtown Tigard that takes into consideration good urban design based on the principles of transit-oriented development, affordable housing, walkability, safety, equitable business development, and a vibrant connection to Main St.</p> <p>Refinement Considerations: We support further study of Refinement #6 and strongly prefer the proposed station immediately adjacent to Hall Blvd as it better serves downtown Tigard. Such study should address concerns about the cost and the impact a proposed flyover would have on the look and feel of downtown Tigard.</p>	
O34	Tigard Town Center Advisory Commission	Kate Rogers	<p>Hello, I'm Kate Rogers, and I'm here representing the TCAC. The following recommendations have been prepared regarding the Southwest Corridor Project Environmental Impact Statement by Tigard's Town Center Advisory Commission, the TCAC. We are an advisory citizen commission charged with advising the City of Tigard and the board of the Town Center Development Agency on policy related to the City of Tigard urban renewal districts. Tigard's urban renewal districts are colloquially known as downtown Tigard and the Tigard triangle. Comments are limited to those portions of the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project that are located within the urban renewal areas or will have significant impact on these areas.</p> <p>The most important consideration for the TCAC is a light rail alignment that will serve the City of Tigard including the division of sufficient station locations to serve our expanding population base. Another key factor in our recommendations is the preservation of naturally occurring affordable housing. The TCAC has had project reviews by Metro and Tri-Met staff setting the DEIS, heard feedback from our liaison to the Southwest Corridor Community Advisory Committee, and received input from city staff and city council liaison. These perspectives inform our discussion and this recommendation.</p> <p>Regarding segment C preferences, the line configuration, the DEIS studied six route proposals through the Tigard area. The TCAC strongly prefers a through route rather than a branched route. This option ensures regular and frequent service to the Tigard Transit Center providing access to the area near the transit center and in connectivity to the area south and west that would not be served by the Southwest Corridor Light Rail. The route into downtown, Ash and Clinton alignments provide access to the downtown area west of I5 and Highway 217. The TCAC prefers the Ash alignment to the Clinton alignment based on cost and travel time considerations, as well as environmental impacts.</p> <p>We strongly urge the steering committee to consider the potential for incubating locally owned businesses, developing small retail and service businesses for commuters, providing structured parking and redevelopment opportunities. Another key consideration is the possibility to use property remnants for affordable housing. The TCAC prefers the Elmhurst alignment due to the original alignment's impacts on the existing roadway and businesses along the Beveland Road route. The TCAC is supportive of further exploration into the 68th Parkway refinement that promotes better station spacing in the triangle with the caveat that service parking is not appropriate at this location while structured parking is highly desirable. Station placements, Tigard triangle station locations, we support the locally preferred alternative that results in two stations in the triangle. Given the size and the area of the Tigard triangle, the provision of two stations is necessary. The downtown Tigard station recommendation, the TCAC strongly considers a station located on or near Main Street as shown in the original alignment segment with the DEIS. However, concerns were raised about crossing Hall Boulevard at two locations and the traffic implications of closing the street upwards of 300 plus times a day were considered too onerous to support. Also, the probable route towards Main Street would result in the destruction of a substantial quantity of naturally-occurring affordable housing, which the TCAC opposes.</p>	Please see the response to Comment 033, above.
O35	Tualatin Aging Task Force	Susan C. Noack	On behalf of the Tualatin Aging Task Force, we respectfully submit that this committee strongly advocates for leaving the Village Inn in its current location and request that Tri Met/ Metro consider other options available for the terminus, parking garage and bus access.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn property.
O36	Tualatin Chamber of Commerce	Linda Moholt	<p>On behalf of the Tualatin Chamber Board of Directors, I submit to you the resolution passed by the Board on July 17th, 2018:</p> <p><i>The Tualatin Chamber Board of Directors moves to support the SW Corridor Light Rail project but agrees with the Chamber's BAC (Business Advocacy Council) that TriMet and Metro need to provide other options for the terminus while leaving the Village Inn in its current location</i></p>	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn property.
O37	Urban Design Panel	Brian Campbell	<p>The Urban Design Panel is sponsored jointly by the Oregon and Portland chapters of the American Institute of Architects, the American Planning Association and the American Society of Landscape Architects and composed of urban design professionals from those three organizations. The Panel had a presentation from City of Portland and Tri-Met SW Corridor project staff on July 5th and this letter reflects the comments from approximately 25 members of the Portland urban design community who attended that meeting, and subsequent study of the DEIS.</p> <p>The consensus of the Panel was that this is a critical project for the Metro region. Without completion of this last segment of the light rail network the region will always suffer from an inefficient and inadequate set of mode choices in its transportation system, resulting in increasingly congested highways, especially in the I-5 south corridor. The SW Corridor is critical for the region to meet the transportation needs of its fast growing population.</p> <p>This project also provides the best transportation option to ensure that affordable housing choices can be provided in this corridor through much increased redevelopment opportunities surrounding the new stations. This factor should be added to the list of Needs under S.2.</p> <p>Specific Comments</p> <p>In the presentation the Panel primarily discussed the Portland segments of the proposed line, but the issue of maximizing the opportunity for complete communities and affordable housing is important for all segments. It is imperative that Metro places a strong emphasis on creating complete communities surrounding each station. Specifically in segments A and B, the City of Portland needs to focus on creating significant new affordable housing opportunities along street connections perpendicular to Barbur at each station area since, given its width, there will be limited opportunity for appropriate pedestrian-oriented housing along Barbur Blvd. itself.</p>	<p>See Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to affordable housing and interest in redevelopment of park and ride facilities for housing.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 9 regarding the Marquam Hill Connection.</p> <p>Following publication of the Draft EIS, TriMet has continued to reach out to businesses and organizations, including the Urban Design Panel, to share information and gather feedback, including on the Conceptual Design Report, which describes and illustrates the overall urban design vision as well as the conceptual designs for stations, major structures and other key corridor improvements for the Project (find the Conceptual Design Report at: <a href="https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm">https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm</a>). These discussions can inform the project design and sometimes help to minimize the impacts to properties or</p>

**Table J2.2-2. Response to Draft EIS Organization Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Organization Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>The need for providing complete communities around each station also indicates a preference for the center-running line in Barbur rather than the freeway adjacent options in most places. The Panel would like to be part of a regional effort to further study how to enable the development of these station area communities to ensure that they are pedestrian-oriented, provide everyday services for existing and new residents as well as good access to the region’s transit network.</p> <p>The most important station area on the line is Gibbs St. because of its relationship to OHSU. The region’s largest employer and most important medical facility has always lacked adequate access to the region’s transportation system. The importance of this new opportunity to provide that access cannot be over-stated. This new transit access will provide tremendous relief for the completely inadequate road access from which this facility has long suffered. Because it is so important it’s critical to get this access right. . The redevelopment of this station area needs to be carefully considered to ensure maximum usage of the station as an entrance to OHSU and the ability of the surrounding development to provide both new accessible medical facilities and higher intensity housing and commercial opportunities.</p> <p>Due to the importance and strategic significance of the synagogue site on Barbur we strongly encourage further study of this opportunity. The enormous potential for parking, transit facilities, community facilities, and a meaningful connection between Terwiliger and Barbur is very obvious here. We urge the affected parties to consider further design studies to explore the potentials for facilitating development for transit, higher density office and housing, and local community facilities. We believe that private development linked with Trimet’s transportation goals could create a significant nexus at this site.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the Barbur Transit Center is also an important focal point. There must be a strong housing component here as well, with reduced emphasis on park-and-ride. It is clear that in the future parking facilities will be increasingly obsolete as transit systems become more robust with many more first/last mile options, including autonomous vehicles.</p> <p>At the 53rd St station there is a great opportunity to create a strong commercial/affordable housing corridor connecting the station to PCC, in addition to providing shuttle service. The distance to the campus from the stop is close enough that encouraging and facilitating walking should be a primary focus of this connection.</p>	<p>business operations. The Urban Design Panel can contact TriMet’s Community Affairs team at 503-962-2150 or <a href="mailto:swcorridor@trimet.org">swcorridor@trimet.org</a> to coordinate further on urban design and conceptual design around stations, including the Gibbs Station and Marquam Hill Connection.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS, particularly Section 2.2.4, Preferred Alternative: Segment B, for a description of the connections to PCC-Sylvania.</p>

## J2.3. BUSINESS COMMENTS

This section includes an index of businesses that submitted comments during the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Draft EIS comment period (Table J2.3-1) and the text of all of those comments paired with responses (Table J2.3-2). The comment text in Table J2.3-2 omits addresses, headings, salutations, signatures, footers, images and supplemental attachments that do not contain substantive comments. For the full content of each comment in its original format, see Appendix J3, Original Copies of Draft EIS Comments. Many responses refer to master responses, which are provided in Appendix J1, Introduction to Draft EIS Comments and Responses.

**Table J2.3-1. Index of Draft EIS Business Comments**

Comment ID	Business Name	Commenter Name
B01	Ascend Holdings	Brian Spencer
B02	Ash Court Apartments	Fanny Bookout
B03	Atiyeh Bros	Mark McGirr
B04	Atiyeh Bros	Mark McGirr
B05	Atiyeh Bros	Mark McGirr
B06	Chick Fil-A, Chang's Mongolian Grill, Lu's Sports Bar & Lounge and Quality Inn	Ken Lee, Tabon Chang, Lu Xu Jian and Jitesh Desai
B07	CJH LLC	Glenn L Hayter
B08	Digital One	Eric Stolberg
B09	Digital One	Michelle Stolberg
B10	Girl Scouts of Oregon	Kevin Guinn
B11	La Noue Development	Mark La Noue
B12	Les Schwab	David Gibson
B13	Oregon Education Association	James Fotter
B14	Paul Schatz Home Furnishings	Paul Shatz III
B15	The Portland Clinic	Katie Dobler
B16	The Portland Clinic	Dick Clark
B17	The Portland Clinic	Michelle Cheney
B18	The Portland Clinic	Michelle Cheney
B19	Stahancyk, Kent & Hook P.C.	Jody L. Stahancyk, Laurel P. Hook and Joel J. Kent
B20	Summit Properties, Inc.	Yoshio Kurosaki
B21	James L. Shook, CPA	James L. Shook
B22	James L. Shook, CPA	Jeremy Shook
B23	T. Scandia Motors	Regina Dibb
B24	Unspecified	Linda Nishi-Strattner
B25	Unspecified	Mark Nishi-Strattner
B26	Village Inn	Ryan Sweeney
B27	Village Inn	Ryan Sweeney
B28	Way W. Lee General Contractor, Inc.	Ken Lee
B29	Way W. Lee General Contractor, Inc.	Ken Lee
B30	Winterbloom Inc.	Phil Thornburg

**Table J2.3-2. Response to Draft EIS Business Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Business Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
B01	Ascend Holdings	Brian Spencer	<p>My name is Brian Spencer, V.P. with Ascend Holdings, Inc. We own property at 14020 SW 72nd Ave, Tigard Oregon which is a roughly 8 acre parcel current occupied by United Rentals, Inc. Prior to United Rentals occupying this property in 1998, it was occupied by Power Rents and was the headquarters of a locally owned 18 branch equipment rental company. Power Rents moved to this property in 1991 so the current use has not changed in 27 years. Our company is a member of the Coalition for SW MAX Railroad Options, a group of businesses committed to the best interests of Tigard and the greater Portland area in seeking the most effective option in addressing the region’s growing transportation needs.</p> <p>Ascend Holdings, Inc. and the Coalition supports the IRP (Initial Route Proposal) as it appears in the DEIS (Draft EIS) issued in June. With the IRP, the Partner staff recommended “through” route travels alongside existing rail tracks. Our review of the DEIS and its attachments fully and accurately support this IRP recommendation. This railroad route (C2), which the Coalition has been a proponent of all along, is the best route for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Faster travel time</li> <li>· Most cost effective to operate</li> <li>· Lower capital costs</li> <li>· Most comprehensive multimodal transportation plan with Tigard-Tualatin connectivity</li> <li>· Best support of the Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan</li> <li>· Most accessible to the residents and transit dependent people of Tigard</li> <li>· Displaces fewer businesses and employees and provides for significant economic development</li> <li>· Maintains projected ridership as anticipated</li> </ul> <p>Our support aligns with Metro, TriMet and other jurisdictional planning staff and engineers for this important project for the region.</p> <p>On behalf of Ascend Holdings, Inc. and Coalition members, we request all deciding parties from this point forward support the IRP; the DEIS and its findings, in making the IRP the Preferred Alternative (PA) and moving this work into the FEIS (Final EIS) and the Regional Transit Plan.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for the railroad alignment in the southern portion of Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Alternative C2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p>
B02	Ash Court Apartments	Fanny Bookout	<p>The purpose of this letter is to give my opinion about the Southwest Corridor Plan.</p> <p>As you know I am the owner of Ash Court Apartments located at 8775 SW Commercial Street, Tigard, OR 97223. This complex has 18 apartments that can be considered low income apartments based on the rents. I do have some tenants that have been with me for over 20 years. These tenants are senior citizens who are now on fixed incomes. Their apartments are their homes that they now cherish.</p> <p>The area where these apartments are located is surrounded by apartments whose rents are very similar to mine. I understand that there are a total of 77 apartments in this area. The tenant population appears to also be low income.</p> <p>The Portland area and suburbs are at the moment experiencing a housing crisis and rents have increased quite significantly. There is no way that my tenants if displaced will be able to afford the rents that are now in place. It will be quite detrimental to them to lose their homes and be unable to find housing, in this market, that they can afford. Are they going to join the homeless population? I certainly hope not. There is the possibility that roughly about 400 people could very easily become homeless if the original plan is accepted and proceed with this plan.</p> <p>I am certain that the people involved in this project will take into consideration this situation. Probably they would not be happy to be responsible to cause so much pain and suffering to so many people by making the wrong decision.</p> <p>It is also worthwhile to mention the fact that the nice building and parking lot that was built not too long ago, the American Legion, will also be affected. Where are the folks who come to this building for meetings, events, going to go? I feel strongly that this building should be respected.</p> <p>The Southwest Corridor Plan that goes east of Hall boulevard will not displace so many folks from their homes and should be the plan of choice.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for an alignment east of SW Hall Boulevard in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Refinement 6 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and residential displacements.</p>
B03	Atiyeh Bros	Mark McGirr	<p>Hello, I am Mark McGirr, President of Atiyeh Bros., Inc. Rugs and Carpeting and Co-Chair of the coalition of Tigard businesses, named "Coalition for SW MAX Railroad Options". Members of the CAC, thank you for your hard work to date and what is in front of you as you formulate your recommendations to the Steering Committee.</p> <p>Atiyeh Bros.' and the Coalition supports the IRP (Initial Route Proposal) as it appears in the DEIS (Draft EIS) issued this month. In the Southern section of the IRP, from Downtown Tigard to Bridgeport, the Staff recommended "through" route travels alongside existing rail tracks. It is very affirming for the Coalition, that the engineers and planning staff concluded that the railroad route (choice C2) is the best route for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Faster travel time</li> <li>· Most cost effective to operate</li> <li>· Lower capital costs</li> <li>· Most comprehensive multimodal transportation plan with Tigard-Tualatin connectivity</li> <li>· Best support of the Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan</li> <li>· Most accessible to the residents and transit dependent people of Tigard</li> <li>· Displaces fewer businesses and employees and provides for significant economic development</li> <li>· Maintains projected ridership as anticipated</li> </ul> <p>As we all study and dive further into the DEIS I want you to know that I truly believe that the project partner staff have got it right with the IRP, and that they have heard our Coalition, and that they have taken into account the CAC's detailed observations and considerations. On behalf of Atiyeh Bros and Coalition Members I request the Committee support the IRP, the DEIS and its findings, in its recommendation to the Steering Committee.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for the railroad alignment in the southern portion of Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Alternative C2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p>

**Table J2.3-2. Response to Draft EIS Business Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Business Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>Mark McGirr, Atiyeh Bros., and members of our coalition remain committed to helping this Committee, the Steering Committee, the City of Tigard and project partner staff, in any way we can, to support the DEIS affirmed IRP to the selection as the PA (Preferred Alternative), and adoption into the RTP (Regional Transit Plan). We will continue to engage with stakeholders, attend meetings and offer the Coalition as a resource, if needed, during the remainder of the process.</p>	
B04	Atiyeh Bros	Mark McGirr	<p>Hello, I am Mark McGirr, President of Atiyeh Bros., Inc. Rugs and Carpeting and Co-Chair of the coalition of Tigard businesses, named "Coalition for SW MAX Railroad Options".</p> <p>Since Mid-June when the DEIS (Draft EIS) was made available, I have poured through all 3,900 pages of the six (6) chapters, the appendices and the attachments. What a body of work and an eye opener. I have found the detailed maps, tables of data, comparisons made in all areas and the resulting evaluation of alternatives to be informative, accurate and fully document why the IRP (Initial Route Proposal) has been chosen by the project partner staff.</p> <p>Atiyeh Bros.' and the Coalition fully support the IRP. It is very affirming for the Coalition, that the engineers and planning staff concluded that the "through" railroad route (choice C2) is the best route to be included. It is faster, lower cost, has better access, traffic impacts are the least disruptive, will have much lower impact on businesses and employment, and provides the most robust transportation plan and fully includes Tigard in it.</p> <p>On behalf of Atiyeh Bros and Coalition Members I request the Committee swiftly approve and adopt the IRP and its mitigations so it can be made the PA (Preferred Alternative) in the FEIS and adopted into the RTP (Regional Transit Plan).</p>	Please see the response to Comment B03, above.
B05	Atiyeh Bros	Mark McGirr	<p>Good evening. I'm Mark McGirr, President of Atiyeh Brothers Rugs and Carpets, and our business is located at 6750 Southwest Bonita Road, which is by Sequoia Parkway near I-5. I'm also the co-chair of a coalition of businesses named Coalition for Southwest MAX Railroad Options. Most of our study -- and I've been involved and the coalition has been involved since May, and we've met with several of each of you and partner staff, and really focused more of our study on the decision that you have ahead on August 13th in deciding, you know, what's the best route to push forward in the FEIS.</p> <p>Since mid-June when the DEIS was made available, I have poured through all 3900 pages of the DEIS, the six chapters, the appendices and the attachments. I didn't study them quite to the extent that others have, but mainly just picking the right route with looking at environmental factors and other items. And what a body of work that DEIS is, it's an eye opener. I found the detailed maps, the tables of date, the comparisons made in all the areas and resulting evaluation of alternatives and the way of routes to be very informative. And it fully documents, in my opinion, why the IRP has been chosen by the project partner staff.</p> <p>Atiyeh Brothers and the coalition fully support the IRP as it's laid out with its modifications and mitigations. It's very affirming for the coalition that the engineers and the planning staff did conclude that the through railroad route, choice C2, is the best route to be included in the IRP. It's faster, lower costs, has better access. Traffic impacts are the least disruptive of the six choices that were put out in that C section, and it will have much lower impact on businesses and employment and provides the most robust transportation plan, and fully includes Tigard in that plan.</p> <p>On behalf of Atiyeh Brothers and the coalition members, I request that the Committee swiftly approve and adopt the IRP and its mitigations so it can be made the PA, the preferred alternative, in the FEIS and adopt it into the regional transit plan. Thank you very much.</p>	Please see the response to Comment B03, above.
B06	Chick Fil-A, Chang's Mongolian Grill, Lu's Sports Bar & Lounge and Quality Inn	Ken Lee, Tabon Chang, Lu Xu Jian, Jitesh Desai	<p>As owners of Properties along the south side of Pacific Highway 99W subject to acquisition, we object to the late inclusion of Design Refinement 4 (DR4) to the Initial Route Proposal (IRP) of the SW Corridor Light Rail Project. We believe this refinement has significant problems and fails to meet the goals of the SW Corridor Project and the Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan.</p> <p>The primary benefits addressed by DR4 on Page E-12 in Appendix E are, " ... reduced visual impacts related to the presence of long segments of aerial rail guideway ... " It then continues with a long, descriptive narrative of how DR4 crosses I-5, goes under Barbur, climbs over 68th Parkway, and then turns south.</p> <p>While it is true that there are visual impacts for the B2 aerial light rail guideway when viewed from I-5 or crossing I-5 on Barbur, it is not unusual for a major overpass crossing a freeway with on and off ramps as is the case at 99W/Barbur/I-5. The visual impacts lost the will be more than offset by DR4's similar long segment of aerial rail guideway emerging from the Discount Tire location, rising over 68th Parkway, and then making a long sweeping curve dropping south to cross Red Rock Creek.</p> <p>We are including with this letter graphic representations of DR4 on 99W as described and mapped in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) prepared by Fat Pencil Studio of Portland. There are three views, an eastbound view approaching 68th Parkway on 99W, a westbound view approaching the same intersection, and a view from the north side of 99W looking south at 68th Parkway. DR4 removes the businesses along 99W with an industrial Light Rail aerial guideway. Such guideways usually run along freeways like I-205 or along other existing railroad tracks like the Orange Line in Milwaukie.</p> <p>Other anticipated benefits of DR4 cited in Table E-1 in Appendix E in terms of transit travel time, ridership, displacements, and costs. We believe these benefits also have problems and describe each below.</p> <p><u>Travel Time</u></p> <p>Although DR4 eliminates the curve of the B2 Alternative as it crosses I-5, it then goes under Barbur and will have to slow to stop if the Baylor Station is moved to 99W at 68<sup>th</sup> Parkway. From there it will leave the 99W Station, climb over 68th Parkway on an aerial guideway, and continue on a long curving, aerial guideway descending down to a bridge crossing Red Rock Creek.</p> <p>The length of DR4 from Barbur on the east side of I-5 to the Baylor Station is actually longer than the section of B2 that it replaces. The curvature of DR4 as it turns south has a tighter radius and is a sharper (i.e., slower) turn than B2, according to the map on Page F-27 in Appendix F. (We confirmed these measurements with tracing paper and the scale provide in Figure F-12.)</p> <p>Although DR4 straightens the curve that B2 would make crossing over I-5, it has to descend under Barbur, climb over 68th Parkway, and negotiate a tighter, descending curve as it heads south. While B2 will require trains to slow through turns as they approach the Baylor Station, DR4 will have to stop at a 99W/68th Station and then start</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to Refinement 4, which would run along the south side of Pacific Highway (99W) in the southern portion of Segment B (Outer Portland) and the northern portion of Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin) and would add a station at SW 68th Avenue. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.5, Visual Quality, of this Final EIS regarding concerns about visual impacts from elevated structures.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding property acquisitions and business displacements.</p> <p>Please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS regarding travel times and ridership for the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 13 regarding your concerns about process and timing of the Draft EIS analysis and outreach, including the design refinements.</p> <p>Regarding your concerns about impacts to wetland areas and creeks, please see Section 4.9, Ecosystems, and Section 4.10, Water Resources, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Regarding your concerns about whether Refinement 4 meets the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project goals, the Preferred Alternative, which includes Refinement 4, does meet all three goals listed in your comment.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.2, Land Use, of this Final EIS for more information on consistency with the Tigard Strategic Plan.</p>

**Table J2.3-2. Response to Draft EIS Business Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Business Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>climbing from a dead stop to cross over 68th Parkway. If the Baylor Station remains, DR4 will still have to slow to negotiate the tighter turn south and then have to slow just as it picks up speed in order to stop at the Baylor Station. The actual transit travel time by including DR4 will not be that significant and may actually increase.</p> <p><u>Ridership</u></p> <p>As a late addition to the IRP and DEIS, staff suggests the Baylor Station and Park &amp; Ride could be moved north to SW 68th Parkway and 99W to increase ridership because of the population demographics north of 99W. This certainly wasn't part of the plan for bringing the SW Corridor Light Rail Project into the Tigard Triangle for the last six years. If capturing ridership north of 99W was a goal, the Light Rail route should have been designed to come down the center of 99W like the Blue Line in Gresham on Burnside, and then turn south into downtown Tigard.</p> <p>The primary goal of the SW Corridor Light Rail Project is to accommodate the growth in the region, and support the design and vision of the Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan (TTSP.) Included is Figure 2 of the Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan. The Baylor and Beveland Stations are located in the two planned residential areas of the Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan and will promote more ridership from the high density housing and ground floor retail businesses that are planned for those areas. It also provides better ridership access for the existing and future businesses north of Baylor and the businesses and schools south of Beveland.</p> <p>Moving the Beveland Station north to Elmhurst with Design Refinement 5 and the Baylor Station north to 99W/68th with DR4, effectively gives only one stop in the Triangle. It moves Light Rail access away from businesses, universities, and high density housing to the south. Likewise, it moves access to Light Rail away from high density housing and retail stores already prepared for development at 69th Avenue between Dartmouth and Atlanta. This will only limit the mass transit-oriented development and potential in the Triangle.</p> <p>The DEIS does not provide any ridership statistics, but potential riders north of 99W will have to walk several blocks from the lower density neighborhoods, and then have to walk across five lanes of traffic on 99W to get to a station at that location. It's more likely that residents north of 99W will drive to the Park &amp; Ride. Moving the Baylor Park &amp; Ride north 1,500 feet to the south side of 99W is not going to be a compelling, extra incentive to attract a significant increase in ridership for residents north of 99W.</p> <p>The Baylor Station also makes more sense for the location of a Park &amp; Ride. It puts Light Rail access closer to the high population on the southeast side of the Haines Street Overpass at the east side of I-5. It also pulls more eastbound traffic during the morning rush hour off of 99W from the west entrance to Dartmouth or 72nd Avenue, than would a location on 68th Parkway where there are already log jams trying to access the I-5 northbound ramp.</p> <p>Pulling traffic off of 99W has been a longtime goal of ODOT and the City of Tigard. It's the reason why the original Tigard Triangle Master Plan adopted in the 1990's designated a "Backage Road," be constructed between 99W and Atlanta, from 68th Parkway to 72<sup>nd</sup>. This plan failed only because the area where the road was designated to be built was through Red Rock Creek and the wetlands around it. After 20 years, the City finally recognized the problems with this requirement and removed it in the Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan.</p> <p><u>Displacements</u></p> <p>DR4 displaces 10 businesses on 10 properties paying property taxes, 4 of which are minority-owned. Table E-1 claims that although DR4 would impact businesses south of 99W, it avoids impacts to businesses and homes on the west side of I-5. On Page E-13 it states that DR4 would avoid a partial property acquisition for one large office campus adjacent to I-5.</p> <p>According to Figure F-12, that large office campus is not actually a business, but the PERS Building and its parking lot. As a State agency, PERS does not pay property taxes. The building will remain intact, but some of its parking may be lost. Light Rail access at the Baylor Station will be at least a block closer than 68th and 99W to the PERS Building, which should be a net benefit to PERS, even with a loss of some parking.</p> <p>Table E-1 and the narrative for Design Refinement 5 claim to reduce the number of partial property acquisitions required by the original location of the Beveland Station, but increase the number of full acquisitions of single family homes on Elmhurst and Hermoso Way, as well as a partial acquisition of the Walmart property. However, it also results in an even greater number of full acquisitions of commercial properties than the narrative claims because it forces moving the Baylor Station north and out of the Triangle, resulting in the addition of DR4 and its acquisition of the ten commercial properties.</p> <p><u>Cost</u></p> <p>Both Table E-2 and Table E-1 state that DR4 and other design refinements will reduce costs. However, the first footnote in fine print for each table states:</p> <p><u>"Numbers are approximate and subject to change because the design refinements have not been analyzed at the same level of detail as the alignment alternatives in the Draft EIS ..."</u></p> <p>The Barbur Undercrossing's tunneling under Barbur is going to create its share of problems and costs, but there are more issues related to the cost of DR4. Its elevated aerial guideway over SW 68th Parkway will stay elevated as it turns and heads south towards the OEA property because the Lu's Sports Bar's grade has a significant drop from 99W heading south to the back of its parking lot above Red Rock Creek.</p> <p>Constructing the aerial guideway undoubtedly will be more expensive than it first appears because Lu's Sports Bar's parking lot is built over boulders and non-engineered fill excavated from the north side of 99W. This can be confirmed by comparing published contour maps and aerial photos taken before the late 1960's to similar maps and photos published and taken since the late 1970's. Stability may be sufficient for a parking lot, but may not be for the Light Rail trains.</p> <p>Route C2 with or without Design Refinement 5 crosses a wetland area before crossing over Highway 217. DR4 crosses Red Rock Creek and disturbs the one protected stretch of the creek and its surrounding wetlands between 68th Parkway and 72nd Avenue. Way Lee General Contractor has spent over \$144,000 since 2013 eradicating</p>	

**Table J2.3-2. Response to Draft EIS Business Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Business Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>approximately 2 acres of Himalayan blackberries and English Ivy, and planting over 3,000 native species under the direction of Clean Water Services, the Department of State Lands, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to enhance the wetlands at the east end of Red Rock Creek and 68th Parkway.</p> <p>One of the goals of the SW Corridor Light Rail Project is to, "Advance transportation projects that are sensitive to the environment ... " For at least three year we were led to believe that Light Rail would avoid this area with Routes B1-B4 avoiding the sensitive area by traveling along existing infrastructure. The late inclusion of DR4 violates this goal and adds a second crossing of a wetland area and a Clean Water Services' vegetated corridor in the Tigard Triangle by Light Rail.</p> <p>The addition of DR4 to the IRP is baffling. The visual impacts will be moved from the I-5 Freeway to the Northeast Entrance to Tigard. Transit travel time is questionable since the curvature of DR4 is actually tighter than any of the B1-B4 routes. DR4 moves the Baylor Station north, away from planned routes and high density development hoping to attract ridership from older, lower density neighborhoods across 99W. The partial loss of parking for a State agency building that benefits from Light Rail is coming at the expense of displacing 10 businesses, all of whom pay property taxes. Although there are claimed costs savings with all Design Refinements, each contains a footnote that their costs have not been analyzed at the same level of detail as the original route alternatives and are subject to change. Finally, DR4 includes a second crossing of wetlands in the Tigard Triangle.</p> <p>None of this adds up or seem to justify the need for DR4. For at least three years, the only routes into the Triangle from the east were the published B1-B2 routes. It was only last March that DR4 was added, and not really until last month that we were informed that our properties were a part of DR4-and DR4 has been added as part of the preferred route. Property owners on the DR4 route should have been afforded the same time during the last three years that property owners on the published Segments B and C Routes were given to comment on those proposed routes.</p> <p>The late addition of DR4 does not meet the goals of the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project. Listed among the purposes and needs for the Project according to S.2 of the DEIS are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· support adopted regional and local plans including ... the Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan ...</li> <li>· improve multimodal access to existing jobs, housing and educational opportunities ...</li> <li>· advance transportation projects that are sensitive to the environment, improve water and air quality, and help achieve the sustainability goals and measures in applicable state, regional and local plans</li> </ul> <p>For the last three years, two Light Rail stations have been part of the SW Corridor Light Rail Project in the Tigard Triangle to accommodate the planned, high density housing consistent with the design and vision of the Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan, and supporting existing jobs and educational opportunities. Relocating the Baylor Station north to 99W and 68th Parkway moves it away from prime land ready for transit-oriented housing and business development on 69th between Atlanta and Dartmouth.</p> <p>Moving the Beveland Station north to Elmhurst in DRS doesn't address the void of moving the Baylor Station because it doesn't move far enough north. It also moves access away from the business and universities at the south end of the Triangle.</p> <p>Modifying the original plan by inserting DR4 in the SW Corridor Light Rail Project not only reduces support for the Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan, it also doubles the impact and is less sensitive to the environment by creating a second Light Rail crossing of a wetland in the Triangle. We urge the Steering Committee to eliminate Design Refinement 4 from the Preferred Alternative Route.</p>	
B07	CJH LLC	Glenn L Hayter	<p>My name is Glenn Hayter, Managing Partner of CJH LLC, a family owned limited liability company. Since 1995 we have owned the building and property located at 7400 SW Landmark Lane, which for the entire time has been leased to a local manufacturer. Our company is a member of the Coalition for SW MAX Railroad Options, a group of businesses committed to the best interests of Tigard and the greater Portland area in seeking the most effective option in addressing the region's growing transportation needs.</p> <p>CJH LLC, and the Coalition supports the IRP (Initial Route Proposal) as it appears in the DEIS (Draft EIS) issued in June. With the IRP, the Partner staff recommended "through" route travels alongside existing rail tracks. Our review of the DEIS and its attachments fully and accurately support this IRP recommendation. This railroad route (C2), which the Coalition has been a proponent of all along, is the best route for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Faster travel time</li> <li>· Most cost effective to operate</li> <li>· Lower capital costs</li> <li>· Most comprehensive multimodal transportation plan with Tigard-Tualatin connectivity</li> <li>· Best support of the Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan</li> <li>· Most accessible to the residents and transit dependent people of Tigard</li> <li>· Displaces fewer businesses and employees and provides for significant economic development</li> <li>· Maintains projected ridership as anticipated</li> </ul> <p>Our support aligns with Metro, TriMet and other jurisdictional planning staff and engineers for this important project for the region.</p> <p>On behalf of CJH LLC and Coalition members, we request all deciding parties from this point forward support the IRP; the DEIS and its findings, in making the IRP the Preferred Alternative (PA) and moving this work into the FEIS (Final EIS) and the Regional Transit Plan.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for the railroad alignment in the southern portion of Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Alternative C2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p>

**Table J2.3-2. Response to Draft EIS Business Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Business Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
B08	Digital One	Eric Stolberg	<p>I am writing to flag our business as a noise and vibration sensitive location. We are located between SW 1st and Naito, along SW Lincoln. We are an audio post production facility (recording studio), working primarily with advertising agencies, films, and corporate clients with Monday-Friday 9-6 business hours.</p> <p>We reviewed the DEIS and it appears our recording studio was missed as a special use building along the alignment. On page 18 of Attachment E "Noise &amp; Vibration Technical Results Report", lines 6 and 7 which says, "As of this initial analysis, there were no special use buildings identified near the project alignments." In the DEIS statement, section 4.2.4 "Potential Mitigation Measures", it points out that no long-term land use impacts requiring mitigation have been identified for any of the light rail alternatives.</p> <p>In reviewing section 4.11.2, it discusses that vibration was measured along SW Lincoln and that the residences levels were below the FTA criteria. I'd like to point out that we worked with TriMet when the MAX Orange line was built. They installed a special vibration mat along Lincoln next to our building. They decided at the time to continue a lighter version of that mat along Lincoln between SW 4th and SW 1st to offset the vibration to the residences.</p> <p>Please let me know if you have any questions or would like to discuss our situation in more detail.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed concerns related to the SW Naito Parkway alignment in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternatives A2-BH and A2-LA in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration Impacts, of this Final EIS, regarding concerns about noise and vibration. As noted in your comment, the Draft EIS should have identified the Digital One property as a Category 1 receiver, because it was within the study area used for the Draft EIS (generally, 350 feet from the light rail alignment). However, in the Final EIS, the Preferred Alternative does not study noise or vibration impacts to this property, because the light rail vehicles would not run on SW Lincoln Street or SW Naito Parkway and the property is outside of the study area as described above.</p>
B09	Digital One	Michelle Stolberg	<p>Our business is located at 2112 SW 1st Ave, identified as map ID 99 on Appendix F Properties Affect by Acquisitions. I attended the open house last evening at the Hillsdale Library and was advised to place a comment here with any concerns. The proposed route would not run by our building, but the two alternate routes that go down Naito would have the track making a sharp turn from Lincoln onto Naito at the corner of our property. I'd like to flag that our business is sensitive to noise, and am concerned about the wheel squeal and vibration.</p> <p>We have previously worked with TriMet when the Orange line was redirected to go down Lincoln. Extensive testing has been completed and steps taken to mitigate the noise/vibrations that otherwise would have made it impossible to perform our work. Between 2009 to 2013, the building owners worked closely with Jonathan Tillman, Trimet's PMLR Mitigation Manager and Daly Standlee and Associates to conduct a study to determine the impacts of the rail line on the building. Multiple reports with recommendations were presented on both vibration mitigation and airborne noise mitigation. Trimet has these reports on record, but we are happy to present copies for review. They also have the records of the mitigation steps taken.</p> <p>I'm requesting to keep the communication open on what route is chosen and what we can expect if one of the alternate routes for Segment A is chosen.</p>	<p>Please see the response to Comment B08, above.</p>
B10	Girl Scouts of Oregon	Kevin Guinn	<p>Hi, I'm Kevin Guinn. I'm Director of Property for the Girl Scouts of Oregon, Southwest Washington. We have the property at 9620 Barbur Boulevard. I'm here this evening to provide testimony as it relates to our property in the Southwest Corridor Light Rail project. Our property is found on page F15, Southwest Corridor DEIS, Appendix F document with the identification numbers 6933 and 6934.</p> <p>We are impacted and yet we still support the project. GSOSW's preferred option is alternative B2, I-5 Barbur TC to 60th, which would locate the Barbur Transit Center station in the center of Barbur Boulevard. This option seems to have the least negative impact to our Portland service center. We understand that we will be contacted about the purchase of some property along the Barbur right-of-way, and we'll have further questions at that time.</p> <p>In closing, we'd like to share with you that the Girl Scouts have both a commitment to science, technology, engineering, and math programming, as well as a non-partisan civic engagement initiative called the Girl Agenda. As such, we would like to plant a seed with Metro and TriMet and ask you to consider engaging local Girl Scouts in the appropriate phase of planning and design. For example, perhaps we can have processes surrounding the selection of public art or landscape architecture. We'd also be happy to partner with you to provide girls with the opportunity to help shape the future of their community. Thanks a lot for your time and consideration, and good evening. Good luck.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for a center-running Barbur Transit Center station in Segment B (Outer Portland), which is studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p> <p>TriMet appreciates your request for staff to consider engaging with local Girl Scouts in future planning and design. Staff will make contact if future opportunities arise.</p>
B11	La Noue Development	Mark La Noue	<p>Thank you for arranging the introduction meeting with members of the staff at Metro and yourself this past week. The team's presentation outlined several alternative routs all of which could have a negative impact on the property that I own at 10075 SW Barbur Blvd.</p> <p>As a potentially impacted owner, I wish to state for the record that Alternative B2:I-5 Barbur TC to 60th, as presented, will have little or no encroachment on my property. With this design we may avoid litigation.</p> <p>The property in question is known as the Capital Corner Shopping Center. The Center is a two building complex anchored by Chase Bank in a stand alone facility and in the larger building we have nationally known tenants such Goodwell and Domino's Pizza. The configuration of the Center does not allow for a partial taking of either structure.</p> <p>I encourage all parties to this important project to give serious consideration to the B2 alignment. This design will have minor negative impact to the immediate neighborhood.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for an alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland) that would minimize impacts to your property. The alignment studied in the Draft EIS that would minimize impacts to your property is Alternative B1. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p>
B12	Les Schwab	David Gibson	<p>Les Schwab operates a store at 8910 SW Barbur Blvd. Two of the alternatives, I am informed by staff, would involve the elimination of our store that is less than 10 years old. This would result in the loss of around 20 living wage paying jobs, complete with health care and profit sharing. We cannot merely take any condemnation proceeds and build a store elsewhere. This store serves a discrete market and it is unlikely we can come up with a similar sized parcel in the same market.</p> <p>We support the development of mass transit. We support doing so in a manner that does not harm local businesses that contribute to the local economy and the livability of the community through support of many charitable and civic causes. The alternatives that put MAX along I-5 would help to bolster business, not harm it.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied in both Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for mass transit.</p>

**Table J2.3-2. Response to Draft EIS Business Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Business Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
B13	Oregon Education Association	James Fotter	<p>On behalf of the Oregon Education Association (OEA), please consider this letter as our formal comments regarding the proposed Southwest Corridor Light Rail Plan and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) currently available for public review.</p> <p>The OEA is a union that represents about 46,000 educators working in pre-kindergarten through grade 12 public schools and community colleges. OEA's membership includes licensed teachers and specialists, classified/education support professionals (ESPs), community college faculty, retired educators, and student members.</p> <p>Our organization is in favor of public transportation, including light rail, because it provides students and our members safe and economical access to schools and their community. However, the proposed route of the Southwest Corridor light rail significantly impacts our statewide office campus located at 6900 SW Atlanta Street, Tigard, Oregon 97223. The modified route runs the light rail along 70th Avenue, south of HWY 99 W. This alternate route cuts through the middle of our 17.76 acres of property.</p> <p>Outlined below are our preliminary comments on these impacts which will require further discussion, more precise information and economic evaluation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ability to Sell or Develop. The uncertainty of the potential route of light rail diminishes the market value of our property for at least seven years.</li> <li>2. Design Restriction. The potential for having light rail divide the property creates less flexibility in the development design for one large property, and two smaller properties create multiple building set back requirements which diminishes the market value of our property.</li> <li>3. Reduction of Property. The right of way for light rail is thirty-five feet wide and approximately six hundred feet in length. In addition, there will be a requirement to provide a construction and eventually a maintenance easement for one or both sides of the rail. The light rail easement alone is approximately 21,000 square feet and may double or triple in size in consideration of the other required easements.</li> <li>4. Compensation for Air Rights. The light rail right of way and the easements represent only the footprint of the diminished land area. The property is zoned to allow four story buildings so the total affected square footage is four times the footprint. Therefore, the market value of the property is diminished by the inability to utilize these air rights.</li> <li>5. Right to Peaceful Use and Enjoyment. The proposed light rail route crosses over and through two pristine wetland areas including one creek. In addition, the noise and obstruction of natural views caused by an elevated light rail diminishes both the market and environmental value of the property.</li> <li>6. Accessibility. The bisecting of our total property by the light rail prevents accessibility from the currently developed portion of our property to 72nd Avenue by walking, biking or automotive traffic, further diminishing the market value and quality of the future use of the property.</li> </ol> <p>In summary, we request that the Southwest Corridor planners consider and plan for an alternative light rail route, moving it away from 70th Avenue. At a minimum, we respectfully request that Metro and City of Tigard planners work with us to reduce the negative impacts to our property.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for public transportation and light rail.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed concerns regarding an alignment along SW 70th Avenue in the northern part of Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which is studied as Refinement 4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p> <p>Regarding your concerns about impacts to wetland areas and creeks, please see Section 4.9, Ecosystems, and Section 4.10, Water Resources, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration Impacts, of this Final EIS regarding concerns about noise.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.5, Visual Quality, of this Final EIS regarding concerns about visual impacts from elevated structures.</p>
B14	Paul Schatz Home Furnishings	Paul Shatz III	<p>My name is Paul Schatz III and I represent Paul Schatz Home Furnishings. We have been in the Portland Oregon area since 1919 when my grandfather started our company. Over the years our company has been located all over the Portland area: the Hollywood district in 1939, Tualatin in 1973, and Delta Park in 1985. All of these stores were leased property. In 1997 we had the opportunity to purchase a permanent location that we could build on for our family's future and that is where we are located now, just south of Bonita Road next to I-5. Our company is a member of the Coalition for SW MAX Railroad Options, a group of businesses committed to the best interests of Tigard and the greater Portland area in its transportation, wellness, economic and lifestyle needs.</p> <p>Four (4) of the six (6) alignment choices studied (the I-5 alignments) would have put a station and park &amp; ride where we exist today. The thought of losing this location is devastating to our family, and to all the other businesses that have moved to this economically developed area for similar reasons. These properties are irreplaceable. We are pleased that the project partner staff have recommended a railroad alignment in the IRP (Initial Route Proposal) that was incorporated into the DEIS (Draft EIS). They have recognized the value that all of our businesses (including historic Atiyeh Bros. Rugs and Carpeting and The Portland Clinic - serving over 7,000 patients) bring to the community and specifically the Tigard, Tualatin communities.</p> <p>Paul Schatz Home Furnishings and the Coalition supports the IRP as it appears in the DEIS issued in June. With the IRP, the Partner staff recommended "through" route travels alongside existing rail tracks. Our review of the DEIS and its attachments fully and accurately support this IRP recommendation. This railroad route (C2), which the Coalition has been a proponent of all along, is the best route for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Faster travel time</li> <li>· Most cost effective to operate</li> <li>· Lower capital costs</li> <li>· Most comprehensive multimodal transportation plan with Tigard-Tualatin connectivity</li> <li>· Best support of the Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan</li> <li>· Most accessible to the residents and transit dependent people of Tigard</li> <li>· Displaces fewer businesses and employees and provides for significant economic development</li> <li>· Maintains projected ridership as anticipated</li> </ul> <p>Our support is in alignment with Metro, TriMet and other jurisdictional planning staff &amp; engineers for this important project for the region.</p> <p>On behalf of Paul Schatz Home Furnishings and Coalition Members, we request all deciding parties from this point forward support the IRP, the DEIS and its findings, in making the IRP the Preferred Alternative (PA), and moving this work into the FEIS (Final EIS) and the Regional Transit Plan.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for the railroad alignment, as opposed to the I-5 alignment, in the southern portion of Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which is studied as Alternative C2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p>

**Table J2.3-2. Response to Draft EIS Business Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Business Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
B15	The Portland Clinic	Katie Dobler	<p>Good evening. My name is Katie Dobler. I'm the Chief Operations Officer for The Portland Clinic. The Portland Clinic is locally owned by physicians and will be celebrating its 100th anniversary in 2021.</p> <p>The Portland Clinic has one of its six branches located in Tigard along 1-5 between Bonita Road and Carmen Drive.</p> <p>We are proponents of public transportation and offer benefits for our 600 employees to utilize Trimet throughout the metro area. I personally, take light rail in from East County to Downtown. We also know that many of our 90,000 patients depend on public transportation to seek medical care at our clinics.</p> <p>The Portland Clinic is a member of the Coalition for SW MAX Railroad Options.</p> <p>We support the planning staff's recent recommendation to follow the railroad line from Downtown Tigard to Tualatin as it not only reduces potential project costs, but also allows for faster travel time and best access to the residents and transit dependent people of Tigard. The displacement of fewer businesses and employees as well as the potential for significant economic development along east boundaries and properties adjacent to the railroad is another plus.</p> <p>Our support is in alignment with the metro and jurisdictional planning staff &amp; engineers.</p> <p>I look forward to joining you this evening.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for the railroad alignment, as opposed to the I-5 alignment, in the southern portion of Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which is studied as Alternative C2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p>
B16	The Portland Clinic	Dick Clark	<p>I support Metro and Tri-Met choosing the alignment that parallels the railroad tracks from Downtown Tigard to Tualatin and doesn't impact businesses along I-5. Please find my attached letter representing the 600 employees of The Portland Clinic who support this option. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>My name is Dick Clark, the CEO of The Portland Clinic, which has one of its branches located at 6640 SW Redwood Lane along 1-5 between Carmen Drive and Bonita Road - within the study area of the Southwest Corridor Light Rail extension.</p> <p>The Portland Clinic is nearing its centennial celebration having started with four pioneer doctors in Downtown Portland in 1921. We are locally owned by 45 physicians and now employ 600 health care providers are our six locations - four of which are located in east Washington County.</p> <p>We have established a network of branches to serve our 90,000 patients throughout the metro area. We have leased our branch office at Redwood Lane for the last 17 years. We have a long-term lease to continue operation there for at least the next 13 years. The branch has grown in its popularity and convenience and now serves 7,000 patients - about half of them are seniors coming from nearby King City and Summerfield Estates.</p> <p>We have been able to create a network of health care providers around the clinic in Tigard and Lake Oswego to serve most of the needs of our patients and regularly refer patients to nearby Meridian Park Hospital and Providence St. Vincent Medical Center.</p> <p>That is why we were concerned to learn about some of the alignment options for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail project. We wanted to offer constructive and proactive input to the process. Thus, our company helped form the Coalition for SW MAX Railroad Options, a group of businesses committed to the best interests of Tigard and the greater Portland area in seeking the most effective option in addressing the region's growing transportation needs.</p> <p>Four (4) of the six (6) alignment choices studied (the 1-5 alignments) would have required the demolition of our medical clinic in order for the MAX line to run adjacent along 1-5 between Bonita Road and Carmen Drive. The thought of losing this location is devastating to our doctors and patients.</p> <p>We are pleased that the project partner staff at Metro and Tri-Met listened to our concerns and have recommended a railroad alignment in the IRP (Initial Route Proposal) that was incorporated into the DEIS (Draft EIS). They have recognized the value that all of our businesses (including historic Atiyeh Bros. Rugs and Carpeting and Paul Schatz Home Furnishings) bring to the community and specifically the Tigard and Tualatin communities.</p> <p>The Portland Clinic and the Coalition supports the IRP as it appears in the DEIS issued in June. With the IRP, the Partner staff recommended "through" route travels alongside existing rail tracks. Our review of the DEIS and its attachments fully and accurately support this IRP recommendation. This railroad route (C2), which the Coalition has been a proponent of all along, is the best route for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Faster travel time</li> <li>· Most cost effective to operate</li> <li>· Lower capital costs</li> <li>· Most comprehensive multimodal transportation plan with Tigard-Tualatin connectivity</li> <li>· Best support of the Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan</li> <li>· Most accessible to the residents and transit dependent people of Tigard</li> <li>· Displaces fewer businesses and employees and provides for significant economic development</li> <li>· Maintains projected ridership as anticipated</li> </ul> <p>Our support is totally consistent with Metro, TriMet and other jurisdictional planning staff &amp; engineers for this important project for the region.</p> <p>On behalf of The Portland Clinic, we request all deciding parties from this point forward support the IRP, the DEIS and its findings, in making the IRP the Preferred Alternative (PA) and moving this work into the FEIS (Final EIS) and the Regional Transit Plan.</p>	<p>Please see the response to Comment B15, above.</p>

**Table J2.3-2. Response to Draft EIS Business Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Business Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
B17	The Portland Clinic	Michelle Cheney	<p>Good evening. My name is Michelle Cheney. I am the Branch Manager for The Portland Clinic South Office, located in Tigard along I-5 between Bonita Road and Carmen Drive at 6640 S.W. Redwood Lane. I have been a proud Tigard resident for 14 years and I serve on the Board of Directors for the Tigard Chamber of Commerce.</p> <p>The Portland Clinic South Location has 7,000 primary care patients and we serve between 150 - 200 patients per day. We have 15 specialty departments, a lab and an overnight sleep center. We have 1,500 patients who are over 65 and come to our clinic from nearby communities.</p> <p>The South Clinic is one of our six branches in the Portland Area which total 600 employees. We are proponents of public transportation and offer half-price TriMet passes to our employees to use throughout the metro area. We also know that many of our 90,000 patients depend on public transportation to seek medical care at our clinics.</p> <p>The Portland Clinic is a member of the coalition of Tigard businesses named "Coalition for SW MAX Railroad Options." Members of the Steering Committee, The Portland Clinic, and the Coalition support the IRP (Initial Route Proposal) as it appears in the DEIS (Draft EIS) issued in June.</p> <p>With the IRP, the Partner staff recommended "through" route travels alongside existing rail tracks This railroad route (C2), which the Coalition has been a proponent of all along, is the best route for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Faster travel time</li> <li>· Most cost effective to operate with lower capital costs</li> <li>· Most comprehensive multimodal transportation plan with Tigard-Tualatin connectivity</li> <li>· Best route to support the Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan</li> <li>· Most accessible to the residents of Tigard</li> <li>· Displaces fewer businesses and employees and provides for significant economic development</li> <li>· Maintains projected ridership as anticipated</li> </ul> <p>Our support is in alignment with Metro, TriMet and other jurisdictional planning staff &amp; engineers for this important project for the region.</p> <p>On behalf of The Portland Clinic and Coalition Members, I request the Committee support the IRP, the DEIS and its findings, in making the IRP the Preferred Alternative (PA) in August, moving this work into the FEIS (Final EIS) and the Regional Transit Plan.</p>	Please see the response to Comment B15, above.
B18	The Portland Clinic	Michelle Cheney	<p>Good evening. My name is Michelle Cheney and I am the Clinic Manager for the Portland Clinic south office. We are located in Tigard along I-5, between Bonita Road and Carmen Drive. Our address is 6640 Southwest Redwood Lane. I've been a proud Tigard resident for 14 years. I also serve on the Board of Directors for the Tigard Chamber of Commerce.</p> <p>The Portland Clinic south location has 7,000 primary care patients. We serve between about 150 and 200 patients per day. We have 15 specialty departments, including primary care. We have also have an overnight sleep center. We have 1,500 patients who are over 65. They come to our clinic from nearby communities.</p> <p>The south clinic is one of six clinics in the Portland area and we have about 600 employees. We are big proponents of public transportation and offer half-price TriMet passes to all of our employees. We also know that many of our 90,000 patients depend on public transportation to seek medical care at clinics.</p> <p>The Portland Clinic is a member of a coalition of Tigard businesses called the Coalition for Southwest MAX Railroad Options. Members of the Steering Committee, the Portland Clinic and the coalition support the initial route proposal as it appears in the DEIS.</p> <p>With the IRP, the partner staff recommended through route travels alongside rail tracks. The railroad route C2, which the coalition has been a proponent of all along, is the best route for the following reasons. Faster travel time, most cost effective to operate, lower capital costs, most comprehensive multi-modal transportation plan with the Tigard-Tualatin connectivity, and the best route to support the Tigard triangle strategic plan most accessible to the residents of Tigard.</p> <p>We feel it displaces fewer businesses and employees, and provides for a significant economic development. It also maintains projected ridership as anticipated. Our support is in alignment with Metro, TriMet, and other jurisdictional planning staff and engineers for this important project for the region.</p> <p>On behalf of the Portland Clinic and coalition members, I request that the Committee support the IRP to DEIS findings and making the IRP the preferred alternative in August, moving this work from the final EIS and the regional transit plan. Thank you.</p>	Please see the response to Comment B15, above.

**Table J2.3-2. Response to Draft EIS Business Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Business Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
B19	Stahancyk, Kent & Hook P.C.	Jody L. Stahancyk, Laurel P. Hook and Joel J. Kent	<p>Our building located at 2400 SW 4th Avenue in Portland, Oregon is included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) of the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project because it will be negatively impacted by the proposed Segment A, Inner Portland, Alternative A-1, Barbur route.</p> <p>On page 39 of the Cultural Resource Survey for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project, the writers correctly identify our building as "likely eligible for listing" in the National Register of Historic Places, but the writers of this Cultural Resource Survey have done you a disservice as they do not further explain the particular historical significance of this building.</p> <p>We purchased this building in 2013, in part because we were acquainted with the exquisite architectural work of William Fletcher. William Fletcher's design skills are on par with modernist contemporaries such as Pietro Belluschi and John Yeon. Very few of the original Fletcher buildings from the 1960s remain intact, however our building is distinguished as being maintained in a manner consistent with its original design.</p> <p>This building was featured in the Oregonian at its conception. It was dedicated over 51 years ago by Eugene Farley and Mayor Terry Schunk on Thursday, April 27, 1967. At the dedication, Mayor Schunk noted that this building was a "Portland First" in being fully leased on the day of dedication. (See attached 4/28/67 Oregonian article.)</p> <p>The property at 2400 SW 4th Avenue is iconic of an important era in South Portland in the 1960s as it was built in the first phase of the South Auditorium Urban Renewal Project. During the renewal, an upgrade to the area was accomplished but many culturally significant buildings were wiped out by the project. Please don't wipe out another historic building! (See attached Duniway Plaza Origins Book.)</p> <p>The Oregonian reported on the unique property and landscape design in 1965. (See attached 10/31/65 Oregonian article.) The landscaping was an integral part of the building's construction as the building owners planned "landscaping to blend the site into the surrounding view of the river, mountains, western hills and the urban redevelopment area." This was the intent for all William Fletcher buildings, but with our building it was carried out as demonstrated in the attached design photo. (See attached design diagram of Duniway Plaza.)</p> <p>The property still boasts most of the original Azalea and Rhododendron plants from 1963. A number of these trees have grown much larger than expected and as a landscape architect employed to restore the property to its intended beauty has indicated, these Rhododendrons are a special kind from the 1960s that were not supposed to grow so high. When asked why the plants grew so large, he said "after 50 years, you'll get large too." (See attached letter from Craig Kiest, Landscape Architect).</p> <p>We have maintained the windows to be historically accurate. We fear that the shaking from the construction and light rail will make it impossible for us to maintain the historical significance of the building, as it will be cost-prohibitive and the building will have to be torn down.</p> <p>We beg you to not put the light rail on Barbur, because we will not be able to remediate the damage that occurs. While we firmly support the purposes of this project and recognize the need for its completion, the appropriate route for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Segment A, Inner Portland, is Alternative A2-BH, Naito with Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please accept this letter as our official comments on the Initial Route Proposal and DEIS study.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p> <p>To learn more about historic properties studied in the Final EIS, please see Section 4.6, Historic and Archaeological Resources, as well as the <i>Cultural Resource Survey for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project, Multnomah and Washington Counties, Oregon</i>, which is provided as Attachment C to this Final EIS, as well as Appendix F, Section 106 Documentation Forms, of Attachment C.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration Impacts, of this Final EIS regarding concerns about vibration.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for the SW Naito Parkway alignment, as opposed to the SW Barbur Boulevard alignment, in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternatives A2-BH and A2-LA in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
B20	Summit Properties, Inc.	Yoshio Kurosaki	<p>Summit Properties, Inc. ("Summit") owns two properties in the City of Tigard (7330 SW Landmark Lane and 7555 SW Tech Center Drive) within the vicinity of certain route segments considered as part of the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project. Summit has followed the public process with interest over the last several years. Please accept these comments on the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("DEIS") for consideration by the Southwest Corridor Steering Committee in its selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p> <p><u>We support the Initial Route Proposal, including the C2: Ash to Railroad Alignment.</u></p> <p>For a variety of reasons outlined in the DEIS, the Initial Route Proposal is the right choice for the community at large. Specifically, the C2: Ash to Railroad Alignment has a number of advantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Preferred by 61% of commuters.</li> <li>· Lower cost to build.</li> <li>· Fewer impacts on private properties and business owners.</li> <li>· Faster travel times</li> <li>· Use of existing railroad right-of-way.</li> <li>· Additional redevelopment opportunities along railroad corridor.</li> <li>· No complicated crossing at 72nd.</li> </ul> <p><u>We do not support the I-5 or C1 and C3 alignments.</u></p> <p>As noted above, Summit owns properties that would be impacted by the "I-5" or C1 and C3 alignments. Specifically, the I-5 alignment in alternatives C1 and C3 would require at least one of the existing buildings be demolished and its businesses displaced. The industrial buildings on these properties have longstanding tenants that contribute significantly to the regional economy, and there are few sites within the Metro area that could easily accommodate such uses. In addition, the close proximity to the freeway of the I-5 alignment presents a number of other issues, including the absence of a walkable environment and little developable adjacent land.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for the opportunity to comment.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for the railroad alignment, as opposed to the I-5 alignment, in the southern portion of Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which is part of Alternative C2 studied in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p>
B21	James L. Shook, CPA	James L. Shook	<p>I am a small business and property owner on SW Beveland St. As you probably know, Beveland St. has a high concentration of small businesses, many of whom have been here for 20+ years and have personally invested in the infrastructure of this area. We are a community of small businesses who know each other by first name. We care about our neighborhood and we support mass transit. Most of us have participated heavily in the SW Corridor Light Rail Project Committee meetings and public hearings.</p>	<p>Section 4.4, Communities, of the Draft EIS acknowledges the concerns raised about impacts to community cohesion among the business owners and employees along SW Beveland Street.</p>

**Table J2.3-2. Response to Draft EIS Business Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Business Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>As you evaluate the potential paths for the SW Corridor project, we encourage you to consider the Elmhurst St. Locally Preferred Alternative as a replacement for the Beveland St. Initial Route Proposal. The Elmhurst option offers several advantages over the original Beveland St. path:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. TriMet has described that a lower travel time increases ridership and is an important attribute for successful mass transit. The Elmhurst St. route offers an opportunity to incrementally decrease the total travel time between Portland and downtown Tigard.</li> <li>2. The Elmhurst St. route would avoid a transportation "hot spot" identified by Anthony Buczek of Metro. During the April 2nd, 2018 Community Advisory Committee Meeting, Anthony described two obstacles with the Beveland St. route: the freight traffic in connection with Lowe's and the impact on street parking heavily relied on for the small businesses on Beveland St. The Elmhurst St. alternative route would avoid both of these obstacles.</li> <li>3. In conjunction with the Locally Preferred Alternative that would shift the proposed "Baylor/Clinton station" farther North towards Hwy 99, an Elmhurst station would provide a wider geographic range of access, or "walksheds", and far less overlap (without gaps) in station coverage than the original Initial Route Proposal (Beveland St.).</li> <li>4. A max station on Elmhurst would provide greater access to mass transportation for employees of large employers in this area, including Walmart, Costco and Winco.</li> <li>5. The Elmhurst St. route would avoid the destruction of the Hampton Park Apartments located at 12320 SW 72nd Ave. We are all familiar with the current shortage of affordable housing in Portland and surrounding area.</li> <li>6. The Elmhurst St. route would be far less expensive to purchase the underdeveloped land than the well-developed buildings existing on Beveland St. We are literally comparing a dilapidated, graffiti covered barn and empty lots on Elmhurst St. to the millions of dollars spent to build commercial buildings on Beveland St.</li> <li>7. The Elmhurst St. route would protect the type of development the City is trying to encourage in the Tigard Triangle. The buildings on Beveland St. are well maintained and owners continue to invest in their property. We have personally spent almost \$1,000,000 on our property here and our business generates over \$1,000,000 year in services that are taxed locally here. We also employ six people here who's families rely on us for their financial well-being, as compared to the Elmhurst St. option which contains no such business at all to be disrupted.</li> <li>8. The Elmhurst St. route would protect the wide range of small businesses that exist on Beveland St. Beveland St. has been an incubator for small businesses due to its unique access to highways and proximity to the people they serve. This diversified group of small businesses includes mediators, therapists, architects, psychologists, financial advisors, attorneys, doctors, printers, optometrists and accountants. Relocating these small businesses outside of the area would be disruptive and detrimental to the businesses.</li> </ol> <p>We urge you to consider the Elmhurst St. option. It appears to be less costly than Beveland St. and offers several advantages which will positively impact the community. In addition, the Elmhurst St. option will avoid destroying a community of affordable housing and avoid negatively impacting many businesses along Beveland St. I appreciate your time and consideration.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for the SW Elmhurst Street alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which is studied as Refinement 5 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and business displacements.</p>
B22	James L. Shook, CPA	Jeremy Shook	<p>I am a business and property owner on 7410 Beveland St. My father and I both own the CPA firm and building we practice in. We have attended various CAC and Steering Committee meetings to keep informed about the project and to consult with the member and local representatives. We support mass transit. We are concerned however that there is much better alternative for the route the transit takes. Many business owners on Beveland St. who are friends with one another and some even family who have invested their livelihood on the infrastructure of this neighborhood are in danger of losing all they have worked so hard to build.</p> <p>There is a preferred alternative route to the initial route proposal, Elmhurst St. There are many advantages if you were to select the locally preferred alternative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Avoid transportation "hot spot" as identified by Anthony Buczek of Metro during the April 2, 2018 CAC meeting. He identified issues with freight traffic from Lowes on Beveland St. and the heavily relied on street parking for small business on Beveland St. Elmhurst St. alternative eliminates both of these issues.</li> <li>· Create a wider geographic range of access and far less overlap in station coverage because of the preferred alternative route's closer proximity to Hwy 99</li> <li>· Decrease in total travel time from Portland to Tigard which will lead to increase in ridership.</li> <li>· Greater access to for employees of large employers in the area; Walmart, Costco, Winco.</li> <li>· Avoid destruction of Hampton Park Apartments on 12320 SW 72nd; one of the last remaining affordable housing in the area.</li> <li>· Less Expensive: It would be far less expensive to buy the underdeveloped and abandoned structures on Elmhurst than it would to buy the highly invested in, and modern building structures on Beveland St.</li> <li>· Protect the type of development the city encourages for the Tigard Triangle area; well maintained and actively investing in. Also protect the diversified group of small businesses practicing along Beveland St. and their unique location with rare access to highways and the customers they serve. Relocating them would be disruptive and devastating to the business' health and longevity.</li> </ul> <p>Please consider the Elmhurst St. option.</p>	<p>Please see the response to Comment B21, above.</p>

**Table J2.3-2. Response to Draft EIS Business Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Business Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
B23	T. Scandia Motors	Regina Dibb	<p>My name is Regina Dibb. I represent T. Scandia Motors located at 8848 SW Commercial St. Tigard. I support the initial route proposal (IRP) particularly in Segment C for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. First and most important, IRP would not create as much traffic congestion on Hall Blvd comparing to other alternatives that require crossing Hall Blvd twice. As it is now, traffic on Hall Blvd is congested particularly when the freight train crosses and switches tracks on Hall Blvd during the day. Sometimes the traffic is stop for 5-10 minutes. Imagine how much more traffic will be if it will have to stop every 7 -15 min. for light rail.</li> <li>2. There would be less relocation of residents and businesses and hence less cost, also another key factor.</li> <li>3. Even though the Tigard TC would shift further from Tigard Downtown area but it is closer to the City Hall and Tigard Public Library which makes it more convenient for many people who need to conduct business with at the City Hall and utilize the public library.</li> </ol> <p>I would like to encourage the planning committee to do further study and analysis on the IRP and recommend it as a viable route to the final plan. Thank you for your considerations.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for the initial route proposal in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which includes Alternative C2, Refinement 4, Refinement 5 and Refinement 6 as studied in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p>
B24	Unspecified	Linda Nishi-Strattner	<p>I am a minority woman small business owner on Beveland Street who is opposed to the construction of light rail on Beveland Street. I urge you to consider the Design Refinement #5: Elmhurst of your Initial Route Proposal, as presented in Figure S-7 on page S-18 of your June 2018 packet. Design Refinement #5 would avoid our street, leaving the 23 small businesses located on Beveland Street intact. Your actions today will either maintain or destroy the livelihoods of scores of families, so I hope you will keep an open mind as I make four points in favor of Design Refinement #5.</p> <p><u>A train route through Beveland will obliterate small family enterprises.</u> Eighteen years ago, we were the first small business to take the risk of investing in Beveland Street in the Tigard Triangle by converting an abandoned house into a clinic for mental health professionals. Beveland Street now houses more than 23 practices and small business enterprises.</p> <p><u>A train route through Beveland will hurt the Tigard Triangle:</u> The city of Tigard required us to put in sidewalks, plant trees, widen the street, install street lights, build curbs, and form an LID to bring the sewer line up from Hwy 217, all in service of developing the Tigard Triangle. A train route through our businesses would destroy one of the most populated and well-developed streets in the Tigard Triangle. Our businesses draw children, parents, couples, families, and adults to the Tigard Triangle every week, and of course they patronize our other Tigard Triangle businesses, which further invigorates the economy of this tiny area. If we must move, our clientele will certainly move with us.</p> <p><u>A train route through Beveland will eliminate mental health services:</u> Is Tri-Met a friend to mental health services? Our nine professionals in our building alone provide 160 mental health clients with services each week. Our next door neighbors at Western Psychological &amp; Counseling Services provide another 180 mental health clients with services each week. So together, we serve about 340 mental health clients each week. Each week. These services would disappear from Tigard if the light rail goes through Beveland Street.</p> <p><u>A train route through Beveland will destroy our small business community:</u> The other businesses located on Beveland Street provide valuable services and they generate income for the city of Tigard. Together, we are mental health providers, retirement investment managers, CPAs, engineers, sleep disorders clinic, consultants, cafe owners, optometrists, naturopaths, human resource trainers, and more. We will all be obliterated and our businesses ruined if Tri-Met directs the light rail over Beveland Street.</p> <p>Please do not destroy our 23 small businesses after we have turned Beveland Street into a thriving small business community that it is today. Please don't fool yourselves into thinking that we'll just start over somewhere else. Many of us will simply not survive. Please consider routing light rail through Elmhurst and away from Beveland Street.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>	<p>Section 4.4, Communities, of the Draft EIS acknowledges the concerns raised about impacts to community cohesion among the business owners and employees along SW Beveland Street.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for the SW Elmhurst Street alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which is studied as Refinement 5 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and business displacements.</p>
B25	Unspecified	Mark Nishi-Strattner	<p>I am in support of the Design Refinement option # 5, the Elmhurst St. option. I am a partner in an office building on SW Beveland St. and although I don't work at that location, I, and my partners, have contributed money, sweat and emotional energy to make that location a welcoming and successful business. Losing that building to light rail would be devastating. Please support the Elmhurst St. option for the SW corridor light rail project.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>Please see the response to Comment B24, above.</p>

**Table J2.3-2. Response to Draft EIS Business Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Business Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
B26	Village Inn	Ryan Sweeney	<p>Good evening, I'm Ryan Sweeney. I'm co-owner of the Village Inn Restaurant located at 17070 Southwest 72nd Avenue, on the border of Tigard and Tualatin. My family and I have owned that restaurant since 1977. It was my first job when I was 10 years old. I worked there throughout high school and college, and when I graduated college, I became a general manager, and just last spring, I became an owner.</p> <p>I'm here tonight because I've had a chance to review the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and I have some objections and I've brought a couple alternative options. Obviously, my first and foremost concern is that the plan currently calls for my restaurant to be relocated, and I am adamantly opposed to that. In lieu of relocating my business, I would offer a few suggestions. One would be to look at the property directly north of my property because I feel that that property -- it's one tax lot. It's much bigger. It can accommodate the parking garage, the bus turnaround, plus it would shorten the length of the terminus, which would save some money. Also it would free up the south TriMet Park &amp; Ride lot for future development.</p> <p>And I also feel like the businesses that are there currently would have better opportunity for successful relocation. To give you an example, the Bed Bath &amp; Beyond has six area locations and they're headquartered in Union, New Jersey. DWS has five area locations and they're headquartered in Columbus, Ohio. Men's Wearhouse has seven Portland area locations and they're located in Houston. Whereas, Village Inn is owned by myself and my mother and we live here in town. And also, I feel like our business is more location-dependent than the aforementioned businesses. That would be one option.</p> <p>The second option would be to move the bus turnaround to south TriMet Park &amp; Ride location to be next to the parking garage. And as this would preserve our property and just so you know, it's not just me who is concerned about it. We have over 300 comment cards and we've collected almost 1,000 signatures within a couple weeks. And as I'm sure you'll probably hear tonight, there are a lot of people in the community who are concerned about it, and they don't want to lose their favorite restaurant. Thank you very much for your time, and appreciate you letting me speak.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.</p>
B27	Village Inn	Ryan Sweeney	<p>Good evening. Ryan Sweeney, Village Inn Restaurant. I spoke last week, as well. I'm still opposed to the plan as it is today as it still calls for wiping out my restaurant, my business, my livelihood. Staff has known since December of 2015 that Bridgeport Village was going to be the terminance versus downtown Tualatin.</p> <p>I was first notified in June of 2017, and I was curious what happened in those 18 months when you decided that you were going to take the property that my business sits on? What happened in those 18 months when I was first notified and when the decision was made to take my property? I'll tell you what happened on my end. I personally made a financial agreement to buy into this business. We finalized the deal in March. And I spoke with you in June and you told me that you were taking my property.</p> <p>I've been participating in this process, participating by going to community action committee meetings, steering committee meetings. I've met with Metro, Tri-Met at our restaurant and at the Chamber of Commerce. Nothing's changed, though. I haven't got any answers. I have seen one drawing that wouldn't take my property but it was literally done in color pencil. So I'm asking staff when will I know what's going to happen to my property? Is it going to be when the bond passes in 2020 or is it going to be when the feds decide to fund or de-fund the project? I need to know so I can make decisions.</p> <p>I've already lost enough time on this deal. I know you'll probably say you don't know the answer to that question, which is understandable, but I just need to know where I sit so I can make decisions for the long term best interests of myself and my family. Thank you very much for your time.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.</p>
B28	Way W. Lee General Contractor, Inc.	Ken Lee	<p>My family owns two properties at the south intersection of Pacific Highway 99W and SW 68th Parkway that will be acquired if Design Refinement 4 (DR4) is included in the Preferred Alternative route for the SW Corridor Plan. They are leased to the Chang's Mongolian Grill at 10900 SW 68th Parkway and the Tigard Chick-Fil-A at 10935 SW 68th Parkway, Tigard, OR 97223.</p> <p>We oppose the inclusion of DR4 in the Initial Route Proposal and ask the Steering Committee to exclude it from the Preferred Alternative. We feel this refinement has deficiencies, faulty assumptions, and more negative impacts than hoped for. We specifically address the claims and benefits below as outlined in Appendix E, Pages E-12 &amp; E-13 of the DEIS (and summarized in Table E-1 on Page E-23, as well as Figure F-12 on Page F-27 in Appendix F.)</p> <p><u>Impacts Addressed</u></p> <p><i>"This design refinement would reduce visual impacts related to the presence of long segments of arterial light rail guideway..."</i></p> <p>While this is true, such visual impacts are common on freeways with access ramps and overpasses. I-205 has greater visual impacts with the Max Red Line heading to and from the airport. If there are problems associated with the visual impacts of the Max Red Line that DR4 will reduce or eliminate on the SW Corridor Light Rail Line, they should be included in the DEIS.</p> <p>DR4 simply moves the visual impacts from I-5 where the public expects to see them, to Pacific Highway, which is the east entrance and major commercial highway into the City of Tigard. Elevated light rail structures like DR4 that aren't on highways or bridges crossing rivers are usually hidden or located in industrial areas, such as the section of the Milwaukie Orange Line near SE Ochoco in the photos on Page 5 of this letter.</p> <p>We commissioned Fat Pencil Studios of Portland to prepare 3D model renderings of what DR4 might look like based on its description on Page E-12 in Appendix E of the DEIS. They can be seen on Pages 6 and 7 of this letter.</p> <p><u>Key Assumptions</u></p> <p><i>"Access to the existing Quality Inn hotel from Pacific Highway would remain in place."</i></p> <p>This assumption is confusing. The Quality Inn is being replaced by the Baylor Park &amp; Ride structure according to the Initial Route Proposal.</p> <p><u>Overall Changes in Impacts or Other Benefits</u></p> <p><i>"Compared to Alternative B2, this design refinement would straighten the curve of the light rail guideway and more efficiently cross the I-5/SW Barbur Boulevard interchange, and would improve transit travel time."</i></p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to Refinement 4, which would run along the south side of Pacific Highway (99W) in the southern portion of Segment B (Outer Portland) and the northern portion of Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin) and would add a station at SW 68th Avenue. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.5, Visual Quality, of this Final EIS regarding concerns about visual impacts from elevated structures.</p> <p>Regarding the Quality Inn, the statement on page E-12 in Appendix E, Potential Design Refinement Concepts and Options, of the Draft EIS was included in error. Both the Draft EIS and Final EIS indicate that the existing Quality Inn property would be utilized for a portion of a park and ride facility at the 68th Avenue station, as a result of the inclusion of Design Refinement 4 in the Draft EIS initial route proposal and the Final EIS Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS regarding travel times and ridership for the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.2, Land Use, of this Final EIS for more information on consistency with the Tigard Strategic Plan.</p> <p>Regarding your concerns about impacts to wetland areas and creeks, please see Section 4.9, Ecosystems, and Section 4.10, Water Resources, of this Final EIS.</p>

**Table J2.3-2. Response to Draft EIS Business Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Business Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>While DR4 does straighten the curve over I-5, it becomes a roller coaster as it dives under Barbur/Pacific Highway, rises over 68th Parkway, and then requires a sharper curve to turn south to connect with 70th Avenue.</p> <p><i>“This design refinement would reduce the length of aerial guideway that would need to be constructed over the existing I-5 travel lanes and ramps, thereby reducing traffic impacts and lane or ramp closures during construction. This would also reduce the visibility of light rail elements in the overall landscape.”</i></p> <p>While the length of the aerial guideway would be reduced along with traffic impacts and lane or ramp closures during construction, it does so at the expense of removing at least five businesses. It will not reduce the visibility of light rail elements in the overall landscape—it will actually increase it. While there may be a small number of homes who will see the guideway over the existing overpasses and freeway ramps that have been in place for decades, the vast majority of viewers will be motorists on Barbur and I-5. There will be a greater number of homes, businesses, restaurant customers on the north side, and traffic, which will be subjected to a closer view of that guideway along Pacific Highway.</p> <p><i>“Compared to Alternative B2, this design refinement would construct the light rail trackway closer to homes north of Pacific Highway/SW Barbur Boulevard in the Metzger and Crestwood Neighborhoods. Shifting the Baylor or Clinton Station north to Pacific Highway would improve transit access for these residents and increase ridership on the line.”</i></p> <p>The Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan (TTSP,) described in Appendix B on Page B4.4-19, identifies two areas targeted for high density housing as shown in Figure 2 of the TTSP and Page 8 of this letter. The Beveland and Baylor Stations included with Alternatives B1-B4, fully support the TTSP. The Beveland Station provides access to the offices and universities at the south end of the Triangle as well. The Baylor Station provides direct access to properties ready for transit oriented housing and corresponding commercial/retail development.</p> <p>Moving the Beveland Station north to Elmhurst makes light rail less accessible to the existing businesses and universities to the south. Moving the Baylor Station to 99W and 68th moves it away from high density housing planned around Baylor and Clinton Streets between 69th and 72nd Avenues with the hopes of attracting ridership north of 99W.</p> <p>While the population north of 99W is greater than that to the south, it is spread out among lower density neighborhoods. Potential riders from north of 99W will likely need to walk much greater distances just to get to 99W and 68th, and then they will have to cross 5 lanes of traffic to get to the station. It’s more likely that motivated riders north of 99W will drive to the Park &amp; Ride, in which case the extra 1,500 feet from 68th to the Baylor Station (calculated using the scale of Figure F12 on Page F-27 in Appendix F) will not be a deterrent, even in the winter.</p> <p>Moving the Beveland and Baylor Stations north may work against the design of the Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan and could end up leaving the glass half empty, like the original Tigard Triangle Master Plan adopted in the 1990’s.</p> <p><i>“Compared to Alternative B2, this design refinement would result in additional full or partial property acquisitions, particularly commercial properties south of SW Barbur Boulevard/Pacific Highway and west of I-5. However, one large office campus adjacent to I-5 on the west side would be avoided.”</i></p> <p>The “one large office campus adjacent to I-5 on the west side,” is the PERS office building and parking lot. PERS has a known parking space shortage at that property and has leased parking spaces under contract from our properties in the past, most recently from October 2014 to April 2017. Alternative B2 may have a temporary impact on the PERS property, but it stands to benefit from light rail more than any existing business in the area.</p> <p><i>“Compared to Alternative B2, this alternative would cross a similar area of City of Tigard Goal 5 Habitat classified as “Moderately Limit” but would also cross a designated Clean Water Services Vegetated Corridor as it travels south along SW 70th Avenue.”</i></p> <p>This is true. My company has already spent over \$144,000 for the removal of the Himalayan Blackberries and English Ivy invasive species, and planted over 3,000 native plants to enhance the two acres at the east end of the Clean Water Services Vegetated Corridor where Red Rock Creek crosses under 68th Parkway. The Alternative B2 crossing near I-5 is not conducive to wildlife habitat because of its proximity to the freeway.</p> <p>On the other hand, Red Rock Creek between 68th and 72nd is the one area of the Triangle where the wetlands and wildlife habitat can be protected. This stretch of CWS Vegetated Corridor could be negatively affected by light rail trains zooming overhead every ten minutes.</p> <p>Finally, Table E-1 does claim that DR4 will reduce Capital Costs. This presumes that the tunnel under Barbur/Pacific Highway, the acquisition of existing businesses and properties, the aerial guideway over 68th and transitioning south will cost less than the structure along I-5. There may be additional costs constructing the tracks or guideway south of the Lu’s Sports Bar building because its south parking lot was built over boulders and non-engineered fill from the north side of Pacific Highway in the late 1960’s.</p> <p>The cost savings may not be as significant as anticipated, especially since DR4 was added so late in the planning process. As stated in the first footnote in Table E-1:  <u><i>“Numbers are approximate and subject to change because the design refinements have not been analyzed at the same level of detail as the alignment alternatives in the Draft EIS...”</i></u></p> <p>We urge the Steering Committee to exclude Design Refinement 4 from the Preferred Alternative.</p>	
B29	Way W. Lee General Contractor, Inc.	Ken Lee	<p>Good evening. My name is Ken Lee, Way Lee General Contractor. My family owns two properties on 68th Parkway, 99W or Pacific Highway. Our tenants are Chick xx Fillet and Chang’s Mongolian Grill. I’m joined tonight by the owner of Chang’s Mongolian Grill, Tai Bon Chang (ph) – Bon will you stand, please.</p> <p>Also joining us are our neighbors, how Xujian Lu of Lu’s Sport’s Bar, and JD Dasye (ph) owner of the Quality Inn. And we’re all up there on 68th Parkway and 99W. And our properties are located on design refinement 4 of IRP, which we object to. We think the route should just continue into Tigard triangle on route B2, which has already been part of the route.</p>	Please see the response to Comment B28, above.

**Table J2.3-2. Response to Draft EIS Business Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Business Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>In the short time that we have, I'd like to highlight a few problems with the refinement, which I'll refer to as DR4. The first is according to Appendix E, DR4 is supposed to reduce visual impacts related to the presence of long segments of aerial light rail on I-5. Well, first of all, it's not unusual to see light rail structures along I-5 or freeways in general. I-205 has aerial guideways and overpasses from the airport to Clackamas Town Center. Otherwise, these structures are typically hidden from view in industrial zones. Last month I met TriMet on two occasions and they were not ready to show me what DR4 would look like. So last week we commissioned Fat Studio Pencil in Portland to create some 3D visualizations based on the information in the DEIS. And I think those are being passed around here. So the first view is eastbound on Pacific Highway approaching -- pass that around. The second is westbound at Pacific Highway and 68. And the last view is the north side of 68th and Pacific Highway looking south. So while DR4 eliminates the visual impacts on I-5, it's just moving them to Pacific Highway closer to cars in the first place, and it's a bigger visual impact. That's the reason they put in that table E1 and Appendix E.</p> <p>The second problem we have with DR4 is it adds a second crossing of a wetland in Tigard triangle. Route C2 already crosses the wetland on the west side of the triangle. Design refinement 5 was added to improve that but it still crosses the same wetland. One of the goals of the DEIS is to advance transportation projects that are sensitive to the environment. Design refinements are supposed to help avoid or reduce impacts. Instead when you're adding DR4, you're adding a second crossing of a wetland and additional impacts.</p> <p>Then the final objection we have is moving the Beveland station to north to 68th Parkway and 99, with the hopes of attracting more ridership this late in the game. Ridership data should have been determined before putting the DR4 in the IRP. So we urge the Steering Committee to remove DR 4 from the IRP and come into the Tigard triangle through B2. Thank you.</p>	
B30	Winterbloom Inc.	Phil Thornburg	<p>Hello, my name is Phil Thornburg, and I'm the President of Winterbloom Incorporated. We're a landscape design installation and gardening company employing 15 people in Tigard, the Portland Metro area and Yamhill County. We've created employment opportunities and jobs for 35 years. I've lived in the area since 1978. I grew up overseas but I graduated from OSU, and during that time in 1972, I lived, worked and attended college for 13 months in Lausanne, Switzerland. I had very little discretionary money to enjoy Europe, I found, however, that I was able to go anywhere I wanted in 1972 without the purchase of a car or keeping it up. I used the mass transportation. I used light rail between the Swiss cities, rail between European cities, trains to take me up to the mountains to hike and ski. And finally, I used the electric trams and buses inside of Lausanne. Europe is not car-centric as we tend to be. It is people-centric. It's important to Europeans to preserve the farms and create beauty for all to experience, and not to asphalt all their countryside for the sake of their cars. Their mass transportation system is considered an important investment for their children, their grandchildren, and great grandchildren, their countries, and, of course, their tourists. They want those who follow them in life to inherit a country which is available all to gain access to jobs. But at the very same time, to enjoy the beauty of their land. With mass transportation, their people and the masses of tourists who visit from the United States of America can enjoy and have access to their countryside and beautiful villages as well as the major cities.</p> <p>I'm going to jump over some things as we don't have a whole lot of time. To those who say that light rail is a waste of money or who say that it creates an inconvenience, or who say that it will change our community for the worse, I say, do you remember when 217 and I-5 were built? Remember the expense and the inconvenience it was for everybody? Many people complained and were fearful about creating those freeways. They said it would change Washington County, the community of Tigard and the Portland metro area forever. Actually, it did. The whole process was described as being too progressive. There were many who did want their taxes spent on what they thought was a big waste of money. In addition to the taxes needed to be raised for that large financial investment, creating those freeways required many local Willamette Valley farmers to sell their land, and many nice ones too, for the future good of those who one day drive on those freeways, which, of course, we do.</p> <p>So listening to all these different things, you know, maybe we should go underneath. That way we're not impacting anybody's properties, and, yes, it would cost more, but, you know what, it might work better. And then lastly, I have two things, maybe go underneath like moles. And the then last one would be, you know, maybe we should change our society because we're focused on cars and what do we do to help us become thinking about mass transportation. How do we get all of us to think about getting on mass transportation rather than taking our cars? Because we're getting more cars and more people, and we all know logically that does not work. So maybe we should go underneath everything and encourage everybody to do that. So there you go. Thank you.</p>	<p>In past phases of design, tunnels have been shown to be prohibitively expensive and would make the Project less cost-effective (the cost per rider of constructing a tunnel would be very high, given the number of riders estimated for such an alignment), and therefore less competitive for federal funding through FTA's New Starts grant program. In general, tunnels are more expensive because of the cost of tunnel boring machines, the requirement of mechanical ventilation and emergency exits, and the need for elevators/escalators at every station. Tunnels still have significant property impacts around every station and where the boring machines need to enter/exit the ground.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for light rail and mass transit in general.</p>

## J2.4. PETITIONS AND PETITION COMMENTS

This section includes an index of petitioners that submitted petitions during the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Draft EIS comment period (Table J2.4-1), an index of additional commenters who submitted comments along with a petition (Table J2.4-2), the text of all of those petitions paired with responses (Table J2.4-3) and the text of additional comments submitted alongside petitions paired with responses (Table J2.4-4). The comment text in Tables J2.4-3 and J2.4-4 omit addresses, headings, salutations, signatures, footers, images and supplemental attachments that do not contain substantive comments. For the full content of each petition and the additional petition comments in their original formats, see Appendix J3, Original Copies of Draft EIS Comments. Many responses refer to master responses, which are provided in Appendix J1, Introduction to Draft EIS Comments and Responses.

**Table J2.4-1. Index of Draft EIS Petitions**

Comment ID	Petitioner	Number of Signatories	Additional Comments
P01	Unite Oregon	73	0
P02	Tigard Business Owners	259	5
P03	Village Inn	1,855	322

**Table J2.4-2. Index of Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petitioner	Commenter
P02-1	Tigard Business Owners	Oneill, Rebecca
P02-2	Tigard Business Owners	Pulsinelli, Christine
P02-3	Tigard Business Owners	Smith, Mark
P02-4	Tigard Business Owners	Thiele, Marie
P02-5	Tigard Business Owners	Von Renchler, Martin
P03-A1	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-A2	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-A3	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-A4	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-A5	Village Inn	Arnold, Marge
P03-A6	Village Inn	Astin, Penelope
P03-A7	Village Inn	Austin, Donna
P03-A8	Village Inn	Bailey, Gene
P03-A9	Village Inn	Baldwin, Jean H., RN, DNSC
P03-A10	Village Inn	Beebe, Jan & Bill
P03-A11	Village Inn	Bledsoe, Teresa
P03-A12	Village Inn	Bobei, Angelica
P03-A13	Village Inn	Bolen, D.
P03-A14	Village Inn	Bolen, Jennifer
P03-A15	Village Inn	Bowen, Donna
P03-A16	Village Inn	Bredahl, Anna
P03-A17	Village Inn	Brown, M.
P03-A18	Village Inn	Cahan, Linda
P03-A19	Village Inn	Coleman, Tom & Linda
P03-A20	Village Inn	Cresto, Connie
P03-A21	Village Inn	Cumbo, Barbara & Vincent
P03-A22	Village Inn	Currey, Katherine
P03-A23	Village Inn	Cutler, D. R.
P03-A24	Village Inn	Dale, Jim
P03-A25	Village Inn	Darke, Bob & Barb
P03-A26	Village Inn	Davis, Joyce
P03-A27	Village Inn	deBrauwere, Ellie

**Table J2.4-2. Index of Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petitioner	Commenter
P03-A28	Village Inn	deBrauwere, R.
P03-A29	Village Inn	Decker, Frank
P03-A30	Village Inn	Decker, Lori
P03-A31	Village Inn	Delapaix, Greg
P03-A32	Village Inn	Dotson, Marian
P03-A33	Village Inn	Dravis, Katie
P03-A34	Village Inn	Dresser, Ann & Meridian Park Hospital Staff
P03-A35	Village Inn	DuPrau, Jeff
P03-A36	Village Inn	Dusek, Lynn
P03-A37	Village Inn	Dusek, Ron
P03-A38	Village Inn	Edwards, Dawn
P03-A39	Village Inn	Edwards, Lauren
P03-A40	Village Inn	Emburny, Mark
P03-A41	Village Inn	Evart, Donald
P03-A42	Village Inn	Fabian, Gilda
P03-A43	Village Inn	Falk, Georgia J.
P03-A44	Village Inn	Fetters, Annette
P03-A45	Village Inn	Fitch, Janet
P03-A46	Village Inn	Fleetwood, Cory & Sherie
P03-A47	Village Inn	Fox, Joyce
P03-A48	Village Inn	Fuller, Joan
P03-A49	Village Inn	Gester, Peter
P03-A50	Village Inn	Hamer (Douglass), Patsy L.
P03-A51	Village Inn	Handy, Vicki
P03-A52	Village Inn	Hansen, DeeDee
P03-A53	Village Inn	Harme, Charles D.
P03-A54	Village Inn	Harris, Brenda
P03-A55	Village Inn	Harris, Donald
P03-A56	Village Inn	Hayden, E. L.
P03-A57	Village Inn	Henkel, R. C.
P03-A58	Village Inn	Henson, Jason

**Table J2.4-2. Index of Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petitioner	Commenter
P03-A59	Village Inn	Hewlett Family
P03-A60	Village Inn	Hill, David
P03-A61	Village Inn	Hummert, Sharon
P03-A62	Village Inn	Hungate, Linda
P03-A63	Village Inn	Hunter, Meredith
P03-A64	Village Inn	Hurgate, Bill
P03-A65	Village Inn	Johnson, Mona
P03-A66	Village Inn	Kafalias, Alex
P03-A67	Village Inn	Kaufman, Marilyn
P03-A68	Village Inn	Krafthefer, W.
P03-A69	Village Inn	Langner, Patrick
P03-A70	Village Inn	Lehrer, Judy
P03-A71	Village Inn	Lehrer, Robert E.
P03-A72	Village Inn	Lewis, Steve
P03-A73	Village Inn	Lind, Mr. & Mrs. Don
P03-A74	Village Inn	Maxwell, Jerry
P03-A75	Village Inn	Maxwell, Melissa
P03-A76	Village Inn	McCade, F.
P03-A77	Village Inn	McClure, Scott
P03-A78	Village Inn	McDowell, Carlene
P03-A79	Village Inn	Mitchell, Geraldine
P03-A80	Village Inn	Mitchell, Mike
P03-A81	Village Inn	Moore, Catherine J.
P03-A82	Village Inn	Nelson, Betty
P03-A83	Village Inn	Newberry, Laurie
P03-A84	Village Inn	Newell, Jeff
P03-A85	Village Inn	Nowall, Wylie
P03-A86	Village Inn	Oak, Dorothy
P03-A87	Village Inn	Oest, Allen & Jane
P03-A88	Village Inn	Olin, Shirley
P03-A89	Village Inn	Palmer, Edward J.
P03-A90	Village Inn	Palmer-DuPrau, Tabitha

**Table J2.4-2. Index of Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petitioner	Commenter
P03-A91	Village Inn	Phillips, Peggy
P03-A92	Village Inn	Prapas, Christi D.
P03-A93	Village Inn	Prussack, Brigitte
P03-A94	Village Inn	Prussack, Sam
P03-A95	Village Inn	R., Carlos & Carmen
P03-A96	Village Inn	Rainy, Kristi
P03-A97	Village Inn	Rhodes, Ina Carol
P03-A98	Village Inn	Rios-Daley, Marina
P03-A99	Village Inn	Ritemann, Mary
P03-A100	Village Inn	Robelli, Mike
P03-A101	Village Inn	Sanders, Sharon
P03-A102	Village Inn	Sanders, Tom
P03-A103	Village Inn	Sardone, Frank
P03-A104	Village Inn	Sardone, Mary Jane
P03-A105	Village Inn	Scott, Joann C.
P03-A106	Village Inn	Shivers, John A.
P03-A107	Village Inn	Sierra, Lola A.
P03-A108	Village Inn	Sigler, Mary Anne
P03-A109	Village Inn	Sinclair, Susan
P03-A110	Village Inn	Slaughter, Bea
P03-A111	Village Inn	Smits, Teri
P03-A112	Village Inn	Solomon, Carl
P03-A113	Village Inn	Spears, Patricia
P03-A114	Village Inn	Stensberg, Charlene C.
P03-A115	Village Inn	Stewart, Lori
P03-A116	Village Inn	Thomson, Linda
P03-A117	Village Inn	Tofte, June
P03-A118	Village Inn	Ulrich, Ron
P03-A119	Village Inn	Ulrich, Sherry
P03-A120	Village Inn	Unknown
P03-A121	Village Inn	Unknown
P03-A122	Village Inn	Unknown
P03-A123	Village Inn	Unknown, Anne
P03-A124	Village Inn	Unknown, Carol
P03-A125	Village Inn	Unknown, Chris
P03-A126	Village Inn	Unknown, Christensen
P03-A127	Village Inn	Unknown, Jennifer
P03-A128	Village Inn	Unknown, Kelli
P03-A129	Village Inn	Unknown, Kelsey
P03-A130	Village Inn	Unknown, Kristen
P03-A131	Village Inn	Unknown, Mario
P03-A132	Village Inn	Unknown, Robin
P03-A133	Village Inn	Unknown, Sandee
P03-A134	Village Inn	Unknown, Stephanie

**Table J2.4-2. Index of Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petitioner	Commenter
P03-A135	Village Inn	Unknown, Steve
P03-A136	Village Inn	Unknown, Wynona
P03-A137	Village Inn	Unknown, Yajaira
P03-A138	Village Inn	Velk, Michael & Connie
P03-A139	Village Inn	Walker, Karen
P03-A140	Village Inn	Winkelman, Darrel & Betty
P03-A141	Village Inn	Woldhan, Cheryl
P03-A142	Village Inn	Wright, Jason & Jackie
P03-B1	Village Inn	A, Dianne
P03-B2	Village Inn	Akin, Denise
P03-B3	Village Inn	Alt, Dan
P03-B4	Village Inn	Andersen, Jon
P03-B5	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B6	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B7	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B8	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B9	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B10	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B11	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B12	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B13	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B14	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B15	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B16	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B17	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B18	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B19	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B20	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B21	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B22	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B23	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B24	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B25	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B26	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B27	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B28	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B29	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B30	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B31	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B32	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B33	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B34	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B35	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B36	Village Inn	Anonymous

**Table J2.4-2. Index of Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petitioner	Commenter
P03-B37	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B38	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B39	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B40	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B41	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B42	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B43	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B44	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B45	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B46	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B47	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B48	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B49	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B50	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B51	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B52	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B53	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B54	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B55	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B56	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B57	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B58	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B59	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-B60	Village Inn	Bailey, Herman & Eileen
P03-B61	Village Inn	Barnett, Paula
P03-B62	Village Inn	Baron, Carolyn M.
P03-B63	Village Inn	Beavers, Temple & Carolyn
P03-B64	Village Inn	Bellew, Stephanie
P03-B65	Village Inn	Bilow, Steve
P03-B66	Village Inn	Blackwell, Jim
P03-B67	Village Inn	Blodgett, Jim
P03-B68	Village Inn	Brown, Janice & David
P03-B69	Village Inn	Cahan, Linda
P03-B70	Village Inn	Calkin, Paul
P03-B71	Village Inn	Catlin, Dianne
P03-B72	Village Inn	Chin, Maisie
P03-B73	Village Inn	Christofferson, Rea
P03-B74	Village Inn	Cotner, Shannon
P03-B75	Village Inn	Csaszar, Mike
P03-B76	Village Inn	D., Julie
P03-B77	Village Inn	Davis, Lance & Medina, Donna
P03-B78	Village Inn	Easly, Marcella
P03-B79	Village Inn	Elliot, R
P03-B80	Village Inn	Evans, Joyce & John

**Table J2.4-2. Index of Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petitioner	Commenter
P03-B81	Village Inn	Faria, Carol
P03-B82	Village Inn	Findlay, Janet E.
P03-B83	Village Inn	Fisher, Jim
P03-B84	Village Inn	Freeman, Dave & Shelley
P03-B85	Village Inn	Fromdahl, Larry
P03-B86	Village Inn	Goforth, RJ
P03-B87	Village Inn	Haas, Pat
P03-B88	Village Inn	Hamilton, Bill
P03-B89	Village Inn	Hanes, Ken
P03-B90	Village Inn	Heide, Mae & RM
P03-B91	Village Inn	Henry Family
P03-B92	Village Inn	Hill, Jenny
P03-B93	Village Inn	Johnson, Gary & Denna
P03-B94	Village Inn	Lund, Dorothy
P03-B95	Village Inn	Lund, Wayne
P03-B96	Village Inn	Maizel, Harriet
P03-B97	Village Inn	Maizel, Richard
P03-B98	Village Inn	Martin, Brian & Frank, Hannah
P03-B99	Village Inn	McClain, Ellen
P03-B100	Village Inn	McClure, Karen
P03-B101	Village Inn	Miller, Don
P03-B102	Village Inn	Newman, Doris
P03-B103	Village Inn	Olsen, Bonnie R.
P03-B104	Village Inn	Peterson, Elisabeth
P03-B105	Village Inn	Phelps, Eddie
P03-B106	Village Inn	Phillips, Joe
P03-B107	Village Inn	Pinson, Judy
P03-B108	Village Inn	Richey, Paul
P03-B109	Village Inn	Rizzutto, Julie & Tony
P03-B110	Village Inn	Robison, Joe & Mills, Patti
P03-B111	Village Inn	Rosenquist, Dave & Kathie
P03-B112	Village Inn	Russell, Jim
P03-B113	Village Inn	Russell, Mrs. Linda
P03-B114	Village Inn	Schaeten, Dave & Nicole
P03-B115	Village Inn	Schamber, Larry & Paulette
P03-B116	Village Inn	Scholes, Alice
P03-B117	Village Inn	Schouten, Nicole & Dave
P03-B118	Village Inn	Schulder, J.
P03-B119	Village Inn	Skibinski, Linda
P03-B120	Village Inn	Spencer, Erika
P03-B121	Village Inn	Sprauer, Al & Linda
P03-B122	Village Inn	Stanaway, Skip
P03-B123	Village Inn	Starling, Bev
P03-B124	Village Inn	Stephen, Tom & Gail

**Table J2.4-2. Index of Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petitioner	Commenter
P03-B125	Village Inn	Stierle, Nanette
P03-B126	Village Inn	Thomason, Barbara & Bill
P03-B127	Village Inn	Tomeoni, Bob
P03-B128	Village Inn	Tulay, Kari
P03-B129	Village Inn	Unknown
P03-B130	Village Inn	Unknown
P03-B131	Village Inn	Unknown
P03-B132	Village Inn	Unknown
P03-B133	Village Inn	Unknown
P03-B134	Village Inn	Unknown
P03-B135	Village Inn	Unknown, Barb
P03-B136	Village Inn	Unknown, Becky
P03-B137	Village Inn	Unknown, Carol
P03-B138	Village Inn	Unknown, Charlotte
P03-B139	Village Inn	Unknown, Cheryl
P03-B140	Village Inn	Unknown, Cheryl
P03-B141	Village Inn	Unknown, Cynthia
P03-B142	Village Inn	Unknown, Donna
P03-B143	Village Inn	Unknown, Dorothy
P03-B144	Village Inn	Unknown, Doyal
P03-B145	Village Inn	Unknown, E.
P03-B146	Village Inn	Unknown, G.
P03-B147	Village Inn	Unknown, Gary
P03-B148	Village Inn	Unknown, Guadelupe
P03-B149	Village Inn	Unknown, Gwen
P03-B150	Village Inn	Unknown, Irene
P03-B151	Village Inn	Unknown, Janice
P03-B152	Village Inn	Unknown, Josh
P03-B153	Village Inn	Unknown, JP/GP
P03-B154	Village Inn	Unknown, Kaela
P03-B155	Village Inn	Unknown, Karen
P03-B156	Village Inn	Unknown, Karen
P03-B157	Village Inn	Unknown, Katherine
P03-B158	Village Inn	Unknown, Leah
P03-B159	Village Inn	Unknown, Lee
P03-B160	Village Inn	Unknown, Lenall
P03-B161	Village Inn	Unknown, Marcus
P03-B162	Village Inn	Unknown, Mary
P03-B163	Village Inn	Unknown, Nicole
P03-B164	Village Inn	Unknown, Nicole
P03-B165	Village Inn	Unknown, Nicole
P03-B166	Village Inn	Unknown, Pat
P03-B167	Village Inn	Unknown, Patt
P03-B168	Village Inn	Unknown, Rose

**Table J2.4-2. Index of Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petitioner	Commenter
P03-B169	Village Inn	Unknown, Stephen
P03-B170	Village Inn	Unknown, Susan
P03-B171	Village Inn	Unknown, Tracy
P03-B172	Village Inn	Unknown, William
P03-B173	Village Inn	Woodworth, Jay
P03-B174	Village Inn	Young, Lindsay & Matos, Lorena Reyes
P03-B175	Village Inn	Zukor, Linda
P03-C1	Village Inn	Anonymous
P03-C2	Village Inn	Landert, Michael
P03-C3	Village Inn	Olson, Dennis D.
P03-C4	Village Inn	Sibinski, Chet
P03-C5	Village Inn	Strahan, Sheila & Brian

**Table J2.4-3. Response to Draft EIS Petitions (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petitioner	Number of Signatures	Petition Text	Response
P01	Unite Oregon	73	<p>We, Tigard SW Corridor residents, are writing to you to express our concerns and ask that you carefully consider our community-identified needs around staying in place outlined in this letter. With your support, we hope to minimize displacement and reduce negative impacts our communities could face, when or if, the Southwest Corridor MAX line is constructed.</p> <p>We are optimistic about the opportunities that a new MAX line could bring to the SW Corridor region. Our hope is to stay in our neighborhoods and be able to benefit from increased access to public transportation through better connections to where we need to go, access to living wage jobs in and around the Corridor, and most importantly uphold healthy, affordable and safe housing practices.</p> <p>We look to you with the hope that you will become an ally in our efforts, create space for us to speak for ourselves, and uplift our voices in systems of institutional power. We invite you to work with us, because we are most at risk of displacement as low-income, working class people, communities of color, immigrants, refugees, and renters.</p> <p>We understand that historically large transportation projects have led to the displacement of local communities through land acquisition for project construction, land speculation, and redevelopment connected to new light rails. We are already experiencing exponential rent increases, in some cases up to a 300% rent increase from one month to the next. Throughout this economic hardship, our wages remain the same. We fear these trends will only be exacerbated if our local, regional, state and federal governments do not invest in affordable housing now.</p> <p>We love our communities and we wish to keep growing with our families, friends, and social networks.</p> <p>Below are our request and specific concerns:</p> <p><b>COMMUNITY PRESERVATION</b></p> <p><b>Affordable Housing Preservation and Construction Must be the First Priority.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Focus on rehabilitation and building affordable housing before any MAX construction begins to ensure that all tenants stay housed in the area before the project breaks ground.</li> <li>· Ensure that information about the process of rehabilitation and construction of all developments of affordable units is accessible, free of jargon and available in people's preferred language.</li> <li>· Create an affordable housing protocol that ensures first priority for current residents who might face displacement by the construction of the SW Corridor.</li> <li>· Ensure that non-citizens who face displacement by SW Corridor construction have equitable access to mitigation relocation funds as citizens.</li> <li>· Give affordable housing priority to low income Seniors.</li> </ul> <p><b>Increase Tenant Protections.</b> Housing instability is rapidly becoming the norm throughout the Portland metro region, and most acutely for low-income and moderate-income households. We are already losing our homes to no-fault terminations and excessive rent increases. We need tenant protections that ensure relief, and keep us stably housed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Renters need relocation assistance in all Oregon jurisdictions</li> <li>· Renters need rent stabilization because household wages are not keeping up with the pace of rising rents. We cannot afford to get more than 10% rent increases, and still provide food, transportation, medicine, and the basics for our families.</li> </ul> <p><b>Expand Tenant Services and Supports.</b> Keeping renters stably housed also includes a suite of services and supports that help people navigate social services and the legal system when housing is at-risk. Local jurisdictions have the power to assist people and families to remain housed while maintaining fair access to safe and healthy housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Education and information about tenant rights and responsibilities, fair housing, and access to legal consultation should be free, or at a very low cost for anyone who needs support, regardless of their ability to pay.</li> <li>· Renters deeply benefit from programs that help to repair and improve credit history, one of the biggest barriers when seeking housing.</li> <li>· Create pathways to permanent stable housing through homeownership opportunities and programming directed at residents of color to help close the region's minority homeownership gap.</li> </ul> <p><b>Access to Stable Housing.</b> Rental criteria should focus on rental history, combined with ability to pay. Tenants are often required to provide proof of income three times the amount of the rent. Many of us living in the SW Corridor make minimum wage or just above, are retired, or on fixed income. Our incomes cannot meet arbitrary criteria that prevents us from gaining housing in our own neighborhoods. We ask that landlords, especially within a 1.5 mile area of the proposed MAX line adhere to rental criteria that works for all income households and to provide exceptions to common practice of charging 3x the amount of rent.</p> <p>&gt; We ask that all housing providers accommodate tenants to break the barriers that prevent them from renting by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Allowing tenants to apply again without charging a new application fee within 3 months of the first application fee.</li> <li>· Provide programs that support financial literacy and home ownership preparation so when new units are ready to rent, tenants can qualify to rent or purchase homes in the neighborhoods they currently live.</li> <li>· Provide programs that assist with utility costs for low-income homeowners and renters. In times of inclement heat or cold, unexpected utility expenses can cascade into debt that is hard to recover from, and cause housing instability.</li> <li>· Require that no additional utility charges, such as garbage and sewer, be passed on to tenants.</li> </ul> <p><b>Enforce Fair-Housing Protections.</b> Tenants from various protected classes (both state and federal) in and around the SW Corridor experience fair housing violations every day.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Require all landlords to understand their responsibilities and rights under fair housing laws, and the consequences if they are found to discriminate.</li> </ul>	<p>Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to affordable housing preservation and construction. Your comments regarding a desire for a protocol designating "first right of refusal" for displaced residents have been shared with project partners.</p> <p>Your comments regarding general housing policy, including tenant protections, services and supports, access to stable housing and enforcement of fair housing standards, have been shared with local agency partners who are more directly involved in addressing these concerns, which are outside the scope of the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project.</p> <p>TriMet appreciates your request for additional language announcements on the MAX system, broader bus service hours, less punitive fare enforcement and more bathrooms near transit, and will consider that feedback outside of this Final EIS process.</p> <p>See Master Response 14 regarding safety and security on the TriMet system.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding bicycle and pedestrian improvements studied in the Final EIS.</p> <p>Improvements to SW Ash Avenue in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin) were studied as Alternatives C1, C2 and C5 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p> <p>Please reference TriMet's Conceptual Design Report for more detailed information on streetscape improvements, including landscaping and lighting (see: <a href="https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm">https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm</a>).</p> <p>Regarding access to destinations, the Preferred Alternative would directly connect residential areas and bus lines to retail areas, including stations near Safeway, Fred Meyer and Barbur World Foods on SW Barbur Boulevard, and would connect to other transit lines that further serve these types of uses.</p> <p>Your concerns regarding outreach and engagement with Latinx, undocumented, immigrant and refugee communities have been shared with project partners. In addition, Chapter 6, Public Involvement, Agency Coordination and Required Permits, of this Final EIS describes the outreach completed during the Draft EIS comment period and leading up to the publication of this Final EIS. The outreach during the Draft EIS comment period included a multilingual event/hearing in collaboration with Unite Oregon, as well as newspaper advertisements, letters and postcards in multiple languages. The website for the Draft EIS also included a Spanish-language version of the Draft EIS executive summary.</p>

Table J2.4-3. Response to Draft EIS Petitions (multipage table)

Comment ID	Petitioner	Number of Signatures	Petition Text	Response
			<p>· Provide a mechanism for tenants to file complaints without fear of retaliation, further intimidation, or harassment - which often results in trumped up fines, neglect of basic repairs, and even no-cause termination. In some situations, tenants are afraid to report needed repairs for fear that a discriminatory landlord will report them to immigration officials, regardless of their status.</p> <p><b>TRANSPORTATION</b></p> <p>The proposed Southwest Corridor Light Rail project will enhance transit along the corridor, but will not fully serve the needs of residents along the corridor. In order to effectively serve all of the community it is critical that there is a full investment in bus service to serve the community until a MAX line is built and ensure that the entire region has access to transit.</p> <p>&gt; To that end, we recommend the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Incorporate better bus connections and services in order for us to make connections from our communities to the new MAX line.</li> <li>· The SW Corridor community is diverse and home to populations of linguistically isolated communities. Additional language announcements are needed on the system.</li> <li>· Swiftly implement the Southwest Service Enhancement Plan, adding bus service throughout Tigard, Tualatin and the surrounding area, to ensure residents have bus service within walking distance from most homes, businesses, services and places of recreation. As TriMet has already had three years to implement the plan, we are asking for no further delay, and to start adding bus routes and services immediately.</li> <li>· Ensure that the bus service is safe, reliable, and frequent. Many minority populations often work early morning or late night shifts or on weekends, and bus service must match the hours of operation for businesses in the area. Too many bus routes stop operating at approximately 9:00 PM or earlier, leaving late-night workers stranded and unable to travel.</li> <li>· We need a system that is less punitive and that issues warnings instead of fines in the event that as riders, we are not able to prove that we have a paid ticket, monthly or annual pass. A person whose sole offense is not paying or having sufficient fare to ride should not be considered a criminal and subject to harsh and cruel punishments.</li> </ul> <p>While it is recognized TriMet depends upon fare revenue to cover a portion of its operating expenses, the punitive fine of \$200 and court costs is out of proportion for merely failing to pay \$2.50.</p> <p>TriMet can, and should: consider the totality of the circumstance, provide warnings to first time offenders, offer alternatives that can be resolved within a short time that avoid a citation and criminal record (for example, allow a rider to purchase a "\$10 penalty fare" within one week to satisfy the violation; in exchange the violation will also serve as a day pass for the remainder of the day) and allow riders to make an immediate payment in lieu of a citation (for example, require a \$5 day pass to be purchased)</p> <p><b>COMMUNITY SAFETY</b></p> <p>Transit must be a safe and welcoming place for any person who wants to travel, but cannot travel by other means. Public transit unites our community regardless of socioeconomic status or other identifiers, and the operation of our transit system should reflect the community as a whole.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Any rider should feel safe and welcomed aboard public transit, and should not fear the presence of law enforcement or security, whose purpose should be the safety of the riders as well as transit agency employees. Law enforcement and security personnel working on the transit system should be trained with the understanding that they are public servants whose job it is to ensure the safety of the riders, and not to treat every rider as a potential criminal or suspect.</li> <li>· TriMet law enforcement and security personnel have no justification asking for a person's immigration status. This practice is in violation of ORS 181A.820, and our public transit system is, and should be, open for any person to ride, regardless of any factor. Swift action should be taken to hold accountable any employee or agent who violates ORS 181A.820.</li> <li>· Ensure that bus stops are safe and accessible. TriMet, along with Metro, the Oregon Department of Transportation, Washington County, the City of Tigard and other surrounding cities, must work together to prioritize the improvement of pedestrian access to, from and around bus stops. Riders should be able to expect a safe walking route, such as a sidewalk, to and from a bus stop as well as a safe place to wait for the bus; a well-lit bus stop, and preferably a shelter, bench, and an informational sign to inform riders of the bus schedule and route.</li> <li>· We need safety lighting and landscape, surrounding all the bus and MAX stops. Particularly better lighting on Ash Ave</li> <li>· We need proper crossing and traffic lighting by the new MAX line and all bus stops</li> <li>· Bathrooms in and near the MAX and buses are needed. All riders but especially children, elderly, and long commuters should have this basic service available</li> <li>· The transit system in our community needs to ensure that residents can easily reach major retail and service areas, such as grocery stores like WinCo, Fred Meyer, Safeway and Albertsons.</li> <li>· The proposed light rail routes through Tigard and by Ash Ave, have significant negative impacts to lower income housing populations, and any impact needs to be addressed ensuring that impacted families and persons be able to retain housing within the neighborhood.</li> </ul> <p><b>CIVIC ENGAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY</b></p> <p>There is fear in the Latinxs, undocumented and other immigrant and refugee community about engaging with some City workers. We would like to see more efforts from government employees and elected officials to engage with our communities and more diverse and trained personnel that understand our community's—needs.</p> <p><b>ECONOMIC PROSPERITY</b></p> <p>Ensure that small businesses, particularly those owned and operated by people of color, immigrants, or refugees have the opportunity and funds to stay in SW Corridor area</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read this letter. We hope to hear from you in writing by <u>no later than July 7, 2018</u> about how you can support us with the request outlined in this letter.</p>	

**Table J2.4-3. Response to Draft EIS Petitions (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petitioner	Number of Signatures	Petition Text	Response
P02	Tigard Business Owners	259	Seeking an alternative route for SW Corridor Light Rail than Refinement 4, keeping light rail stations and platforms away from Pacific Hwy 99 in Tigard, OR. to decrease the displacement of existing businesses, maintaining walkability and a welcoming streetscape on a main entry point to Tigard and A developing Tigard Triangle. Eliminating additional problems such as: Noise, Vibrations, Crime associated with park & ride possible locations, customer accessibility to driveways, biking & walkability for surrounding businesses and narrowing traffic concerns on an already congested stretch of Hwy between 72nd and Interstate 5.	<p>Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and business displacements.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle improvements studied in the Final EIS. Please also refer to TriMet’s Conceptual Design Report for more detailed information on streetscape improvements, including landscaping and lighting (see: <a href="https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm">https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm</a>).</p> <p>Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration Impacts, of this Final EIS regarding concerns about noise and vibration.</p> <p>Please see Mater Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime.</p> <p>In general, compared to the No-Build Alternative, future traffic levels would be lower with the Project, except at locations with new or expanded park and rides. To learn more about the traffic analysis and traffic impacts, please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p>
P03	Village Inn	1,855	We, the undersigned, do not want TriMet/Metro to replace the Village Inn with a bus turnaround as currently planned in the Southwest Corridor/Bridgeport Light Rail Project. We implore you to seek other options/alternatives.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.

Table J2.4-4 is organized by Comment ID, with numbers starting with “P02” for comments associated with petition P02 (Tigard Business Owners), “P03-A” for Village Inn comments that were written on a template provided by Village Inn (Template A), “P03-B” for Village Inn comments that were written on a different template provided by Village Inn (Template B) and “P03-C” for Village Inn comments that did not use a template. To provide context for the comments, the text of the two Village Inn templates is as follows:

Template A
<p><b>We Need Your Support</b></p> <p>Metro and TriMet are working on a new 12-mile MAX line from Portland to Bridgeport Village that would take our property and the restaurant away. Please tell us what coming to Village Inn means to you and why you think it should stay right where it is.</p>

Template B
<p><b>We Need Your Support</b></p> <p>Metro is working on a SW corridor project:  A new 12-mile MAX line from downtown Portland to Tigard and Bridgeport Village in Tualatin  One of the proposed locations for the Max Station is right here which will  <b>take your Village Inn AWAY!</b>  Please tell us what coming to the Village Inn has meant to you  over the years and why they should choose another location for their station.</p>

**Table J2.4-4. Response to Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petition Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
P02-1	Tigard Business Owners	Oneill, Rebecca	I dont want to see many businesses destroyed just to put in a max line. It will bring more crime with it.	Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and business displacements. Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime.
P02-2	Tigard Business Owners	Pulsinelli, Christine	I am worried about congestion and influx of undesirable characters, crime and loss of businesses.	In general, compared to the No-Build Alternative, future traffic levels would be lower with the Project, except at locations with new or expanded park and rides. To learn more about the traffic analysis and traffic impacts, please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS.  Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime.
P02-3	Tigard Business Owners	Smith, Mark	I agree that this plan is not not the best option.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.
P02-4	Tigard Business Owners	Thiele, Marie	Concerned about increase in traffic commutes, increase in crime rates, increase in taxes to fund the project, and the negative impact it will have on local residents and businesses disrupted by the constriction. I would rather see our tax dollars go to projects like improving & maintaining our exisiting roads and bridges!	In general, compared to the No-Build Alternative, future traffic levels would be lower with the Project, except at locations with new or expanded park and rides. To learn more about the traffic analysis and traffic impacts, please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS.  Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime.  To learn more about funding for the Project, please see Section 5.3, Cost and Funding Evaluation, in Chapter 5, Evaluation of Alternatives, of this Final EIS.  Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Chapter 4, Environmental Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS identify the long-term (permanent and operational), short-term (construction), indirect and cumulative impacts of the Project and mitigation measures to address these impacts.  Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for roadway and bridge improvements instead of light rail.
P02-5	Tigard Business Owners	Von Renchler, Martin	Its a ludicrous waste of money that will cause more traffic---not less	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.  In general, compared to the No-Build Alternative, future traffic levels would be lower with the Project, except at locations with new or expanded park and rides. To learn more about the traffic analysis and traffic impacts, please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS.
P03-A1	Village Inn	Anonymous	It would be (a shame) to tear down the Village Inn. It is a great gathering place. Find another route for the MAX line!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A2	Village Inn	Anonymous	It's the <u>only</u> reasonably priced place to eat in the area. Use other land for a parking lot!!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A3	Village Inn	Anonymous	Vlg Inn had to move once before. Don't make them have to do this again. We need a GREAT breakfast, lunch, & dinner right where it is. We've been going here for years and don't want to see it gone.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A4	Village Inn	Anonymous	You should learn from East County in the late 1980s - bring in Light Rail and it <b>destroys</b> the neighborhood - Rockwood is now a ghetto!! Even Fred Meyer moved out!!!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.  Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A5	Village Inn	Arnold, Marge	The Village Inn has wonderful food at a reasonable price and is the cleanest restaurant I have ever been in. They are so friendly it's like eating with family - it would be terrible to take away this family's long time business - the expense of the MAX line is ridiculous - <u>I'm voting no</u> -	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.  Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A6	Village Inn	Astin, Penelope	There aren't many great places for people to have time together anymore. Let's keep this one!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.

**Table J2.4-4. Response to Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petition Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
P03-A7	Village Inn	Austin, Donna	I am in support of a MAX line; however, I don't think it's necessary to take out local businesses when alternatives are possible. There are other locations that could be used, e.g. the DSW, Men's Warehouse, and Bed, Bath, & Beyond. Those businesses are in leased space and unlikely to be in business in the next few years.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A8	Village Inn	Bailey, Gene	We enjoy having Sunday breakfast	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A9	Village Inn	Baldwin, Jean H., RN, DNSC	Village Inn is the place my husband and I frequent oh so often - more than 3 or 4 times a month. Basically - the food is great and their pies are good. (illegible) to Bridgeport shopping is very ideal for us. Don't move this property!!! Please!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A10	Village Inn	Beebe, Jan & Bill	We have been dining at the Tualatin Village Inn for over 30 years - first w/our parents, our children, and now with our grandchildren too. This is home away from home for us - the owners and all the staff are professional, helpful, and welcoming in their great food and service! This restaurant truly serves a niche for a viable neighborhood!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A11	Village Inn	Bledsoe, Teresa	Been coming to this restaurant since the beginning - please don't move! I think TriMet rail is a boondoggle. I think Metro is a layer of government we don't need!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A12	Village Inn	Bobei, Angelica	Village Inn is convenience; affordability; family atmosphere; helpful staff; variety of foods to choose from; I would absolutely hate to see it go!!! Please work to keep it here!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A13	Village Inn	Bolen, D.	We love this restaurant please don't destroy it!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A14	Village Inn	Bolen, Jennifer	It's all about <u>community</u> ! This is a family friendly gathering place and the owners here are so kind and wonderful to the community. This is a special place!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A15	Village Inn	Bowen, Donna	I've been coming here for many years & enjoy the food, service, and kind staff. Would hate to see this Village Inn go away.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A16	Village Inn	Bredahl, Anna	There is no need to move Village Inn. I love coming here for lunch. If you move it, it won't be as easy to join my friends for Sunday Brunch. Do a second story on the existing lot at DSW instead.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A17	Village Inn	Brown, M.	My fiance & I go to Village Inn every Sunday. It's one of our favorite places to eat. Everyone who works there is happy, hardworking, & pleasant. It would be a TERRIBLE decision to sacrifice such a great restaurant for a parking lot.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A18	Village Inn	Cahan, Linda	The Village Inn is where I go to meet friends, for relaxing fun meals with family...it's a meeting place for people from all around the area thanks to the excellent location. The food & service are excellent - we are very fond of this place - lots of great memories that we hope will continue for MANY years. Men's Warehouse - no memories - pave it over!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A19	Village Inn	Coleman, Tom & Linda	Bad idea. Not in favor of TriMet moving in and taking over. Not fair to do this to a business or businesses, you're not going to get the ridership to justify doing this.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A20	Village Inn	Cresto, Connie	I love this place! Don't take it away!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A21	Village Inn	Cumbo, Barbara & Vincent	I arrived in Portland (Tigard) 10 years ago and one of the earliest places I came for dinner was Village Inn - fast forward, and I am still coming here almost weekly – Great food, wonderful service and friendly people - all at a fair price - A wonderful alternative to the pricey establishments across the street in Bridgeport Village – As seniors, my husband and I appreciate all of the above being so close by - It would be a shame to lose this Tigard landmark - Please reconsider!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A22	Village Inn	Currey, Katherine	We have been coming here for years, not a lot of good places left. Need to keep good ones.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A23	Village Inn	Cutler, D. R.	(blank comment card)	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A24	Village Inn	Dale, Jim	I've known this family and its restaurant here for as long as its been here. Please don't move!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A25	Village Inn	Darke, Bob & Barb	Countless fabulous breakfasts at Village Inn, served by friendly people in a consistently clean restaurant with great food. Put a turn around where you already have pavement and don't disrupt this business!!!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A26	Village Inn	Davis, Joyce	Having been eating here since 2002. Put the bus turnaround and connections at the old (illegible) Parking Lot.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A27	Village Inn	deBrauwere, Ellie	The family owned business is an exemplary model for future generations to follow in small business. Customers feel welcome and safe. Group and family gatherings are encouraged and catered to with a smile. If light rail is allowed to extend to Tualatin there will be far more crime just like Gresham and all areas of Portland.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.

**Table J2.4-4. Response to Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petition Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
				Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime.
P03-A28	Village Inn	deBrauwere, R.	If you bring the MAX line to Tigard-Tualatin you will be bringing the same problems to Tigard-Tualatin as the Gresham area has, i.e. shootings stabbings etc. The city law enforcement depts will have to increase officers from current to 50-60 officers. The homeless problem will increase & Bridgeport Village will be turned into an unsafe shopping center similar to Lloyd Center.	Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A29	Village Inn	Decker, Frank	We enjoy eating at Village Inn. It is our favorite restaurant. I say the MAX can go somewhere else. There is a benefit for me having TriMet here, but I enjoy eating at this Village Inn.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A30	Village Inn	Decker, Lori	This Village Inn is our favorite place to eat. It has the best chicken noodle soup in the world. It's even better than the Village Inn in east Portland. Please don't close this Village Inn restaurant.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A31	Village Inn	Delapaix, Greg	Transportation is not property management - please stop trying to make it what it is not	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A32	Village Inn	Dotson, Marian	We already had to move once and don't want to do it again! We are weekly regulars, enjoy the food, service, prices, and LOCATION. Please leave it alone!!!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A33	Village Inn	Dravis, Katie	community staple, very important to us.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A34	Village Inn	Dresser, Ann & Meridian Park Hospital Staff	We as a group of retired nurses love this restaurant - it is easy to communicate, the food is good, and the staff is courteous - please don't close!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A35	Village Inn	DuPrau, Jeff	Village Inn remains one of very few family diner restaurants in the area. Without it we would have to drive to Sherwood or Wilsonville.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A36	Village Inn	Dusek, Lynn	We've been coming here since long before it was moved from the southwest corner of the intersection, maybe 30 years? Maybe more?? We don't want it closed or moved, nor do we want or need a MAX line. It's not that I'm objecting to change! We truly don't need MAX at Bridgeport. Don't do it.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A37	Village Inn	Dusek, Ron	We have been coming to Village Inn for 40 plus years. They treat seniors with respect and preferential service. It is our favorite place to eat. Some seniors would not be able to eat out if it wasn't for Village Inn and its senior menu. Please do not destroy the quality & service provided by Village Inn as the <u>only</u> place in the area available for seniors.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A38	Village Inn	Edwards, Dawn	There are no longer very many options for homestyle dinners (e.g. turkey, roast beef, etc) in local restaurants. We like having the option of getting a "grandma's" style dinner without all the work! They also have a good variety of vegetables which is rare. Would be a shame to lose it!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A39	Village Inn	Edwards, Lauren	I feel increasing buses would fulfill the same transportation need and service without jeopardizing old fashioned restaurants. Which seem to be dying breed. At 31 years old I feel there are few restaurants that capture the old time feel. As a user of public transportation I also feel buses are a <u>safer</u> option with more accountability from the driver. The light rail system just doesn't fit the needs of the community it is supposed to serve.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant. Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus service improvements instead of light rail.
P03-A40	Village Inn	Emburny, Mark	Increase bus service to MAX line in Beaverton. Start buses at 3-4 AM. Do an express at 4 AM from Bridgeport Village.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant. Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus service improvements instead of light rail.
P03-A41	Village Inn	Evert, Donald	I certainly hope that the MAX train could be re-routed (maybe not that far) so that wonderful Village Inn could be kept in business. It is an excellent place to eat with fine employees and food. I also say again that the MAX trains don't have to be re-routed too far - because they are very important also. IF this could actually happen then maybe everybody could be as happy as any of us can be in this world, especially these days.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A42	Village Inn	Fabian, Gilda	I have been coming to the Village Inn for many years and would hate to see it taken away. It is convenient for me and the food and service are excellent. Being a sr citizen (95 years old) the prices also fits my budget - unlike the restaurants in Bridgeport plaza. I doubt that the number of riders on the MAX would make it worth the expense of building the line and displacing so many people	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A43	Village Inn	Falk, Georgia J.	Please leave our Village Inn as it is. Village Inn is the only family restaurant that's central to Sherwood, Wilsonville, Tigard, Tualatin. We love our Village Inn.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A44	Village Inn	Fetters, Annette	We are new to this area. It is a friendly, welcoming place for families and seniors! Very good food! Reasonably priced variety menu. Village Inn is a focal point and gathering place for many, many local residents. It is important to preserve a few anchor original restaurants/businesses to keep <u>communities together</u> .	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A45	Village Inn	Fitch, Janet	I have come here for years. So many places today are all the same. The Village Inn is a special restaurant - a place that connects the past to the present. A place where friends, family can meet and feel like they are at home! A place where business appointments can be discussed over coffee without that sense of having to rush. What will our world be like if we keep putting city development & change above those things that bring us together. Cell phones computers will connect but we are still apart. The Village Inn brings	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.

**Table J2.4-4. Response to Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petition Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			us together in real time - with smiles hugs - conversations - great food and service. Maybe we need to all stop & think about what's really important in our lives. The Chinese restaurant & large parking lot across from Jared is also a large space in good location.	
P03-A46	Village Inn	Fleetwood, Cory & Sherie	Village Inn is a meeting & eating place that we love to come to - to meet friends & family that otherwise we would have to find another place that is filled with laughter, good service & of course good food & service. In other words there isn't another one around in close. So keep the restaurant!!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A47	Village Inn	Fox, Joyce	"Progress" isn't advantageous when it ruins/misplaces a community icon business of 41 years.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A48	Village Inn	Fuller, Joan	We don't need or want MAX from Portland - Leave us alone -	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A49	Village Inn	Gester, Peter	PUT PARKING ABOVE THE <u>TRAIN TURNAROUND</u> . THERE ARE NOT ENOUGH EATERIES LIKE VILLAGE - PLAN A WAY TO KEEP VI	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A50	Village Inn	Hamer (Douglass), Patsy L.	Our family has been coming to VI at least 2/3 generations - we have moved in & out of the metro area during those years but always meet here for dependable, healthy meals and kind service -	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A51	Village Inn	Handy, Vicki	Alleviating congestion is important. However, targeting a family owned business, Village Inn, for destruction is an unacceptable price for a MAX line. Alternative options must be considered.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A52	Village Inn	Hansen, DeeDee	1) I like this place because I spend time with others, where we can talk. 2) Our family gathers here regularly because of the friendliness of the staff, excellent service, & delicious food. While I understand the need for public transportation, I can't believe that destroying a business is the only solution to light rail. The Village Inn had to move once already because of the building of Bridgeport Village. This is truly unfair to this family-oriented business with a loyal clientele.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A53	Village Inn	Harme, Charles D.	Count on my vote - keep this business here!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A54	Village Inn	Harris, Brenda	A MAX LINE IS NOT NEEDED IN THIS AREA. THE AREA IS SUBURBAN AND AFFLUENT, PEOPLE IN THIS AREA WILL NOT UTILIZE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A55	Village Inn	Harris, Donald	There is no need for another Metro/TriMet MAX service in this area. This would be a total waste of tax dollars and the removal of an iconic service like Village Inn. If anything is needed, please widen the I5 corridor.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for widening I-5 instead of building light rail. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A56	Village Inn	Hayden, E. L.	It is a preferred restaurant that we drive several miles to visit. The food is excellent and the service also. The staff are friendly, and the prices are reasonable.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A57	Village Inn	Henkel, R. C.	Village Inn has been one of our favorites for years. You have consistently had the friendliest service, most delicious dishes and best prices for years. This location is most convenient for us in Tualatin. Please don't take our Village Inn away!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A58	Village Inn	Henson, Jason	No more MAX, more mom & pop's = no need for more MAX. That being said we are regulars personally, and I also work for a local business that uses Village Inn's services regularly. Village Inn & businesses like them are what make America great <u>period</u> .	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A59	Village Inn	Hewlett Family	While mass transit is important, taking away a family friendly multi generational diner is not the answer. Village Inn has become our families late night stop after sports practices, our after church tradition and our comfort food on a lazy afternoon. Portland has become too trendy...we need traditional diners for families to find comfort when they don't want fancy food...tell MAX/Metro/TriMet to find another location. My picky eater actually eats food here!!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A60	Village Inn	Hill, David	Village Inn has been my families Sunday brunch restaurant for over 10 years. My children & grandparents have enjoyed coming here for as long as we have lived in Lake Oswego. The friendly service, good food, and convenient location keeps us coming back. Please don't take Village Inn away or build a space for them into your plans.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A61	Village Inn	Hummert, Sharon	The Village Inn should stay where it is. The terminal for the MAX train can be modified. This is a great restaurant & it has already been moved once. We need this restaurant to stay put.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A62	Village Inn	Hungate, Linda	The Village Inn offers seniors a good meal at a reasonable price. It's walkable to a lot of locals. It's located directly across the street from Bridgeport Village which makes it very convenient to another shopping area. Its location is off I-5 - making it convenient for motorists. It's a prime location, and as customers, we are here 3-5 times a week, as are a lot of locals. I would need to understand the benefit to the area of adding the Southwest light rail project.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.

**Table J2.4-4. Response to Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petition Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
P03-A63	Village Inn	Hunter, Meredith	Where to start? What you're proposing is criminal. THIS Village Inn is an outstanding "coffee shop" and all that conveys. Good atmosphere, good food, good people - constancy - a 'go-to' place to meet friends and family over comfort food.  There are precious few of these restaurants left - in case you hadn't noticed - and you're going to bulldoze it for basically a parking lot! Be ashamed, be very ashamed. Take Men's Warehouse or DSW or even Bed Bath & Beyond - they can go anywhere. Leave our coffee shop alone - WE (and I use we universally) - need this place!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A64	Village Inn	Hurgate, Bill	We love the friendly, affordable Village Inn. It has become a landmark in the Bridgeport area. It is usually somewhat crowded - a testament to the quality meals - breakfast, lunch, and dinner. The staff has been here for years - they are known and loved. This truly is a "family restaurant" and we feel part of the family. The 50's - 60's ambience makes you smile. This is a destination and a reminder of earlier times. The Village Inn has earned its place here. Don't ruin it for all of us!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A65	Village Inn	Johnson, Mona	The MAX flyer that you are giving to customers is pro-project. Make a flyer that tells your story & how you support the local community.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A66	Village Inn	Kafalias, Alex	As a local business I feel it's time to restrict Metro's and TriMet's power. Oregon is already very business unfriendly and local governing bodies compound this. My vote is to re-structure Metro and give more control over growth back to the people of Oregon. Save our <u>Restaurant!</u>	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A67	Village Inn	Kaufman, Marilyn	Village Inn - <u>perfect</u> in many ways - <u>efficient</u> , <u>friendly</u> staff - great <u>food</u> - great community <u>family</u> restaurant caters to many hours service. Always our favorite - FREEWAY access. ALSO VERY IMPORTANT - traffic at that terrible intersection is more than it can handle now. Lanes and signs don't match from your first view. Speeding cars make it impossible to watch lane designations and match with signs on freeway underpass. IT WOULD ONLY BE MUCH WORSE with station location. Very heavy traffic now.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A68	Village Inn	Krafthefer, W.	We love Village Inn- we have been coming here for years - with our parents...and now with the kids!! No one uses the WES line out here (2 cars at a time? Really?) and there is already a huge park and ride across the street. Small business is very important in our family as my brother owns a local furniture store. Please reconsider the route for Bridgeport - or <u>go around</u> Village Inn!!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A69	Village Inn	Langner, Patrick	This restaurant is too important to our community. There <u>must</u> be another Metro/TriMet solution. Please put on your thinking caps. The cheapest way is not always the best way.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A70	Village Inn	Lehrer, Judy	Its sad when a business has been here for many years and bigger business decides to remove it. We have been coming here for years. The only restaurant in the area.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A71	Village Inn	Lehrer, Robert E.	Save Village Inn - we've enjoyed this restaurant for years. If you want the area move it and light rail pay for the move	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A72	Village Inn	Lewis, Steve	We have been patrons for almost 25 years - this is a tradition, it is family & good quality food - terrific service. We don't want to lose this part of our lives. This has become family for us!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A73	Village Inn	Lind, Mr. & Mrs. Don	Very convenient - food is wonderful! Service is excellent. Reasonable prices - friendly atmosphere! Clean!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A74	Village Inn	Maxwell, Jerry	Village Inn has been in Tualatin for many years. They were forced to relocate when Bridgeport Village was being built and the idea of making them relocate (again) is ridiculous! They should not be required to move. Our local businesses need to be encouraged and not prosecuted. Keep Village Inn where its at! Please!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A75	Village Inn	Maxwell, Melissa	Our family has been visiting Village Inn since 1980 at original location in Tualatin. We have considered this restaurant a neighborhood icon in this area and would be very distressed if this family owned business would be forced to relocate (again) or would close down . Please rethink this decision to take property and restaurant away from local merchant!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A76	Village Inn	McCade, F.	I belong to a club that meets for lunch every Sat - we enjoy Village Inn. American family style restaurants are disappearing. This is a favorite.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A77	Village Inn	McClure, Scott	Breakfast is the best meal of the day on our weekends and the Village Inn is one of our few favorites. We have been coming here for well over a decade and wouldn't just miss it - life would not be the same. Good luck in this fight.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A78	Village Inn	McDowell, Carlene	The Village Inn in Tualatin is ideally located for our family members who live in Hillsboro, Aloha, Lake Oswego, and Oregon City to meet for family celebrations. Granted we could meet at other nearby restaurants, however the Village Inn has a varied and flexible menu and is warm inside. One of our family members, who has an extremely limited diet, can order off the menu. There is no other restaurant in the nearby area where that is possible. Please keep this restaurant open and in its current location.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A79	Village Inn	Mitchell, Geraldine	Please don't close the restaurant. It is so fantastic like coming to a family members home!!! I am totally against the plan to close it.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A80	Village Inn	Mitchell, Mike	Great place to get service & food - has the old fashion feel that a lot of places is missing	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A81	Village Inn	Moore, Catherine J.	As usual Tri-Met is only "listening" to their own "voice". The "Village Inn" is an excellent restaurant @ the bus transition area. It has served us well over the years. Plesae "get" it and support buses & not "knock" out the established businesses for your own poor community planning. Noticed the "Metro" board of transportation members did not ride the bus. No wonder!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.  Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus service improvements instead of light rail.
P03-A82	Village Inn	Nelson, Betty	I support MAX coming to Tigard/Tualatin <u>but</u> please do not force Village Inn to move AGAIN!! There should be a law preventing a business from being forced to move more than once for "progress". Village Inn serves a unique community - provides good food at reasonable prices - not easy to find around here!! Older citizens congregate here, they	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.

**Table J2.4-4. Response to Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petition Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			are a long-standing small business offering employment & service to our community. Forcing them to move will leave many of us with no place we can afford. Please find another way!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A83	Village Inn	Newberry, Laurie	Four generations of my family have made this a destination for every graduation, family reunion, wedding party, gathering and baby blessing. The Village Inn is where I can still think of all the family times and laughter	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A84	Village Inn	Newell, Jeff	Good food, pleasant atmosphere!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A85	Village Inn	Nowall, Wylie	Leave them alone! Please (-:	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A86	Village Inn	Oak, Dorothy	Village Inn is a true staple for Tigard in fact for what its worth, it is for the State of Oregon. They have the only restaurant of top quality for food and family dining. We do not want a connecting light rail transit system that would only bring in more homeless and traffic problems like the one you put in making Oregon a sanctuary state. Are you all on Planet Mars? No station, no, no, no. June 14th 2018.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant. Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime. In general, compared to the No-Build Alternative, future traffic levels would be lower with the Project, except at locations with new or expanded park and rides. To learn more about the traffic analysis and traffic impacts, please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS.
P03-A87	Village Inn	Oest, Allen & Jane	VI is a staple of the community serving families seniors and all with a friendly healthy food and environment. We have been patrons for 30+ years. They have already served the City by forgoing their original site, being forced to move once. I think it wrong to force them again to move or worse be pushed out of business. I can't imagine an area that would serve the community or VI as well. VI is the greatest asset = where it is, more than the Line - not progress.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A88	Village Inn	Olin, Shirley	Absolutely incensed - mad, mad you would take this location away from this lovely business!! Save it!!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A89	Village Inn	Palmer, Edward J.	I've been a customer for quite a while and we've raised our children in Tualatin. When they were in middle school & high school, it was a weekend treat or reward to come to the Village Inn for our breakfast/lunch together. I continue to enjoy our brunches here with my wife, and we would be saddened to see this disappear. Consider other sites carefully and do not negatively impact the quality of life here.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A90	Village Inn	Palmer-DuPrau, Tabitha	Village Inn is important because it is one of the few affordable breakfast & lunch restaurants in the Bridgeport area. It gives people a place to go when they need to get out of their homes. There are other places for a station but not for a decent family style restaurant in the Bridgeport/Tigard community.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A91	Village Inn	Phillips, Peggy	It is a beautiful, friendly place to have breakfast, lunch, or dinner. It is convenient and I do not want them to move.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A92	Village Inn	Prapas, Christi D.	The Village Inn is my home away from home. It would be very upsetting to not have VI at this location. I will carry a sign gladly!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A93	Village Inn	Prussack, Brigitte	We love coming here because it's a family owned business and they have the best bacon!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A94	Village Inn	Prussack, Sam	We love this restaurant! My wife and I spent the weekend in Central Oregon, roughly 3 hours away. When we woke up Sunday and said "where should we go for breakfast?" we chose to drive all the way back to Village Inn Bridgeport, because we love it there so much! Please stay open!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A95	Village Inn	R., Carlos & Carmen	Village Inn provides a nostalgic experience reminiscent of my childhood, in a cozy, convenient location. <a href="#">Save Our Inn!</a>	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A96	Village Inn	Rainy, Kristi	Coming to Village Inn means family time. It is such a lovely community. I believe it stays because I love coming here with my family. This community is wonderful.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A97	Village Inn	Rhodes, Ina Carol	I will "actively campaign" against this move. Re-think "Tualatin"	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant. Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for serving Tualatin instead of Bridgeport Village.
P03-A98	Village Inn	Rios-Daley, Marina	Village Inn is close to our home, easy to get here. The only close restaurant with dinner hours - others are closed at 2-3 pm. Build a garage on your existing parking lot. Ther is another bus lot not far away. People can park at the Barbur Transit Center & catch TriMet there.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A99	Village Inn	Ritemann, Mary	The Village Inn gives the public reasonably priced good food in a high-price area. The location is ideal for all parts of the Portland-Metro area. The restaurant is thriving, family-owned and family-oriented.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.

**Table J2.4-4. Response to Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petition Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
P03-A100	Village Inn	Robelli, Mike	Great Family	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A101	Village Inn	Sanders, Sharon	This is not a good idea, the better idea would be to add a car or two and then light rail with the WES. Extend that line into the valley and get property from maybe some farms. Could use existing track over the Willamette at Wilsonville (on Wilsonville train bridge) and alleviate the traffic coming from the south. Could also run track (on WES) clear to Woodburn eventually to Salem and have a line all the way, at least in peak hours. This would cut down traffic & eliminate the back-up on I-5. At this point enlarging or layering the parking at the current WES end of line (Wilsonville). Improving WES service on the flat land would be wiser since now you have to find a way to get to the light rail. I believe better WES system would be a better way and less costly and leave the Bridgeport area alone. Could have better bus service from WES or another stop. It would help and also not make unbelievable tax burden for home & business owner. Thank you.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant. Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for Westside Express Service (WES) Commuter Rail and bus improvements instead of light rail. Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the alignment to Wilsonville from the current end of the WES Commuter Rail line.
P03-A102	Village Inn	Sanders, Tom	Bringing the MAX to Bridgeport is one of the stupidest ideas imaginable increasing an already overloaded transportation area, plus light rail is an expensive and proven poor alternative mass transit alternative, a better plan would be to increase and extend the WES system using present rails south to the Donald/Aurora exit area thus relieving I-5/Boone's Bridge overload. Light rail is expensive and static/buses are versatile. Buses operate during adverse conditions when MAX can't. Buses diffuse population, light rails creates congestion. Studies show light rail is the prime mover of crime.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime. Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for Westside Express Service (WES) Commuter Rail and bus improvements instead of light rail. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A103	Village Inn	Sardone, Frank	In this age of everything "instantly" and chain eateries, the Village Inn represents an oasis, where people can eat at a slower pace, converse with neighbors and staff, and enjoy what having a meal should be. It's all about family, and Village Inn represents that. Metro: don't bully your way this time. "Let It Be"	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A104	Village Inn	Sardone, Mary Jane	The Village Inn is a family restaurant that has been here for years! Why take a wonderful environment away? "Sometimes progress is not the best option"! Please leave the Village Inn where it is! (Tualatin Resident)	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A105	Village Inn	Scott, Joann C.	Light rail - YES! Displace current business - NO! Locate light rail along present railroad R/W (right-of-way), don't make confluence of traffic worse! Shift to 1/4 mi west and leave present businesses as they are! Use Railway route - not buildings!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for light rail. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant. Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for using a railway route near Bridgeport Village.
P03-A106	Village Inn	Shivers, John A.	My parents, myself, my kids...we all have great memories here & the food is fantastic & reasonable. This has been a part of the community since way before Bridgeport & all of this development. Keep it here, keep the charm & history	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A107	Village Inn	Sierra, Lola A.	I support the Village Inn. The restaurant is a place where friends & family can come and have a good meal and then go to the movies...Please don't take my fun away	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A108	Village Inn	Sigler, Mary Anne	Village Inn is a place I regularly meet with friends for breakfast or come for dinner with my husband. I love the atmosphere of the restaurant - clean - good values - and best part regular staff that has been here with them for years. That is a good sign that it is a great place to work and eat. The location is a perfect spot for us to come and hope it will continue to be here. The plan that is being presented is very unfair and uncaring about a longtime family business.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A109	Village Inn	Sinclair, Susan	We've been coming here for over 20 years. Village Inn is a landmark here & the greatest restaurant in the area! There are so many, many older/elderly customers who will be displaced by the "wrong" decision by TriMet. You would be taking away something so important to our community & use it to transport people who don't even live here.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A110	Village Inn	Slaughter, Bea	Leave where it is. Great food. Give them a break. 2nd time this happened.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A111	Village Inn	Smits, Teri	This is a wonderful, busy, family oriented establishment that needs to stay right where it is. I come here often, it is easy to get to and it has enough parking.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A112	Village Inn	Solomon, Carl	Good food good location fine business. Hands off.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A113	Village Inn	Spears, Patricia	This is a family owned business. Family owned businesses are the backbone of our communities. The people who work here are like family to many people in the area	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A114	Village Inn	Stensberg, Charlene C.	It is a historical business. We have enjoyed many meals here for years. I am totally against this plan. It would take a home place from all customers.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A115	Village Inn	Stewart, Lori	This is the best restaurant in this area - great meeting place - great services - find another area Metro & TriMet!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.

**Table J2.4-4. Response to Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petition Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
P03-A116	Village Inn	Thomson, Linda	This restaurant is a lovely place for families and seniors to be able to enjoy healthy meals at affordable prices. It employs several who have depended on this establishment for years. Taxpayer dollars can be spent more effectively. Use existing rail systems. "Progress" can be unkind and expensive. We need neither.	Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for using existing rail systems instead of a new light rail alignment. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A117	Village Inn	Tofte, June	Find another way to handle this. This place is an institution, it has been uprooted once several years ago. Don't do this to the Village Inn.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A118	Village Inn	Ulrich, Ron	They had to move once, and now they are being asked to move again. They are greatly loved by everyone and these are peoples livelihoods, they need to feel secure to stay here, and serve our community.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A119	Village Inn	Ulrich, Sherry	Because it is part of the Bridgeport group of businesses. It balances the otherwise blank landscape. It is very attractive and draws many people to the area and to shop other businesses. It is all connected to an attractive shopping center for the community. It is a meeting place for our community, and they work hard for us, have great food & service. P.S. - maybe an alternative would be to build a skywalk from the Jared (jewelry store) area parking area and down away, to expand more parking. It seems there is empty land over there. Thank you.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A120	Village Inn	Unknown	We have been coming for years as a family. This place is a tradition! It would upset us so much ):	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A121	Village Inn	Unknown	It is the best place to dine when visiting mom and sister	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A122	Village Inn	Unknown	My husband & I really enjoy this Village Inn. We dine here at least once a week or two times a week. The food is great & we have always had really good service. Please don't let the MAX take our restaurant away.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A123	Village Inn	Unknown, Anne	We prefer that the restaurant remain where it is now, location is convenient to us.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A124	Village Inn	Unknown, Carol	"Pave Paradise...put up a parking lot"...seriously??	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A125	Village Inn	Unknown, Chris	We're out of towners & this is our favorite breakfast place. Please don't take it away. *SAVE THE VILLAGE INN. Don't destroy a classic. New doesn't mean improved.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A126	Village Inn	Unknown, Christensen	Please find a new route	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A127	Village Inn	Unknown, Jennifer	Village Inn has been making my breakfast every weekend for the last eight years. It brings a sense of community to Bridgeport Village which is filled with too many national chain businesses. I feel that if it were lost it would make our neighborhood too impersonal. Please preserve our community and put the bus turnaround somewhere else.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A128	Village Inn	Unknown, Kelli	I love Village Inn. The food & people are great. Save Village Inn!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A129	Village Inn	Unknown, Kelsey	Village Inn is Tigard's ONLY quality family restaurant. We have been coming for years & are completely AGAINST this!! Leave Village Inn where it is.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A130	Village Inn	Unknown, Kristen	We have been coming to Village Inn since 1985, and it was the place to bring each one of my kids when they were born. Lots of memories & special people, so don't make them move again. Pretty sad to see a MAX train in this area - Boo!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A131	Village Inn	Unknown, Mario	The food is amazing and there is barely any wait for the food	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A132	Village Inn	Unknown, Robin	Village Inn has been a staple to our family for years. Even when you were in the old location across street. Hope its here for our kids & grandkids.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A133	Village Inn	Unknown, Sandee	We have been coming to the Village for over twenty years. The food, atmosphere and employees are amazing. We come here because its home and we do not want it to go away. We would miss our breakfast family time.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A134	Village Inn	Unknown, Stephanie	Village Inn has been here since I was a kid. As a Seattle native, I moved to Portland as an adult. I came to this Village Inn often as a child while visiting my grandparents. I love being able to still come here with them. I love the memories that this place has for me.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A135	Village Inn	Unknown, Steve	I'm from Vancouver BC and we come down to Portland quite regularly to enjoy a weekend away. We always stop in for breakfast and love this place. It would be such a shame to lose such a nice family business. Enough of the big businesses crushing the little guy. Save the Village.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A136	Village Inn	Unknown, Wynona	This wonderful family owned business needs to remain! When many go out of business this has been a local institution for 41 years. Shame on you.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A137	Village Inn	Unknown, Yajaira	Friendly, delicious and a family place.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.

**Table J2.4-4. Response to Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petition Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
P03-A138	Village Inn	Velk, Michael & Connie	Please keep this restaurant open	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A139	Village Inn	Walker, Karen	We have been coming to Village Inn since they were at their old location. This is the only place in the area for B - L & D that is family friendly. I understand there is another option for the MAX line - PLEASE use it.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A140	Village Inn	Winkelman, Darrel & Betty	We are members of a car club named Road Runners West. We use your room every month in fall & winter. We enjoy the food & staff, location for members coming from different areas is good. Our group has met here for 10-15 years. It is not something we want for TriMet & Metro to use this property for their benefit. This would also cause people to lose their jobs.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A141	Village Inn	Woldhan, Cheryl	Come in here very often - love the VI! We'll <u>really</u> miss it if it closes. Is there no other place to put this may <u>station</u> ? There are not hardly any choices for breakfast - please don't do this.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-A142	Village Inn	Wright, Jason & Jackie	Great place and location	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B1	Village Inn	A, Dianne	This is the only Village Inn I will eat at. Food is much better and people are family. Do not take away! )-:	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B2	Village Inn	Akin, Denise	We have our car club meeting here at Village Inn every month and have for years. In addition we have friends & family we meet here that come from cities all around (Oregon City, Gresham, Salem etc). There aren't other restaurants with this great of food. Please keep Village Inn here!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B3	Village Inn	Alt, Dan	We support local family owned businesses	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B4	Village Inn	Andersen, Jon	The Village Inn has been a notably fine establishment for us for many years and we will continue to support this business for years to come - Lord willing. Sincerely, Jon Andersen	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B5	Village Inn	Anonymous	NO! NO! NO!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B6	Village Inn	Anonymous	It makes no sense to remove a quality family restaurant for a bus stop - why not use the Bed Bath & Beyond area - they will be gone soon anyway -	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B7	Village Inn	Anonymous	I'd rather have (good) breakfast than MORE of Portland's homeless.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B8	Village Inn	Anonymous	I have been bringing my son here after school for six years. This is his favorite place to eat at. It's our quality time, with good food, friendly faces, and special memories. Losing Village Inn would be devastating to us. There are other places for a MAX station but only one restaurant that gives our family the joy that this one does.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B9	Village Inn	Anonymous	We have dined here since we moved to Oregon. It's a welcoming and family oriented environment. Please save our favorite breakfast spot!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B10	Village Inn	Anonymous	Please don't take away our favorite place to eat. You already have a bus station across the street so do not take away Village Inn	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B11	Village Inn	Anonymous	Its been tradition to come here every Father's Day. It's a place of home away from home. When everything is constantly changing and overwhelming, this place is like a safe haven breather. Why change a good thing?	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B12	Village Inn	Anonymous	This is a great place! Not just to eat, but to enjoy company w/friends. My parents brought me to the old location when I was a baby...and (after they were forced to move) I've been bringing my three children here since they were born. Thanks for all the memories and we look forward to coming HERE for many years to come.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B13	Village Inn	Anonymous	We've been coming to Village Inn for years. We love the family feel, and that it's not a massive chain of restaurants. It's also very convenient to where we live. Please keep the Village Inn here!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B14	Village Inn	Anonymous	This restaurant is like family. Everyone knows you here. I see the same patrons each time we come. Some are individual elderly men who live alone. They are greeted like family & that makes life worth living.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B15	Village Inn	Anonymous	The Village Inn provides a wonderful place for many community meetings as well as a meeting place for friends that come for meals. My wife and I have become regulars and enjoy sharing with the staff and friends. Keep the Village Inn open!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B16	Village Inn	Anonymous	Me and my friends used to walk here every wed	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B17	Village Inn	Anonymous	This area has enough shopping malls, bus transits, MAX lines! Leave the Village Inn alone! It is a part of the community and a great and affordable place for seniors to eat. It would be sorely missed, not to mention the jobs that would be lost. These people that serve us are like family. Sincerely, a Tax Payer!!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B18	Village Inn	Anonymous	We have been coming here for years. We enjoy the food, the waitress, for 20 years. Please find another location for MAX!!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B19	Village Inn	Anonymous	We have been coming here for years. We enjoy the food, location, and a special friendship with our waitress for over 20 years. Please find another location for MAX!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.

**Table J2.4-4. Response to Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petition Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
P03-B20	Village Inn	Anonymous	We have been coming here for as long as this wonderful restaurant has been here - we ate here on <u>opening day!!!</u> Our family and all of our friends would dearly miss our favorite place to eat - don't let them close this wonderful restaurant down!!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B21	Village Inn	Anonymous	Please leave our Village Inn here. We are a community and many families use this restaurant.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B22	Village Inn	Anonymous	The food & people are so great! We need this place!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B23	Village Inn	Anonymous	V.I. is the best awesomest place to eat in the area..& we don't have <u>any</u> - cheap good excellent food & service - friendly waiters - <u>staff</u> - family - if you grew up on fried liver potatoes & onions yummy. <u>NO RAIL!</u>	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B24	Village Inn	Anonymous	Don't destroy this resource.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B25	Village Inn	Anonymous	For years we have continued our fellowship with friends. Leaving church and heading for Village Inn for breakfast. Please do not take this Village Inn away. They have had to move once before for Bridgeport. They are run by a family who love this place. They will lose their income as will a bunch of wonderful servers. You would be putting so many out of work. Please find another place for MAX line. Everyone loves the people at Village Inn.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B26	Village Inn	Anonymous	The food here is fabulous for the price, which is very reasonable. The service and staff is always friendly. Put the MAX station elsewhere. There is land all around. Do not take away this great FAMILY restaurant.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B27	Village Inn	Anonymous	NO! Find another place!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B28	Village Inn	Anonymous	Please use another location. My family & I really enjoy coming to this restaurant. It is pleasant & affordable. We seniors would really miss it.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B29	Village Inn	Anonymous	I have lived in Tualatin for 20 years. This is my favorite restaurant in the area. I have friends that come all the way from Beaverton & Portland to eat here. Forcing VI out is criminal. There has to be another way. VI is family.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B30	Village Inn	Anonymous	We have been customers of Village Inn for over 30 years. We brought our children and parents and friends - to their family style restaurant - it's a regional family gathering place. Now our children bring their children here. Our friends call their adult children in Atlanta GA to brag that they are here - enjoying Eggs Benedict with the fabulous sauce!  As much as the food is great - the staff is wonderful!!! They are friendly honest and certainly "customer service driven". Last, but not least, this is the cleanest restaurant we have been to. Village Inn is part of our family!! Thank you -	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B31	Village Inn	Anonymous	We don't need another MAX station, but we do need the Village Inn. It is a reasonable priced restaurant with excellent food. If you take this away the neighborhood will lose something that can't be replaced.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B32	Village Inn	Anonymous	We've been customers of VI since 1974! Besides being a landmark it's been our go to place for breakfast - and it should stay that way!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B33	Village Inn	Anonymous	We love the location & convenience of the Village Inn. On the front page of the Oregonian a few days ago was a BIG article saying how ridership on the MAX was WAY DOWN & the WES train has NEVER lived up to its ridership projections, the MAX is being rammed down our throat to the tune of millions & millions of dollars w/empty trains, while we are in bumper to bumper traffic because no NEW roads are being built. Also, I would never ride the MAX nor would my children due to the lack of safety on the trains & at the stations. I hope the decision hasn't already been made, please save Village Inn.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime and safety. Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for roadway improvements instead of light rail. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B34	Village Inn	Anonymous	We come to Village Inn every Sunday morning. It is like home. We will be very sad if it is razed. There is no place like it.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B35	Village Inn	Anonymous	Village Inn has always been the go-to place for my family and my friends. It is my favorite place to go! The staff is amazing & I know them. Please choose another location!!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B36	Village Inn	Anonymous	The food here is nutritious and special. The clientele are cheery, funny, and superb! Hope you work out a better plan for this restaurant, we love you!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B37	Village Inn	Anonymous	Best place for business meetings	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B38	Village Inn	Anonymous	Village Inn has been a community gathering place benefited by many.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.

**Table J2.4-4. Response to Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petition Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
P03-B39	Village Inn	Anonymous	Please don't take away Village Inn! It's delicious!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B40	Village Inn	Anonymous	My family loves coming here every Saturday. It's like a second home.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B41	Village Inn	Anonymous	We have been coming to this location for the past 5 years with our family. It is an affordable family restaurant that has wonderful food. Tear down Fuddrucker's. That place is a dump. Its dirty and I'm surprised no one has died yet! Village Inn should be left alone.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B42	Village Inn	Anonymous	There's enough disruption here. We need another McCall. Close the gate to California. This restaurant has moved once. Once is enough. I don't see that many people riding the train. Don't encourage more people coming here.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B43	Village Inn	Anonymous	Notwithstanding the enormous impact upon an already overlooked I-5 corridor...the years of construction delays, etc would render travel on I-5 nearly impossible. The area is already much too overcrowded. If this plan goes ahead, the east side of I-5 would offer the best alternative for routing. Established businesses, such as the Village Inn, could be retained. VI is a landmark establishment that has previously been <u>forced</u> to relocate. One such hardship in a generation is enough!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant. Please see Master Response 15 regarding your support for an extended I-5 alignment.
P03-B44	Village Inn	Anonymous	Warm loving family - the service is outstanding. We have been coming here & spending time with our family. We live near the MAX now in Portland & it brings crime, panhandlers & break ins to vehicles - please don't move this family, they are a blessing to this neighborhood.	Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B45	Village Inn	Anonymous	This has always been our favorite place over the years. For you to have to move is totally unfair. Let them move the rail line somewhere else and leave where you are. There are only so many options in life and its time to say no. Best of luck to stay here.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B46	Village Inn	Anonymous	Please keep Village Inn at its location. We need moderately priced restaurants.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B47	Village Inn	Anonymous	The food is wow!! It is always excellent. We have been coming here for several years, when attending the Broadway Rose Plays in particular we for sure plan to meet several friends for dinner. The people who work here are like family. Sure do not want them to move.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B48	Village Inn	Anonymous	This has been a good central place to come for good food.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B49	Village Inn	Anonymous	It's always been a comfort to enjoy a real breakfast with friendly staff and easy location. No to MAX!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B50	Village Inn	Anonymous	This has been a great spot for us to meet with family & friends. We have been coming to Village Inn when it was located up and to the left of this one.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B51	Village Inn	Anonymous	This is a great restaurant & has been a terrific location. Metro needs to start thinking & planning further into the future than 5 years. Local business is important to the area & to the economy. Get it together & let people have some input.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B52	Village Inn	Anonymous	PUT NEW CONSTRUCTION ELSEWHERE IF AT ALL. THIS SUPER-BUS PROJECT IS AN UNNECESSARY ELABORATION ANYWAY. JUST PUT REGULAR BUS STOPS AND ELSEWHERE!!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B53	Village Inn	Anonymous	My husband and I come to Village Inn every weekend, sometimes both Saturday and Sunday. My husband even uses Village Inn for his morning business meetings. We love the super friendly, efficient team members and the homey atmosphere. The food is pretty darn good too! (-: This area needs a <u>GOOD</u> place for a quick, casual meal and Village Inn is the perfect place. PLEASE DON'T TAKE OUR VILLAGE INN!!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B54	Village Inn	Anonymous	Coming to Village Inn is a family institution, it would be a shame to have this restaurant fall to the foe of progress. Since people don't talk as much on the phone and prefer to text its nice to have a homey place to sit and talk relax and eat together!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B55	Village Inn	Anonymous	This is a very popular place for many people. It would be a serious disappointment for this to happen. Please reconsider!!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B56	Village Inn	Anonymous	This has been a family gathering for our family for over 15 years! Our family Sundays would never be the same. Move the station! Keep Family traditions sacred!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B57	Village Inn	Anonymous	NO! NO! NO! What are you thinking!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B58	Village Inn	Anonymous	Because it's stupid! Go to an empty location - don't take away a small business - you greedy monsters.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B59	Village Inn	Anonymous	THIS IS FAVORITE PLACE FOR BREAKFAST! MY WIFE CAN'T COOK HASHBROWNS LIKE THEY DO! THE SERVICE IS ALWAYS SPECTACULAR AND FRIENDLY!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B60	Village Inn	Bailey, Herman & Eileen	We want Village Inn to stay at this location. We as a huge family have been meeting here for years. PLUS church people meet here always. <u>NO YOU CAN'T HAVE THIS PROPERTY</u>	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.

**Table J2.4-4. Response to Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petition Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
P03-B61	Village Inn	Barnett, Paula	Part of our everyday eateries. Very inconvenient if it's removed! People are friendly & accommodating. Don't want them to lose their jobs!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B62	Village Inn	Baron, Carolyn M.	We have enjoyed eating at Village Inn for many years & they are in a local area, and they have many continual customers from that. I come back repeatedly. The Village Inn is an ideal restaurant and it is in an ideal area. Many people would be unhappy if it was no longer where it is. There are many other places for Metro to locate, do they even have that many riders?	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B63	Village Inn	Beavers, Temple & Carolyn	We frequently eat at the Village Inn and find the food here great and the location is very convenient. We would really hate to see it gone from this location. The whole staff and mgmt are both friendly & most capable. The Village Inn would be sorely missed from this location.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B64	Village Inn	Bellew, Stephanie	No way! Best breakfast in town! Our family loves this restaurant! Please do not take it away!!! }-:	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B65	Village Inn	Bilow, Steve	I first came to this Village Inn over 28 years ago and I choose it partly to support a family owned business that brings revenue to the community. If TriMet wanted this property for a MAX station then I would have difficulty disputing it. But to take this property and potentially run a 30-year community business for a <u>bus turnaround</u> is unconsciable! We have had enough businesses impacted by eminent domain decisions in the greater Portland area. We don't need to do it again for a bus turnaround which is the least important part of a 2 1/2 billion dollar project. Find another place to turn buses around and leave this family-run business alone!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B66	Village Inn	Blackwell, Jim	As an owner of a small business within 1/2 mile we have used Village Inn for 20 years. We have watched their kids at our Durham Learning Tree. Our staff uses the restaurant for lunch - we support every effort to keep the Village Inn here and appreciate the staff and owners. Please support local business by finding a way to keep Village Inn. Owner of the Durham Learning Tree.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B67	Village Inn	Blodgett, Jim	I was a Bus driver for this area for 20 years. There are other options for MAX & parking etc. This restaurant, Village Inn, is a nice break among all the roads, parking places, & businesses. It also serves a lot of people that feel "like home" here & keep coming back. The people that run it are very friendly & hard-working.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B68	Village Inn	Brown, Janice & David	My husband and I come in about one or two nights a week. Village Inn is like family and after a stressful work week we gather and relax at the dinner table, just like family. Sure you could move the diner but for the lack of sites open that is just not possible. The owners have been and still are a local family running the diner for three generations. It takes years to make a diner successful and there is not enough money to pay for that not to mention the employees losing their jobs!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B69	Village Inn	Cahan, Linda	I've been meeting friends here at least 3x a month for 13 years - when we moved to West Linn from Connecticut. The food, service, & warmth of the owners & staff has been consistently excellent and welcoming. When I heard the MAX line wanted the VI for parking, I was shocked. Build a parking garage or use the Men's Warehouse/DSW area instead. Please don't ruin an excellent local business!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B70	Village Inn	Calkin, Paul	Been coming 20 years. Do not need the rail line as we already have WES.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B71	Village Inn	Catlin, Dianne	NO ON THE MAX STATION AT 72ND!! Village Inn is the only restaurant one can get a home cooked meal, especially LIVER & ONIONS. I drive from Portland to enjoy this restaurant!! METRO HAS A TIGARD LOCATION AND A TUALATIN LOCATION. IF YOU MUST TAKE OVER - THE NEXT OFF RAMP WHERE BUSINESSES ARE NOT THRIVING.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B72	Village Inn	Chin, Maisie	To take away someone's livelihood w/out true compensation is criminal. Small businesses are the backbone of this country and your negligence in taking Village Inn away from this community is cruel. You need to rethink your plan.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B73	Village Inn	Christofferson, Rea	I believe in public transit, but why put a station at the site of a wonderful family-owned restaurant that's been here for 40 years? There has to be a better location. Many VI employees have been here decades, and they've been serving us well - at least once a week - for over 13 years. This is a wonderful place to come for young families and older people - pleasant, healthful, and inexpensive. Please rethink your plan.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B74	Village Inn	Cotner, Shannon	<u>Please!</u> Don't take down the Village Inn!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B75	Village Inn	Csaszar, Mike	Village Inn is a beloved <u>FAMILY</u> restaurant we eat at multiple times a week. The staff is wonderful and an asset to our community. We need more peaceful family restaurants around Bridgeport not more traffic. Plesae hear the community needs.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B76	Village Inn	D., Julie	The Village Inn is a special place and one that our family can all agree on! Many great discussions, laughs, and more have been shared here. Please find another way!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B77	Village Inn	Davis, Lance & Medina, Donna	This has been a cherished gathering place over the years - my husband and I enjoy it. My daughters love to eat (and talk) here, and my friends have enjoyed the Village Inn's staff.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B78	Village Inn	Easily, Marcella	It is easy to get to - the food is always good - great family environment. Prices are consistently reasonable. There are other locations better to be moved.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B79	Village Inn	Elliot, R	I come here to meet w/my friends - the food is outstanding & I feel like family to the regulars who serve. I'd hate to see this restaurant go away - it's been local and so much better than the new places in town. There's plenty of other places for the MAX station.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B80	Village Inn	Evans, Joyce & John	Village Inn great place great people please keep it here	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.

**Table J2.4-4. Response to Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petition Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
P03-B81	Village Inn	Faria, Carol	Please don't take the Village! It is a homey and comfortable alternative to Big Box stores	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B82	Village Inn	Findlay, Janet E.	I've been coming here for 28 years. You moved them once - isn't that enough?	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B83	Village Inn	Fisher, Jim	My wife and I have enjoyed coming to Village Inn for over 5 years. We come for the food and the efficient, friendly service. The staff have been very responsive to our requests. And the food is really good! I have never had a long wait for service and parking is always a snap. It would be a shame and a real loss to our community if the Village Inn would have to go. There appears to be plenty of room in the area of that big intersection to put a station - how about getting rid of McCormick & Schmicks?	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B84	Village Inn	Freeman, Dave & Shelley	My husband & I enjoy coming here for dinner (where he usually gets breakfast). It is close to our home & very convenient. We would have voted against light rail coming here. The areas where they have gone in look dirty & not well kept. And not cost effective.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B85	Village Inn	Fromdahl, Larry	This restaurant is so conveniently located off I-5 freeway. I no longer live @ Tigard and make trips to patronize the restaurant! I have patronized the restaurant for almost 10 years while living in Tigard and now living in Salem for the past 2 years. It is the only Family restaurant in the area. It is well managed, food is great, and selection is good too. It is great to make the trip from Salem to eat @ restaurant. The staff is friendly and eager to satisfy you to make your meal enjoyable & want to come back. It is NOT only a family restaurant, it is a GREAT restaurant too. Please SAVE this restaurant and re-direct Mass Transit.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B86	Village Inn	Goforth, RJ	Please don't take the Village Inn. It provides a wonderful niche that is disappearing rapidly. Person, great scenery walking distance. Additionally one of the <u>only</u> sit down restaurants in this area.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B87	Village Inn	Haas, Pat	Excellent food at a reasonable price. Service is great! Location is great, easy access	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B88	Village Inn	Hamilton, Bill	What a mess it would be to have a transit station in this location. Traffic is a mess as is, no need to make it worse. Unwise concept!!! Village Inn deserves to continue here!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B89	Village Inn	Hanes, Ken	Excellent food at a reasonable price. Service is great. Location is great, easy access	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B90	Village Inn	Heide, Mae & RM	Village Inn is <u>much more</u> important than a parking lot! Let's keep this focus of the neighborhood! Do <u>you</u> ride the bus? I don't!! Please don't tear this establishment down.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B91	Village Inn	Henry Family	Terrible idea! Kicking out a well established business is so not smart! The loss of revenue & job interruption doesn't make sense...Metro needs to consider the facts...	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B92	Village Inn	Hill, Jenny	We have been coming here for years. This is our "go to" place for breakfast. The staff is incredible with excellent service and attitude. The food is wonderful.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B93	Village Inn	Johnson, Gary & Denna	Enough is enough! You already moved these people once crippling their business. Now you're doing it again. Traffic is always awful - leave Village Inn alone.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B94	Village Inn	Lund, Dorothy	This has been such a favorite place of ours - and friends from church to meet after service. The service here is great and we appreciate coming here. I am also very frustrated with the idea of MAX feeling they can dictate about personal property when they are being subsidized. Village Inn needs to stay.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B95	Village Inn	Lund, Wayne	There are less and less iconic locations left in this area. Not only is this a location of memories but it represents a family business that is local and meaningful to the family ownership and community at large. The use of Metro's power, exercised by non-local decision makers, is an abuse of power. Do you have a line - in your mind - of what is governance (sp) and what is ruling? Why do you insist on building out a system that leaves the city more vulnerable to earthquakes than a more robust and flexing method of transportation?	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B96	Village Inn	Maizel, Harriet	I came all the way from Beaverton to eat here. We like this Village Inn so much better than the one near us. The <u>staff</u> is great & food is too.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B97	Village Inn	Maizel, Richard	We have been coming here for years. The Village Inn has the best breakfast in the area. Convenient parking & a great staff. It would be a big loss to the community to lose this special place.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B98	Village Inn	Martin, Brian & Frank, Hannah	I truly love this facility and the staff. It would be <u>terrible</u> to see it destroyed by a TriMet station! They are unsightly and honestly I feel like it would be a huge opportunity for crime and lots more unwanted traffic. Please consider what it would do for this town & beautiful area as well as hurt us as a family oriented town and place to eat. Thank you!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B99	Village Inn	McClain, Ellen	I've been an LO resident for 38 years and have seen plenty of changes. "Progress" is not always the best thing for residents. The traffic here is beyond congested - please keep our community safe and sane. We love the Village Inn - been coming here (or should I say the location before the VI moved here) for years!!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.

**Table J2.4-4. Response to Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petition Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
P03-B100	Village Inn	McClure, Karen	There are very few "places" where I can go and feel comfortable. Village Inn is one of these "places". It is an oasis in a busy and impersonal world. This restaurant has had to relocate once before. That's enough. Another option needs to be considered. Please!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B101	Village Inn	Miller, Don	This is one of a very few full-service, all-meal restaurants that have a senior menu and the only one fixing liver & onions. The Bridgeport area <u>needs</u> one good, non-fancy place to eat. Thanks.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B102	Village Inn	Newman, Doris	While there are several restaurants in the Bridgeport area, the Village Inn is somewhat unique in that it offers a menu that truly features meals for the entire family, including the very youngest. It is particularly geared to family dining with offerings for children and seniors with lighter appetites to substantial meals at modest prices.  The staff is incredibly accommodating and respectful of folks needing help with walkers, wheelchairs, highchairs etc. Unlike some of the other restaurants, it never seems to be a problem at the Village Inn. In addition, it's one of the very few places in the area one can find breakfast! Please consider replacing this special Village Inn with another MAX station. Thank you.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B103	Village Inn	Olsen, Bonnie R.	As a senior citizen Village Inn is my favorite place to eat. It is close by home, convenient to get to, very comfortable friendly service. PLEASE...leave this location alone - <u>please</u> .	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B104	Village Inn	Peterson, Elisabeth	Terrible idea. Great restaurant. Brings more business to shopping area. Don't do it.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B105	Village Inn	Phelps, Eddie	Do not take away my Village Inn. I come here a lot. On my way to Washington. Build Lite Rail somewhere else...	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B106	Village Inn	Phillips, Joe	We've lived in this area for 29 years, and have been a customer all that time. Our grandchildren, here with us today, pick Village Inn as their place for breakfast. At a minimum, Metro needs to find a nearby spot for this restaurant. Ideally find another spot for Metro!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B107	Village Inn	Pinson, Judy	We have come to Village Inn for years. It's like a community restaurant where you're assured of getting great food with smiles from all who work here. There is also congestion at the intersection here!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B108	Village Inn	Richey, Paul	I've been eating at the Village Inn for thirty years. This restaurant has been a staple of the community for a very long time. The new MAX station can go somewhere else.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B109	Village Inn	Rizzutto, Julie & Tony	Village Inn is a place we started coming to years ago for a nice meal. We quickly realized it is much more than a restaurant = it's a community gathering place that is so welcoming & caring by Connie & Ryan and the entire staff. They have a very positive effect on hundreds of lives each week. We've made new friends by meeting other customers. It's a great extended family that truly cares about everyone. We feel this location for Village Inn is vital to the community. Most sincerely, Julie & Tony Rizzutto	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B110	Village Inn	Robison, Joe & Mills, Patti	My dad WWII vet 94 years old and my mother and I have been coming here since they opened. Send the MAX around the restaurant!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B111	Village Inn	Rosenquist, Dave & Kathie	We have been coming to Village Inn since it was in its other location across the street up on a hill. Its been moved from one location already. Being regular customers, and increasing in years & activity we eat here. Sometimes 2x day 4-5 days a week. The food is good, consistent and the people are friendly and like family. It's the BEST Village Inn in all we've been to.  We personally do NOT want MAX at all. With it has brought crime to every area it travels. You need to listen to the "people" and not the city governments who think they know what's best for the people.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B112	Village Inn	Russell, Jim	Please do not force Village Inn to move again!! Once is enough. Tualatin does not need light rail - and certainly not at the terrible cost of forcing a business to close. Great owners - good people. DO NOT DO IT.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B113	Village Inn	Russell, Mrs. Linda	The Village Inn is a wonderful place to eat and the owners & people who work here are like family to us! Find another location for your parking and rail!! You have already done this to these people once!! Enough!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B114	Village Inn	Schaeten, Dave & Nicole	This is a great place good people & food. Please keep Village Inn. Thank you.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B115	Village Inn	Schamber, Larry & Paulette	This restaurant is a cherish(ed) place where we have family gatherings for years, would hate TO lose this Tradition!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B116	Village Inn	Scholes, Alice	My husband & I started going to the Village Inn when they were located at the place before this address. Ever since they have been at this location we have come here many times. It would be a real mistake to close this restaurant. Light rail needs to <u>think</u> of a different answer to the problem.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B117	Village Inn	Schouten, Nicole & Dave	Please keep Village Inn. Great place! Great food & people	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B118	Village Inn	Schulder, J.	Good food!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B119	Village Inn	Skibinski, Linda	My husband & I have enjoyed the Village Inn by Bridgeport weekly for many years now. We feel like we know the hostess and the wait staff and we appreciate the friendliness, courtesy and efficiency with which we are always treated. Most important, of course, we like the food! Equally important though is the convenience of the location as near Bridgeport & Safeway for easy shopping. We truly hope this, our favorite restaurant, doesn't close.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.

**Table J2.4-4. Response to Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petition Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
P03-B120	Village Inn	Spencer, Erika	It is wonderful to have a local family owned restaurant in this area. It's important to have non-commercialized parts of town combined with the hustle & bustle of popular dining places. Village Inn feels like the nostalgic breakfast diner that feels like home. There are barely any diners that give that feeling and offer delicious good quality meals the way Village Inn does. Moving or closing Village Inn from this Tualatin location would be a huge detriment to the city, its loyal customers, and the suburban community at large. Please leave this special establishment where it currently is because it is at the heart of this town and its residents.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B121	Village Inn	Sprauer, Al & Linda	We love this place - It's affordable as opposed to the eateries in Bridgeport Village! Find another location	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B122	Village Inn	Stanaway, Skip	creates a neighborhood improving a town/city. -businesses that are local should not be replaced by parking lots.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B123	Village Inn	Starling, Bev	They already moved once for Bridgeport! STILL an icon! Have been coming here for BF (breakfast) & supper both for over 40 years! Move a big box store! Village Inn has a following!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B124	Village Inn	Stephen, Tom & Gail	We've been coming here for many years. It is an institution in this area run by a family for three generations. Just 12 years ago the family business invested to increase their capacity to meet their customers' demands and to improve the quality in the area. Surely the MAX station can be relocated to an area not impacting this fine Portland business. As a tax payer for the MAX improvements, I urge you to reconsider the impact to the Village Inn	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B125	Village Inn	Stierle, Nanette	<u>PLEASE</u> leave it in place. I love it right here!!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B126	Village Inn	Thomason, Barbara & Bill	This has been a gathering place for family and friends for the 45 years we've lived in Tualatin. Everyone who works here is so friendly we feel they are family. <u>Don't</u> take away our favorite restaurant!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B127	Village Inn	Tomeoni, Bob	We have been coming to V.I. for over 38 years. This VI is a historical site, Tualatin wouldn't be the same without the V.I. Light rail is definitely not a priority. I am incensed at the idea that the light rail which is subsidized with my taxes can dictate to take private property against the owners preference.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B128	Village Inn	Tulay, Kari	Village Inn has been our "go to" place. The food, service, & atmosphere is comforting and feels like home. Tigard-Tualatin area is losing the home town feeling. Taking away an established and loved business is wrong. There will be no privately owned businesses left. Save our Village Inn	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B129	Village Inn	Unknown	I come regularly & think it is not a good idea to re-code restaurant	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B130	Village Inn	Unknown	Our family has enjoyed this restaurant and its location many times. I object to Metro's attempt to take this one.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B131	Village Inn	Unknown	Metro - No, not a good idea!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B132	Village Inn	Unknown	We can't even believe that you are thinking of taking away Village Inn. This is a friendly family restaurant for all. There is nothing like it in this area. Good food, good prices and good people.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B133	Village Inn	Unknown	We support you. What a loss to our community if this goes through. Not right.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B134	Village Inn	Unknown	Good food & nice people	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B135	Village Inn	Unknown, Barb	This restaurant has been a meeting place for many people in our church after church. Please don't take it away!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B136	Village Inn	Unknown, Becky	We come here after our exercise class several times a month. The food is always great, service is good and prices are reasonable. There is no other restaurant close by like this.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B137	Village Inn	Unknown, Carol	Don't take Village Inn away! It is one of our favorite restaurants and was already forced to move once before.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B138	Village Inn	Unknown, Charlotte	Good food & service. A group of us (9-11) come here before going to Broadway Rose plays. They always give us a nice quiet spot so that we enjoy our visit	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B139	Village Inn	Unknown, Cheryl	We live in Salem and it's a great place to eat and take a break especially when going on to PDX. We also brought Mom here who enjoyed it when she was alive so it's a memory place also.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B140	Village Inn	Unknown, Cheryl	We love our times at the Village Inn. Their food and atmosphere is wonderful. Food is great. We live in Salem and it is a perfect place to stop to eat on our trip to Portland. Please let them stay!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B141	Village Inn	Unknown, Cynthia	A home to many (-: Stability in a changing world! The best service you'll ever find! Stay!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.

**Table J2.4-4. Response to Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petition Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
P03-B142	Village Inn	Unknown, Donna	Light Rail is not a priority to me - we vote to keep Village Inn and scratch light rail -	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B143	Village Inn	Unknown, Dorothy	Abolish Metro!! Village Inn is a landmark restaurant that has been a part of our family for generations. This site is a fantastic location and does not deserve to be a part of the tactics behind eminent domain. Look at their customer loyalty. Look at their popularity. Better yet, look at the tax revenue you will lose. Also, we will NEVER support another bond measure you try to put before us!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B144	Village Inn	Unknown, Doyal	We usually come here with a large group from our church on Sunday afternoon. Village Inn always accommodates us so well. We enjoy being able to sit together to be able to visit. The food and prices are good. We would be very disappointed if they were to remove this restaurant! This would only be another move to bull-doze another facility by the MAX line!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B145	Village Inn	Unknown, E.	The food & service is great. Prices are affordable. A great place to meet friends for a meal before a play. Breakfast here is really good too.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B146	Village Inn	Unknown, G.	We enjoy coming to this convenient Village Inn location often. Rarely does a government agency have the need to seize property by eminent domain - and we sure hope it doesn't come to this. We are confident that by a bit of careful planning Metro can come up with a different solution.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B147	Village Inn	Unknown, Gary	Great fellowship you can't get anywhere else. Thanks.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B148	Village Inn	Unknown, Guadelupe	Is like eating at home. My kids grow loving this place for breakfast for the last 21 years.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B149	Village Inn	Unknown, Gwen	This is our favorite breakfast place - of all time. Staff is always efficient & polite, they always hire the best people throughout the years - we love & enjoy coming here for years even when up on the hill south of here. Just a very pleasant local family feel to this restaurant - never changing - always there with good food. Can always count on it. Please keep a well established loved place here. Also the <u>very cleanest</u> of all the Village Inns I've been to. So new and fresh.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B150	Village Inn	Unknown, Irene	Hello all! I have been single for over 30 years and eat out daily. Bridgeport Village Inn has been one of my regular stops for many years. Their staff know me and what I want when I walk in. I drink lots of iced tea and they make the best Hollandaise sauce in town! Also their strawberry crepes are the best! Please keep my Village Inn open. Thank you.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B151	Village Inn	Unknown, Janice	I've enjoyed meals here for 25 years. It's the cleanest, most friendly affordable restaurant in Tualatin and the only full serve, including breakfast. They had to move before - once was enough. Let them continue their good service to the community.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B152	Village Inn	Unknown, Josh	The Village Inn in Tigard has always been a friendly fun place for our family to eat. My grandpa, 96 years old, has been coming here for over 30 years, and was his favorite place to eat with his diseased partner. It would take away a very special place in his memory. Please don't remove the Village Inn. I don't even want another MAX line.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B153	Village Inn	Unknown, JP/GP	A favorite breakfast place. Please keep -	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B154	Village Inn	Unknown, Kaela	My husband & I come for the same meal to share. We love the food & service & DO NOT want it to go!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B155	Village Inn	Unknown, Karen	The Village Inn is our favorite restaurant especially for older people with the Senior Menu. We have a group of teachers who meet here socially and a water aerobics group who enjoy the Village Inn.  The staff is friendly and is a family atmosphere. It would be a shame to tear down Village Inn to build a parking lot. The food is fresh and delicious. Light rail is important, however the location chosen for closing seems unthoughtful and there must be a better solution.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B156	Village Inn	Unknown, Karen	Please do not take the Village Inn away!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B157	Village Inn	Unknown, Katherine	Our group has been coming here for several years.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B158	Village Inn	Unknown, Leah	We love coming to the Village Inn. Affordable, family friendly and great service. It's close to home and we would hate to see this great place close. Great food too!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B159	Village Inn	Unknown, Lee	We've been coming to the VI since 1982. We have watched them grow as our family grew. Today marks the 30th Fathers Day we have come here and now with grandchildren. Many fond memories have been made here and we want to make many more. It is sad when government can possibly make this all go away. Please find another location for your MAX station and parking lot!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B160	Village Inn	Unknown, Lenall	I've been coming to the Village Inn for the past 10 years. I have brought all my friends to enjoy breakfast or lunch with me. I can always depend on a great consistent meal with excellent friendly & welcoming service. The owners have welcomed me into their home. I'm always happy to go back to visit. Please choose another location for this project.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B161	Village Inn	Unknown, Marcus	It's not right. The Village Inn has been here 41 years. Pick another site to build light rail project on. I pass through Tigard and the Village Inn is my favorite places to eat. Do not build on my Village Inn site. I'm a registered voter!!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.

**Table J2.4-4. Response to Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petition Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
P03-B162	Village Inn	Unknown, Mary	Village Inn is very important to me. I come three times a week on weekdays & sometimes on Saturday or Sunday. It is my favorite restaurant & I have come here for many years. I would miss the restaurant very much. Why don't you locate the MAX station in Tualatin. There is already one there. The restaurant has been in existence forever. I have been going to Village Inn regularly since it moved to this location 14 years ago. They have a perfect location across from Bridgeport and many of their employees have been with them for many years. And there are many regular seniors including myself and my husband that <u>depend</u> on this restaurant. I don't think it is right to put all these employees out of a job and the owners out of business.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant. Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for serving Tualatin instead of Bridgeport Village.
P03-B163	Village Inn	Unknown, Nicole	Save Village Inn.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B164	Village Inn	Unknown, Nicole	Village Inn is the best (save it!)	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B165	Village Inn	Unknown, Nicole	This restaurant is conveniently located. I drive from Vancouver to Tigard for work. I stop in here in the mornings to get breakfast. They have great food & service. Taking this away will not be good. People depend on this restaurant to feed their families. Don't let your bottom line take food off the tables!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B166	Village Inn	Unknown, Pat	Love the food, love the location. The owners are good to employees and it is an institution in this area. Small business owners need a break. Don't take away their income.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B167	Village Inn	Unknown, Patt	Village Inn has been part of our family for 3 decades - they already moved once - don't make Village Inn "homeless"!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B168	Village Inn	Unknown, Rose	Village Inn has been standing for at least 14 years! This is a family friendly and very successful diner. I for one will not stand to have my Village Inn taken away. Many of others have come here for years...for some it is like a tradition.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B169	Village Inn	Unknown, Stephen	My uncle, 96 y/o now, has been coming here for 30 years - has meant so much to him and our family over the years. Please...find another spot. Thanks.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B170	Village Inn	Unknown, Susan	Attn: Metro - We love the Village Inn right where its located! Please try to find a way to work around the VI so they don't have to move! Thank you	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B171	Village Inn	Unknown, Tracy	Please don't tear down the Village Inn. It is a great place to stop when traveling to Washington. Light rail is a great idea - but not at the expense of any business!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for light rail. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B172	Village Inn	Unknown, William	NO!!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B173	Village Inn	Woodworth, Jay	Best restaurant food good reasonable food and great service. It would be against the public's availability and benefit to remove this great asset to Lake Oswego, Lake Grove, Tigard, Tualatin and neighborhood - always full of neighbors & young and old customers	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B174	Village Inn	Young, Lindsay & Matos, Lorena Reyes	We are NE Portland residents that drive all the way from Alberta neighborhood to enjoy the food and hospitality for the last 7 years we have lived in Portland. We have seen most of their employees here remain long term because they are treated well, which is unheard of in the food industry. Generations of families have enjoyed this place. The tremendous loss of jobs would be unforgivable on your part when you can choose to put the MAX station in many other open locations. You are making a huge mistake to take out a popular and loved family business. If your planners can't figure out a better place you need to fire them and hire better ones. A good urban planner knows where they can improve community without destroying loved places. THERE'S SO MUCH SPACE OUT HERE!! PICK A DIFFERENT ONE!!!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-B175	Village Inn	Zukor, Linda	How sad to hear that "progress" would, for the second time, remove the Village Inn. For we who are seniors it is a clean, comfortable place to find homemade, tasty food at reasonable prices. For people with limited mobility as these being able to park close is very important. Taking the space of the VI would remove another social meeting place for Sundays after church, for friends who are not here for years. Please consider another place to put your project. Thank you!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-C1	Village Inn	Anonymous	Thank you Tom for posting the information about the meeting on Thursday, July 19. I have been working with Ryan, Connie and Steve on a community grass roots campaign to save the Village Inn. We have been in meetings with TriMet and Metro for many weeks offering alternative solutions in order to leave the Village Inn in place. We have over 500 petition and comment card signatures to date but our goal is 750-1000. We also need Village Inn friends and supporters to attend the Thursday meeting to show TriMet we care. Please visit the Village Inn, sign a petition, fill out a comment card, pick up a "Save Our Village Inn" button to wear, attend the meeting and speak up to the committee. Together we can make an impact and be heard. It's not that we are anti a light rail project to ease traffic congestion and offer more transit opportunities. We are FOR leaving the Village Inn where it is.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
P03-C2	Village Inn	Landert, Michael	I am writing after reading your disturbing feature in Tigard Life regards the possible closer/relocation of Village Inn near Bridgeport Village. We have been in this community for over forty years and we were thrilled to move, what once was, a rural area. We live in Durham, probably one of the smallest communities in this area. Instantly, we felt a sense of togetherness and family. We all know that some change is inevitable in this rapidly growing City with urban growth boundaries expanding out into the farmlands that once defined this area. I had heard rumor that this may be a possibility, but never once thought it could come to fruition after having to relocate Village Inn once not that long ago. I know the family that owns Village Inn, all three generations. In our time here we've watched the children grow up, have their own families and STAY in the community. If one	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.

**Table J2.4-4. Response to Draft EIS Petition Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Petition Name	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>has ever paid close attention to this establishment you would realize that it's not just a restaurant, it's a meeting place for all ages and places in life. The staff has longevity which speaks to the family who gives them an opportunity to make a living to feed their families and, in return, there is something very much unheard of these days, loyalty!</p> <p>These people genuinely care about the customers and the employees. In our current climate, it's all about 'cookie cutter' restaurants. The Village Inn is one of the cleanest establishments one could ever wish to dine at. There are stringent rules and guidelines that staff must follow. They are all friendly and sincerely want you to enjoy the experience.</p> <p>It is with great sadness that these organizations are more about taking away these values in an attempt to keep up with big City growth. It's not just about traffic flow and rapid transit, it must be about people and integrity and in keeping those small business values alive.</p> <p>I shall hold out hope that, somewhere, these values can be embraced.</p>	
P03-C3	Village Inn	Olson, Dennis D.	<p>A safe and relatively easy place for seniors to meet and eat. Has been for years...let's keep it that way!! <u>Cancel</u> the choo-choo altogether!! Save the money &amp; improve traffic control &amp; roads/streets.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for roadway improvements instead of light rail.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.</p>
P03-C4	Village Inn	Sibinski, Chet	<p>For the past fifteen years, my wife and I have a Tuesday morning ritual - a wonderful breakfast at the Village Inn near Bridgeport. We love the huge menu, the great food, and, maybe most important, the staff - great service by personable waiters and cashiers.</p> <p>Being retired, we sometimes take driving trips up and down the West Coast, and have never found a breakfast restaurant as appealing as this Village Inn, and that includes eateries in such high-profile places as the San Francisco Bay Area and the Monterey Peninsula.</p> <p>Of course, the location is also a key factor in our weekly breakfast rituals since it's conveniently near Bridgeport Village and I-5.</p> <p>I would expect there are countless customers that would agree with my remarks, and be upset - actually Horrified - at the idea of this restaurant closing, or moving to a far distant area.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.</p>
P03-C5	Village Inn	Strahan, Sheila & Brian	<p>The Village Inn is more than just a simple restaurant. It has become a staple of our community. You would be hard pressed to find anyone who does not come here all the time.</p> <p>I know my husband and I come almost every Saturday and it has become a happy ritual.</p> <p>It is like coming to family's home for breakfast. Everyone knows everyone else and there is always a warm smile and good conversation to go with your meal.</p> <p>This is not a place that you can simply rip down and replace without leaving a big hole in the community. It would be like ripping out the kitchen of your parents home. It would leave a lot of us without a place to gather that several generations of our families have all enjoyed.</p> <p>I understand the need for "progress" but at what cost? If it means losing those special places that make our town as great as it is then it is not worth it.</p> <p>Don't pave over paradise to put in a parking lot. You would be removing something very near and dear to our hearts.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.</p>

## J2.5. INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS

This section includes an index of individuals who submitted comments during the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Draft EIS comment period (Table J2.5-1) and the text of all of those comments (Table J2.5-2). The comment text in Table J2.5-2 omits addresses, headings, salutations, signatures, footers, images and supplemental attachments that do not contain substantive comments. For the full content of each comment in its original format, see Appendix J3, Original Copies of Draft EIS Comments. Many responses refer to master responses, which are provided in Appendix J1, Introduction to Draft EIS Comments and Responses.

**Table J2.5-1. Index of Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment ID	Commenter Name
I1	A, Elena	I40	Bengtson, Joanne	I79	Busch, D	I118	Creamer, Brian
I2	Abbott, James	I41	Benham, Susan	I80	Buss, Deni	I119	Creamer, Brian
I3	Adair, Kristian	I42	Bentch, Jennifer	I81	Byrd, Stephanie	I120	Crespo, Shelby
I4	Adney, Mary	I43	Bergman, Andrew	I82	Calcagno, Eva	I121	Cromley, Margaret
I5	Alberque, Les and Kathy	I44	Bernatovic, Ivan	I83	Carlson, Laura	I122	Cronin, Bruce
I6	Alcorn, Vera	I45	Bernknopf, Emily	I84	Carlson, Timothy	I123	Curtis, Shannon
I7	Alkattan, Lubna	I46	Bernknopf, Robert	I85	Carlton, Brooke	I124	Czech, Christopher
I8	Allen, Douglas	I47	Besaw, Ian	I86	Carnell, Katy	I125	Daly, Kathryn
I9	Alvarez-Castro, Sofia	I48	Besaw, Marjorie	I87	Casas, Cynthia	I126	Dangaran, Ryan
I10	Amayin, Pablo	I49	Besore, Eric	I88	Caster, James	I127	Darling, Stacey
I11	Amonson, David	I50	Betts, John M	I89	Castles, Sandra	I128	Davis, Mike and Jeanne
I12	Anderson, Eric	I51	Birmingham, Kathryn	I90	Caton, Larry	I129	Dawson, Rachel
I13	Anderson, Wade	I52	Bishop, Greg	I91	Chambers, Charlynn	I130	De Lange, Nina
I14	Anonymous	I53	Black, Sylvia	I92	Chapel, Tammi	I131	Deangelo, Steve
I15	Anonymous	I54	Blaumer, Jessica	I93	Chen, Jason	I132	DeBolt, Amy
I16	Antles, Jake	I55	Bondi, Colin	I94	Chicarelli, Morgan	I133	Delaney, Justin
I17	Arendes, Carine	I56	Bonella, Randy	I95	Chisholm, Sarah	I134	Denecke, David
I18	Arendes, Carine	I57	Bonella, Randy	I96	Christensen, Brian	I135	Denton, William
I19	Arendes, Carine	I58	Bonifield, Miranda	I97	Christensen, Katherine	I136	DePue, Sylvia
I20	Armstrong, Justus	I59	Bonn, Lori Ann	I98	Christian, Robert	I137	Dietz, Annette
I21	Arumbakkam, Arvind	I60	Boomer, Elaine	I99	Christiansen, Kara	I138	Doe, John
I22	Ast, Haylergh	I61	Boones, Paul	I100	Christoffersson, Rea	I139	Doherty, Joanne
I23	Auburn, Barbara	I62	Booth, Lee	I101	Christoffersson, Rea	I140	Done, Rachel
I24	Austen, Kathy	I63	Bowers, Barbara	I102	Clapp, David	I141	Doran, Tim
I25	Austen, Kathy	I64	Boyd, Ovid	I103	Clark, Jesse	I142	Doreo, Nancy
I26	Baack, Don	I65	Boyer, Christopher	I104	Clark, Michael	I143	Doss, Chris
I27	Baird, Ellie	I66	Bridger, Glenn	I105	Cohen, Bill	I144	Draper, Leslie
I28	Baird, Gale	I67	Broown, Richard	I106	Cohen, Samantha	I145	Durham, T
I29	Baird, Leslie	I68	Brown, Seth	I107	Conley, Kimberly	I146	Dutt, Jake
I30	Baldwin-Sayre, Carrie	I69	Brown, Seth	I108	Connelly, Jim	I147	Dyer, Linda
I31	Bandstra, Jillianne	I70	Brown, Steve	I109	Considine, Marilynn	I148	Edwards, Kimberly
I32	Banning, Craig and Becky	I71	Bruno, Pricilla	I110	Cook, Tricia	I149	Edwards, Rosemary
I33	Barker, Janis	I72	Brusewitz, Jennifer	I111	Corcoran, Dan	I150	Elisa, Finos
I34	Barker, Joel	I73	Brush, Jason	I112	Cortes, Karen	I151	Ellenberg, David
I35	Barrett, Philip	I74	Bubenik, Frank	I113	Costa, Rachel	I152	Ellis, Stuart
I36	Baze, Zachary	I75	Buckley, Cory	I114	Costarella, Derek	I153	Elmi, Liban
I37	Bear, Alexander	I76	Burks, Gypsy	I115	Cox, Steve	I154	Ender, Timur
I38	Beck, Nathan	I77	Burns, Don	I116	Crail, Doreen	I155	Enelow, Noah
I39	Beil, Kurt	I78	Burns, Don	I117	Crane, Jonathan	I156	Engen, Matt

**Table J2.5-1. Index of Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name
I157	Erickson, Carol
I158	Esar, Tim
I159	Espinoza, Marco
I160	Faber, Mary
I161	Farr, Nolan
I162	Fastenau, Kathy
I163	Fenimore, Marian
I164	Ferguson, Valerie
I165	Ferris-Smith, Matt
I166	Figel, Suz
I167	Finney, Debbie
I168	Fischer, Edward
I169	Fisher, Vileka
I170	Fitzgerald, Marianne
I171	Fleishman, Craig
I172	Fong, April Ann
I173	Fong, Christina
I174	Fong, Steve
I175	Fontes, R A
I176	Ford, Christine
I177	Ford, Christine
I178	Fowler, Justin
I179	Fowler, Justin
I180	Fox, Gerald
I181	Franco, Janet
I182	Frazier, William
I183	Freewheel, Clicky
I184	French, Miles
I185	Freud, Hazrdus
I186	Fromdahl, Larry W
I187	Fromme, Arne
I188	Frost, Cindy
I189	Frost, Julie
I190	Fu, Mary
I191	G, E
I192	Gansner, Elliott
I193	Garbett, James
I194	Garcia, Adriana
I195	Garcia, Todd
I196	Garey, Kelly
I197	Garofalo, Luciano
I198	Gasparovic, Vicky
I199	Gates, William
I200	Gerard, Craig
I201	German, Brett
I202	Gerould, Ilan

Comment ID	Commenter Name
I203	Gibbon, John T
I204	Giguere, Olivia
I205	Gonzalez, Nozomi
I206	Goodale, Anne
I207	Goodman, Rachel
I208	Gordon, Jane
I209	Gordon, Jane
I210	Goulet, Sherry
I211	Grand, Jeremy
I212	Grey, Eric
I213	Griffin, Christopher
I214	Grinnell, Alan
I215	Grinnell, Alan
I216	Gross, Ezra
I217	Grover, Mikailah
I218	Guild, George
I219	H, Jenna
I220	Hadley, Bonnie
I221	Hajdu-Paulen, Allison
I222	Hajdu-Paulen, Allison
I223	Halbert, Jenna
I224	Hall, Aaron
I225	Halstead, Erik
I226	Hamilton, Joan
I227	Hamilton, Marlene
I228	Hamlow, Jen
I229	Handel, Dan
I230	Hangland-Skill, Mick
I231	Hansen, Susan
I232	Harding, Kathy
I233	Harding, Robert
I234	Harding, Robert and Kathy
I235	Hare, Anissa
I236	Harms, Dietrich
I237	Harrel, Wayne
I238	Hart, Alicia
I239	Harter, Evan
I240	Hawkins, Natlie
I241	Helmsworth, Chris
I242	Hennessy, Shaun
I243	Hensel, Maripat
I244	Herms, Dana
I245	Hickey, Elinor
I246	Higgins, Stephen
I247	Hill, Rachel
I248	Hill, Rachel

Comment ID	Commenter Name
I249	Hinamon, Dori
I250	Ho, Jh
I251	Hobson, Jason
I252	Hogan, Adam
I253	Holdahl, Terry
I254	Holland, Ann
I255	Hopkins, Craig
I256	Hughes, Dave
I257	Hughes, Tami
I258	Humann, Alyssa
I259	Humann, Dalton
I260	Humphrey-Keever, Debra
I261	Humphrey-Keever, Mary Ann
I262	Hutchinson, Leslie
I263	Hutchinson, Leslie
I264	Hyndman, Vicki
I265	Ierulli, Joseph
I266	Itscorrupt, Disolvemetro
I267	Ivory, Ed
I268	Jacobs, Gloria
I269	Jeffreys, Tiffanie
I270	Jenkins, Joseph
I271	Jerónimo, Minerva
I272	Johnson, Jay
I273	Johnson, Joe
I274	Johnson, Lindsey
I275	Johnson, M
I276	Jones, Lara
I277	Jones, Milton
I278	Jones, Milton
I279	Jones, Milton
I280	Jorling, David
I281	Joshu, William
I282	Joyce, Patrick
I283	Juric, Iva
I284	Just, Jessica
I285	Kaiser, Alex
I286	Kale, Mike
I287	Kalstrom, Sally
I288	Keating, Mike
I289	Kelch, Carlton
I290	Kelley, Sarah
I291	Kepple, Kara
I292	Keroes, Joshua
I293	Killingsworth, Serge
I294	Kim, Gabrielle

Comment ID	Commenter Name
I295	Kimmelshue, Megan
I296	Kisor, Michael
I297	Kleinbach, Darl
I298	Klieber, Bill
I299	Knapp, Kelly
I300	Knier, Aimee
I301	Kormendy, Amy
I302	Kosbau, Wayne
I303	Kraft, Amanda
I304	Krager, Carol
I305	Krager, Carol and Warren
I306	Kranzler, Brooke
I307	Krnak, Vitek
I308	Kunert, Charles
I309	Kung, Chung-Huey Nina
I310	Kung, Chung-Huey Nina
I311	Kunzler, Joe A
I312	Ladd, Laura
I313	Ladd, Laura
I314	Lamb, Nicole
I315	Landis, Charles
I316	Landsverk, Jaime
I317	Lane, Thomas
I318	Lanigan, Ryan
I319	LaPorte, David
I320	Laporte, David
I321	Lara, Jennyfer
I322	Leatham, Eric
I323	Leatherman, Ken
I324	Leatherman, Ken
I325	Leavitt, Naomi
I326	Lee, Joon Hee
I327	Lee, Melissa
I328	Lee, Melissa
I329	Leggroan, Russell
I330	Leonetti, Richard
I331	Leonetti, Richard
I332	Leslie, Marcia
I333	Levine, Jonathan
I334	Lewellan, Art
I335	Ley, Kari Jo
I336	Liden, Keith
I337	Liden, Keith
I338	Lipscomb, Joe
I339	Little, Anaheed
I340	Loeffl, Jamie

**Table J2.5-1. Index of Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name
I341	Long, Casey
I342	Long, Jim
I343	Long, Jim
I344	Love, Alan
I345	Love, Pamela
I346	Lovorn, Karstan
I347	Luelling, Brett
I348	Luelling, Brett
I349	Luna, Ashley
I350	Lundell, Dana
I351	Lyman, Daniel
I352	Lyman, Daniel
I353	Lyman, Kyle
I354	Lynch, Noah
I355	Lyons, Chris
I356	M, Lonnie
I357	Macioce, Naomi
I358	Mandel, Marvin
I359	Marrin, Dan
I360	Marrin, Dan
I361	Marrin, Dan
I362	Marsh, Audra
I363	Marshal, Janet
I364	Martinez, Manuel
I365	Martel, Sherrie
I366	Martin, Agnes
I367	Martin, Agnes
I368	Martin, Steve
I369	Martin, Steve
I370	Martin, Steve
I371	Martin, Steve
I372	Martinez, Kate
I373	Matos Coelho, Fernanda
I374	Matteri, Robert
I375	Mattson, Bethany
I376	McClain, James
I377	McEwen, Ian
I378	McKennon, Monique
I379	McLauchlan Stone, Kelly
I380	McMinn, Carmie
I381	McMonagle, William
I382	Mcneal, Jennifer
I383	Mehr, Jessica
I384	Mehrabi, Michelle
I385	Merklin, Lee
I386	Meserow, Nancy

Comment ID	Commenter Name
I387	Messimer, Jacob
I388	Michtom, Glen
I389	Michtom, Glen
I390	Miguel, China
I391	Mijares, Alex
I392	Mileham, Steve
I393	Miller, Cheryl
I394	Miller, Colin
I395	Miller, Heather
I396	Miller, Jeff
I397	Miller, Kassi
I398	Miller, Peter
I399	Mishler, Darris
I400	Moll, Philip
I401	Momeni, Carmen
I402	Monahan, Linda
I403	Moore, Alan
I404	Moore, Jaren
I405	Moreland, Erin
I406	Moreno, Elizabeth
I407	Morris, Margaret
I408	Morris, Shiela
I409	Morrow, Vanessa
I410	Murphy, Ashly
I411	Myszka, Jessie
I412	Name, No
I413	Name, No
I414	Name, No
I415	Nargozian, Lara
I416	Navarro, Rachel
I417	Neal, Lori
I418	Nelson PE, Dave
I419	Nelson, Leland
I420	Nemarnik, David
I421	Newman-Woods, Allison
I422	Nick, Kristin
I423	Nielsen, Karla
I424	Niles, Linda
I425	Nishi-Strattner, Leigh
I426	Nystrom, Diane
I427	Nystrom, Diane
I428	O'Brien, Attie
I429	Oblepias, Eric
I430	ODaniels, Tom
I431	Olsen, Deborah
I432	Olsen, Deborah

Comment ID	Commenter Name
I433	Olsen, George
I434	Omansky, Beth
I435	ONeill, Kathleen
I436	Osterman, Richard
I437	Owcarz, Christian
I438	Pérez, Braulio
I439	Paau, Sze Kai
I440	Paddock, Andrew
I441	Padgett, Toby
I442	Padgett, Toby
I443	Pajunas, Briita and Alex
I444	Palmer, Matt
I445	Palmer, Morgan
I446	Papaniq, Karen
I447	Park, Caroline
I448	Parker, Terry
I449	Parker, Terry
I450	Parsons, James
I451	Pasteris, Phil
I452	Patel, Bina
I453	Patel, Harish
I454	Patel, Harish
I455	Patel, Saawan
I456	Patrick, Jovanna
I457	Paulsen, Ken
I458	Pdx, Qa
I459	Peay, Michelle
I460	Peay, Michelle
I461	Peck, Lauren
I462	Pennington, Matt
I463	Perez, Sarah
I464	Petersen, Paige
I465	Petersen, Paige
I466	Phillips, Hope
I467	Phu, Leslie
I468	Platosh, Paul
I469	Pliska, Sean
I470	Pliska, Stephen
I471	Plitt, Andrew
I472	Pohl-Kosbau, Leslie
I473	Prater, Stephen
I474	Pratt, Doug
I475	Pridmore-Brown, Philip
I476	Puckett, Jakob
I477	Quale, Pamela
I478	Quatrini, James

Comment ID	Commenter Name
I479	R, Charles
I480	Ra, A
I481	Rahmani, Ramtin
I482	Raibley, Jon
I483	Ramirez, Trisya
I484	Randolph, Christopher
I485	Raulerson, Sally
I486	Ray, Cynthia
I487	Raymond, Belle
I488	Refi, Emily
I489	Reid, Eileen
I490	Reinhart, Carson
I491	Reinhart, Joseph
I492	Renner, Jon
I493	Renshaw Ruddell, Matthew
I494	Repeau, Dave
I495	Resendiz, Emma
I496	Resident, Local
I497	Reuler, Peggy
I498	Rhyne, Keenan
I499	Ribner, Jason
I500	Richmond, Rod
I501	Richter, Adam
I502	Rivera, Rodrigo
I503	Roach, Mike
I504	Robinson, Tyler
I505	Robinson, Tyler
I506	Robinson, Tyler
I507	Robinson, Tyler
I508	Rockwell, Mark
I509	Rodriguez, Rosa
I510	Rodriguez, Victor
I511	Rohweder, Laura
I512	Rose, Mikel
I513	Rosenthal, Gerritt
I514	Ross, Madeline
I515	Roth, Isadora
I516	Roth, Noah
I517	Ryan, Jennifer
I518	S, Miss
I519	Salisbury, Amy
I520	Salkeld, Eric
I521	Sampson, Jason
I522	Sandell, Beth
I523	Sanders, Dave
I524	Sanders, Tom

**Table J2.5-1. Index of Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name
I525	Schaper, Joel
I526	Schiffke, Heather
I527	Schoebel, Alex
I528	Schoknecht, Kate
I529	Scott, Brenda Ray
I530	Scott, JoAnn C
I531	Scott, JoAnn C
I532	Scott, Mel
I533	Seaman, Peter
I534	Seifert, Rick
I535	Sheikh, Laila
I536	Sheikh, Laila
I537	Sherraden, Catherine
I538	Shoulders, Tatiana
I539	Shultz, Lisa
I540	Siegberg, Gary
I541	Skelton, Kelly
I542	Slater, Debra
I543	Smith, Dean
I544	Smith, Ed
I545	Smith, Edward
I546	Smith, Jeanna
I547	Smith, Keith
I548	Smith, Sara
I549	Smith, Shane
I550	Squires, April
I551	St Clair, Taylor
I552	St Pierre, Janelle
I553	St Pierre, Janelle
I554	Staloff, Steve
I555	Stanford, Kathy
I556	Stanley, James
I557	Steele, Jenna
I558	Steeves, Bonnie
I559	Steinberg, Edward
I560	Stellar, Andrea
I561	Stellar, Andrea
I562	Stello, Noelle
I563	Stensland, J
I564	Stevens, Kimberly
I565	Stienke, Tom
I566	Stienke, Tom
I567	Stiffler, Gail
I568	Stiffler, Gail
I569	Stockton, Michael
I570	Stone, Donna

Comment ID	Commenter Name
I571	Stoops, Melinda
I572	Story, Misty
I573	Strapp, Reri
I574	Stroble, Eric
I575	Strong, Tom
I576	Styner, Jon
I577	Styner, Jon
I578	Styner, Jon
I579	Subotnick, Matthew
I580	Swanson, Karl
I581	T, Marie
I582	Talbot, Wendy
I583	Taxpayer, John "Q"
I584	Taylor, Cynthia
I585	Taylor, Robert
I586	Terrell, Murphy
I587	Terrell, Murphy
I588	Terusaki, Gary
I589	Tevlin, Michael
I590	Tevlin, Michael
I591	Thamert, Kayla
I592	Thelen, Christopheer
I593	Thoren, John
I594	Thorpe, Tom
I595	Titus, Stephen
I596	Titus, Susan
I597	Towne-Smith, Nancy
I598	Towne-Smith, Nancy
I599	Tran, Trinh
I600	Tran, Trinh
I601	Travillion, Karen
I602	Trigoboff, Michael
I603	Trumper, Karen
I604	Trygstad, Jean
I605	Turnquist, Crystal
I606	Unknown, Austin
I607	Unknown, Hazel
I608	Unknown, Jan-godaddy
I609	Unknown, Jan-godaddy
I610	Uribe, Brandon
I611	Usov, Viktor
I612	Valle, Shane
I613	Vázquez, Karla
I614	Vega, Silvia
I615	Velji, Hitesh Tex
I616	Viteritti, Tracy

Comment ID	Commenter Name
I617	Von Renschler, Marvin
I618	Von Renschler, Marvin
I619	Vranas, George
I620	Vranas, George
I621	W, Julie
I622	W, Ted
I623	Wagoner, Ann
I624	Walker, Mark
I625	Walling, Alan
I626	Walter, John
I627	Walter, Nicole
I628	Warner, Harold
I629	Warner, Harold
I630	Wasserman, Marc
I631	Wasserman, Marc
I632	Wasserman, Marc
I633	Watkins, Kevin
I634	Watt, Steve
I635	Weierman, Joel
I636	Weintraub, Dana
I637	Welch, Josh
I638	Weldon, Laura
I639	Welsh, Jim
I640	Werts, Britni
I641	Weston, Donald
I642	Weston, Susan
I643	Williams, Maia
I644	Williams, Robin
I645	Williams, Sierra
I646	Williams-Thomas, Tafflyn
I647	Willson, Brannan
I648	Wilson, Doug
I649	Wilson, Douglas
I650	Wilson, Heidi
I651	Winkler, Luella
I652	Wise, Lindsey
I653	Woerner, Betty
I654	Wojtak, Danielle
I655	Wonder, Michael
I656	Wong, Mary
I657	Wong, Mary
I658	Wood, Dan
I659	Woodard, Adam
I660	Worley, Matthew
I661	Worley, M
I662	Wright, Jeff

Comment ID	Commenter Name
I663	Wright, Jennifer
I664	Yarnell, Ellen
I665	Yoshioka, Craig
I666	Zeigen, Laura
I667	Ziehnert, Ziehnert

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
11	A, Elena	Rating 5 No comment	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
12	Abbott, James	Barbur Blvd is a major route for automobile traffic between Tigard, SW Portland, Beaverton and downtown Portland. I see nothing in website information regarding the impact to Barbur Blvd automobile and bicycle traffic during project construction, or impact upon completion of the project. I can't understand how this topic can be omitted from the information on the project's website.	Permanent traffic impacts and short-term traffic impacts resulting from project construction, along with proposed mitigation measures, are included in Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of both the Draft and Final EISs. The Draft EIS was published on Metro's project website for the Southwest Corridor at the beginning of the Draft EIS public comment period on June 7, 2018, and is still available on the website's project library today ( <a href="https://www.oregonmetro.gov/public-projects/southwest-corridor-plan/project-library">https://www.oregonmetro.gov/public-projects/southwest-corridor-plan/project-library</a> ).
13	Adair, Kristian	Rating 5 I realize that Sylvania is difficult to link up to this and that Tualatin voted to not have MAX, however I think that those are two locations that should absolutely be connected somehow (especially Tualatin, as the southbound chokepoint is the river crossing). Other than this I like the route; I live between Bonita and Durham east of Hall and think this 100% needs to hit both Bridgeport Village, downtown Tigard and Barbur area. If I could get into downtown with a non-roadway option, I absolutely would. Those that say they don't want light rail here are frankly going to be dead and gone when this has seen its true benefit-- we are building for the future here, and while roadway and bus improvements are important, so is non-road multimodal (and even if you don't like the cost of light rail, this is what the region has already established and this is the one segment not connected to it). This is something that needs built now, instead of continuing to defer it; construction and land costs will only continue to rise (also, please fix the Ross Island bridgehead!)	Please see Master Response 12 regarding your support for a tunneled route through the PCC-Sylvania area. Regarding your support for light rail to Tualatin, the Preferred Alternative does extend to Bridgeport Village in Tualatin. Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the alignment farther into Tualatin. Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
14	Adney, Mary	I work at 'the National University of Natural Medicine (NUNM) in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. Even driving to campus or leaving requires a very non-direct approach as most direct routes are dangerous and accident prone. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM campus. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
15	Alberque, Les and Kathy	My remarks are going to be very quick. Just two questions that have come up. I'm Les Alberque. I'm retired from the Air Force. I've lived here in Tigard since 1990, and I'm not really familiar with this project but two obvious things popped up. First of all, downtown, it's fine, has light rail. It's all through town. If something goes wrong, it impacts quite a bit of traffic. They can take care of it. Now it's going to run along the highway, which seems to be some distance from any other resource. Is there something in the plan or will there be something in the plan to deal with a massive system failure? You know, if for some reason the thing just doesn't move, there has to be some way to deal with those people other than leave them on the highway. The second thing I came across, this is from OregonLive and I don't know how current it is, but it seems like something that should be dealt with before we get too far. It says that Tigard doesn't commit city or its taxpayers to help pay for the new light rail, but that could end up happening. Now, I'm assuming there would need to be an election before it's found out whether that's going to go or not. It doesn't seem we should get into spending a whole lot of money that we will not be able to finish up, if we cannot get -- if, in fact, this is going to involve a tax for the people from Tigard, first of all, how much? And also if the project is kind of dependent on that, that's seems to need to be looked at before we get going. Thank you.	In locations where light rail runs adjacent to freeways today (I-84, I-205), TriMet has existing policies and procedures for evacuation in case of an emergency. Less than 2 miles of the alignment in the Preferred Alternative are freeway-adjacent, in short segments between the Barbur Transit Center and the 68th Station, and just north of the Bridgeport Station terminus; the remainder runs along surface streets or existing rail alignments. To learn more about how the Project would be funded, please see Section 5.3, Cost and Funding Evaluation, of this Final EIS.
16	Alcorn, Vera	I study at NUNM in South Portland and feel that the traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. the Naito Parkway and Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects may be the last opportunity to fix this issue for some time and I would like to strongly urge a vote in favor of these improvements. Please consider these projects along with the Southwest Corridor project for the future of all people who live, work, study, and visit businesses in that area!	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
17	Alkattan, Lubna	Good evening dear Southwest Corridor Steering Committee. My name is Lubna Alkattan. I live in Tigard city. I agree with the Ash modified plan because their plan avoids apartments to be demolished, and less people will be affected. And I see -- I can see the benefits of this plan in the future. Thank you very much.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. In your comment, you expressed support for the "Ash modified option," which is the initial route proposal in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), including the SW Ash Avenue alignment, as well as the Barbur Undercrossing, Elmhurst and Tigard Transit Center East of Hall, which were studied as Alternative C2, Refinement 4, Refinement 5 and Refinement 6, respectively, in the Draft EIS, and which span both Segment B (Outer Portland) and Segment C. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C. Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and residential displacements.
18	Allen, Douglas	The project is not cost-effective as planned. It does not generate sufficient ridership, and yet the ridership estimates that are provided are totally unrealistic. The no-build ridership is not based on reality, as TriMet's current ridership trend is static to declining, and the most recent light rail projects have not yielded ridership growth. Given that BRT was rejected due to a claim of insufficient capacity on the Transit Mall for the expected ridership, it is time to go back and re-evaluate use of enhanced transit service in this corridor as an	To learn more about the transportation modeling used to project ridership, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS. Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus rapid transit and WES Commuter Rail improvements instead of light rail.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		interim until such time as the region is willing to devote sufficient resources to building an adequate new project that would divert a significant amount of travel off of I-5 and would serve PCC Sylvania, Hillsdale, and OHSU/VA, as well as continue to Tualatin. The other interim project should be conversion of WES to a light rail extension of the Red Line. This would provide just as good travel time from Tualatin to Pioneer Courthouse Square as the proposed SW Corridor, at a fraction of the cost, and would provide better travel opportunities within Washington County than the SW Corridor. This project does not do anything but attempt to bring in Federal money to promote development, which it is not really suited to do. The project goal should be to significantly improve TriMet system ridership and integrate with improved cross-town bus service.	Please see Master Response 12 regarding your support for improved connections to PCC-Sylvania and OHSU. To learn more about the purpose and need for the Project, see Section 1.2, Purpose and Need, of this Final EIS. The Final EIS identifies a number of purposes for the Project, including serving a projected growth in ridership and providing connections to existing and future transit networks.
19	Alvarez-Castro, Sofia	I would love to have MAX! Currently it's very hard to feel connected to the larger community and to navigate if you don't have a car. I currently work in Portland and I have to drive because it's public transport is horrible, i would have to go to the Tigard transit center and then go to the Beaverton max station which takes so much longer than driving. If I had the max I could just bike or walk or drive to the Tigard max station and commute to work. I'd love to reduce my carbon footprint.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
110	Amayin, Pablo	To the committee Dear committee, my name is Pablo Amayin. I want to ask you [that the project] not affect the communities, please I'm here to give my support I'm married, a construction worker and a Catholic Please support my request. Don't let it affect the poor. On the contrary, help them. Please. Thank you. "My God"	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. The Final EIS identifies potential impacts from the Project and mitigations to minimize the effects of those impacts.
111	Amonson, David	I would like to see bus service in the area of Stephenson Elementary, on Stephenson St, and 35th Ave. There are no consistent sidewalks, and no bus service in this area. Currently, I drive to the Barbur transit center. I would like to take the bus for the whole trip. I am enthusiastic about the MAX in SW Portland and Tigard and feel that it will be an asset to the area.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project.
112	Anderson, Eric	I am a Tualatin resident and a Law Enforcement Officer in Clackamas County. I have seen the increase in crime and livability issues that the orange and green lines have brought to Clackamas County and I am opposed to bringing light rail to Tualatin. It is my understanding that Tualatin voters have voted in the past to oppose light rail and I don't understand how this issue continues to move forward.	Please see Mater Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime. The Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project is under the authority of the Federal Transit Administration, Metro and TriMet; the Tualatin charter amendment passed with Ballot Measure 34-220 does not apply to these authorities, only to the City of Tualatin. Please contact the City of Tualatin directly for how the charter amendment is being applied to their involvement in the Project.
113	Anderson, Wade	With the proposal, my concern is that Trimet will simply retire the 94 and 12/93 from Sherwood to downtown, requiring us to hop the Max at Tigard downtown or Bridgeport Village. While it may be tempting to call the Max a success by forcing us to make this transfer, I want to see the direct to downtown service from Sherwood continue. Otherwise, our commute time will simply increase when factoring in the connection time. I ride Trimet every day to work from Sherwood without driving a car. Discontinuing the 12/93, 94 will cause me to drive to a park and ride, thus defeating the benefit. Many seniors live near my home and rely on Trimet. Adding a transfer increases complexity for them as well.	Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project.
114	Anonymous	I think that it's swell that you are pushing forward with a huge new expansion project when you can't afford to fully-fund your employee's pensions or pay for security to make existing public transportation rideable. Eastside light rail and buses are fit only for the lady boarding with three large sacks of empty cans and the guy in the army jacket having an argument with himself. It is also adorable when people bring their pit bulls on the train and have them occupy the seat next to them because it is their ""comfort"" animal. Did all the decision making adults retire? What happened?	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.
115	Anonymous	The attached maps show why the Initial Route Proposal's Taylor's Ferry Overcrossing has already - 1. Drawn opposition from one of SWNI's neighborhood associations - Crestwood.; and, 2. Produced high agitation in a recent meeting held in a second - Multnomah; and, 3. Produced a cautionary clause in a generally supportive motion from the SWNI Standing Committee most strongly identified with support for this project our Transportation Committee. Although SWNI has not taken coalition wide official position on this issue, before I head to our special watershed committee I wanted to share these two maps with the Steering Committee ahead of our Coalition Director's vote to supply you with context for whatever will come from SWNI. While apologizing for my lack of a colored printer, I submit the METRO map to give you clear evidence that a decision on how a decision affecting the headwaters of Woods Creek which Refinement 2 must do will in essence end up in backyards and parks (and unfortunately sometimes during flood events also front, back and garage doors) all the way north and west through SW Portland and Beaverton until that stream joins anno Creek near the Portland Golf Club and Oregon Episcopal School. I submit the Portland maps exhibit to show that the Refine runs perilously close to a City Nature Park and apparently must of necessity skewer an privately owned area containing the springs, seeps (and highway outfalls(?)) from which Woods Creek originates.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail crossing SW Capitol Highway to the south of SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B2 in the Draft EIS, and opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near Barbur Transit Center, which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B, including information regarding the Crossroads intersection. Regarding your concerns about impacts to Woods Creek and Woods Memorial Natural Area (Woods Park), please see Section 4.7, Parks and Recreation Resources; Section 4.9, Ecosystems; and Section 4.10, Water Resources, of this Final EIS.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		A more expensive alternative, B2 base, reportedly considered by one agency as less aesthetically desirable, has not to date produced the same concern in SWNI neighborhoods including the situs neighborhood West Portland Park."	
I16	Antles, Jake	<p>Hello, Thank you for your work on this proposal. In no particular order, I'd like the following things prioritized:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Limit displacement and the need to purchase private property. Maximize use of existing public right of way.</li> <li>-Where displacement of low and moderate income (0-100% MFI) households occurs, fairly compensate them and assist in relocation.</li> <li>-Prioritize total overall ridership, ease of station access for buses, pedestrians, and bicyclists, and prioritize effectiveness and usefulness of park &amp; rides.</li> <li>-Incorporate an analysis of public, non-profit and private housing opportunities into the plan. Good work!</li> </ul>	<p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and residential displacements, and Master Response 18 regarding your interest in housing opportunities.</p> <p>To learn more about project ridership projections, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Stations are designed to increase the ease of transfers between bus and light rail. Please see Master Response 7 for more information on improved pedestrian and bicycle improvements included in the Project.</p> <p>Park and ride facilities are included in the Preferred Alternative, and they increase light rail ridership by helping people who are traveling from further distances or from locations with little or no transit service to access the light rail system.</p>
I17	Arendes, Carine	<p>See attached (esp. for table formatting)</p> <p>I am a long-time resident of the SW Corridor, having grown up in SW Portland and attended PPS schools as a kid. As an adult, I have lived a total of 18 years in Tigard, with more than a decade spent in my current home located less than mile from Highway 99. I have served for the past six years on the City of Tigard's advisory commission for our urban renewal areas. In addition, I have training and education as a land use planner and am serving on the SW Corridor Community Advisory Committee (SWC CAC) for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process.</p> <p>This project has involved a lot of people, time and resources. Staff has done a great job engaging the community on this project and I know they have worked really hard on the DEIS process. That said, I have been somewhat unnerved by the outsized influence vocal community members appear to have on the process.</p> <p>Although this project will cause real impacts on real people, it is important that decision makers consider the well-being of the entire community, not just those who have the resources to organize and hire professionals to lobby for a particular agenda. In particular, one decision appears to have been made by staff early in the process to favor the RR alignment over the I-5 alignment based, at least in part, on public comments that favored one particular perspective (see staff recommended Initial Route Proposal, or IRP).</p> <p>Concern regarding Railroad (RR) and I-5 Alignment Decision Making</p> <p>Early in the DEIS process, property owners who would have been impacted by the I-5 alignment of Segment C, expressed their displeasure about impacts to their properties. Their position is entirely understandable, since they wish to protect their existing investments. The SW CAC heard repeated public comments for these business owners, since these businesses hired a professional strategist to organize a coordinated response. Tigard elected officials and Metro staff held these concerns repeatedly as well. SW CAC conversations were dominated by concern about these particular property owners without considering the same types impacts on property owners in the alternative location who had not organized in the same fashion.</p> <p>I'm not saying that the RR alignment is the wrong choice; however it is not clear to me that the decision to favor the RR alignment over the I-5 alignment was adequately considered.</p> <p>Although both the RR and the I-5 alignments through south Tigard are associated with a specific O&amp;M facility site, no analysis was conducted by staff to compare the property impacts of the RR and I-5 alignments that included the associated O&amp;M facility. Therefore in order to understand the numbers of properties impacted by the alternatives, one must utilize the figures shown in Table 4.1-1. Potential Property Acquisitions (multi-page table) on pages 4-5 and 4-6 of the report and conduct calculations to add O&amp;M property impacts to the alignment's impacts.</p> <p>The below table shows information from Table 4.1-1 aggregated to compare the south Tigard Ash alignment options with the O&amp;M facility property impacts included in the total numbers of affected parcels and businesses.</p> <p>Alignment Number of Affected Parcels Number of Affected units</p> <p>Full Acquisition Partial Acquisition Residential Units Business or Institutional uses</p> <p>Ash-I-5 41 90 85 41  Ash I-5 w/ Hunzinker O&amp;M 44 90 85 46  Ash-RR 34 94 85 37  Ash RR w/ 72nd O&amp;M 39 94 85 47</p> <p>The resulting difference between alignment options when the O&amp;M facility is included in the comparison, is 46 business or institutional uses displaced with the I-5 alignment compared to 47 displaced with the RR alignment. It is not at all clear that the IRP takes into account the consolidated impacts associated with an alignment choice and associated O&amp;M, since the DEIS states: "The railroad alignment of Alternative C2 would have a faster travel time and result in fewer impacts to businesses and employees than the I-5 alignment (Alternatives C1 and C3)." (pg 5-10)</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 13 regarding the Project's public engagement process and additional information regarding the public involvement process related to the design refinements.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed concerns over the decision-making process between an I-5 alignment and a railroad alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), as well as support for the Elmhurst alignment and the Hall Station, studied as Refinement 5 and Refinement 6 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p> <p>As studied in the Draft EIS, the O&amp;M facility options were assumed to be able to pair with any alignment alternative (with the exceptions that Alternatives C2 and C4 would not be compatible with the O&amp;M facility options on SW 72nd Avenue). Because different alignments could be paired with either O&amp;M, the impacts for the O&amp;M facilities were analyzed separately. While Alternative C2 with the Hunziker O&amp;M Facility would have more business displacements than Alternative C1 with the Through 72nd Avenue facility, it would have fewer business displacements than Alternative C1 with the Hunziker O&amp;M Facility.</p> <p>Benefits to the Hunziker O&amp;M Facility include additional storage capacity for 42 light rail vehicles compared to 32 at an O&amp;M facility option on SW 72nd Avenue, and ability to expand to store up to 60 light rail vehicles, allowing for system growth and operations flexibility. The Hunziker O&amp;M Facility would also have additional maintenance capacity compared to the O&amp;M facility options on SW 72nd Avenue.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and residential displacements, and Master Response 18 regarding your concerns about affordable housing.</p> <p>To learn more about the traffic analysis, including impacts to SW Hall Boulevard, SW Upper Boones Ferry Road, SW Lower Boones Ferry Road and Pacific Highway (99W), please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>Since the SW Corridor project is intended to support local land use goals and policy objectives it is preferred that, when possible, impacts avoid existing areas that provide significant community benefit and already work well. It is not clear that the Sequoia/SW 72nd industrial area provide Tigard with more employment opportunities for industrial uses than the Hunziker industrial area does. Current uses along SW Hunziker appear to be more industrial in nature, while many of the businesses that organized to oppose the alignment cannot be characterized as industrial at all (retail business and medical services).</p> <p>One verbal argument presented in discussion on this topic was that the areas under consideration for the O&amp;M facility are zoned differently therefore the Hunziker site is preferred. That may be true to a limited extent, as the Hunziker area is predominantly Industrial-Light, same as one of the two 72nd locations, however the other 72nd location is zoned Industrial -Heavy, which would appear to permit uses with even more impacts. Therefore, the zoning does not appear to be a determining factor, nor does compatibility with a location's zoning.</p> <p>As mentioned above, I believe this decision to favor the RR alignment was premature. The time-savings involved could be sufficient reason to move forward with the RR alignment over the I-5 option; however that has not been clearly articulated. For example, ridership is highly correlated with travel time, exactly how many riders would be A more thorough analysis to compare differences in land utilization and land values between areas would also be informative.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>It is important that the information collected during the DEIS process inform the alignment decision. The locally preferred alternative should prioritize avoiding impacts, then minimizing unavoidable impacts, and finally, mitigate impacts when they cannot be avoided. Since the SW Corridor project is intended to support local land use support local land use goals and policy objectives it is preferred that, when possible, impacts avoid existing areas that provide significant community benefit and already work well.</p> <p>Based on Tigard's adopted policies and community preference, impacts to the following should be avoided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• naturally occurring affordable housing (or de facto affordable housing);</li> <li>• traffic impacts on Hall Boulevard, Boones Ferry, and Highway 99; and</li> <li>• existing areas that work             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o SW Beveland and</li> <li>o Downtown Tigard.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Impacts that occur should be minimized to protect community investments in SW Beveland and Downtown Tigard. Many business owners recognize that transit users will be served by a Hall Street station. I have yet to talk with a single downtown business owner that is upset that light rail construction may be avoided in the area. To that end, I strongly support the Elmhurst refinement and the Hall Street station refinement.</p> <p>However, it is important to address the impacts the project will have on housing. One cannot understate how impactful light rail has been on housing options and housing costs in other areas of the region when built. It is important that Tigard community members have options to stay in the community and benefit from the impacts this project will cause over the long-term, not just during construction. Therefore, I believe that Tri-Met and project partners should set a goal to provide 2 units of housing for any removed through this process, with a minimum 1:1 replacement rate.</p>	
I18	Arendes, Carine	<p>Good evening. I am Carine Arendes and I want to share my personal thoughts with you about this project and its importance.</p> <p>I've been following plans for MAX for quite sometime. And, you know, it's emblematic of the decision we made as a region to make significant investments in transit. And it's the right thing to do for a number of reasons. We need to reduce vehicle miles and carbon emissions. Humans with active lifestyles are healthier. We serve more people per dollar spent on transit than highway construction. And by planning today for transit tomorrow, we work to benefit our future selves, our family members and our neighbors.</p> <p>As with any large project, there will be trade-offs. There will be impacts. There's going to be change. And even desirable change can be really difficult. And these are really hard conversations to have. You're going to hear about some very real impacts in these comment periods and beyond. It's important that these are understood so they can be addressed.</p> <p>You're also going hear from people who don't want transit, don't use transit, won't ever use transit. You're going to hear from people who do use transit on a regular basis who have different expectations than those who don't. It's important we keep in mind who we're planning this transit line for. We must think about today's transit users and transit users 20 years from now, 50 years from now.</p> <p>We do need to be realistic. It's not going to be a perfect system. No public transit system is ever going to be able to meet all of everybody's desires and still be affordable. We cannot let unrealistic desires derail years of planning. A plan that affords our community with choices that affords our commuters with options. That affords those most vulnerable in our community with access to places and people they cannot otherwise reach.</p> <p>About 15 years ago I bought a home in Tigard thinking there was going to be a light rail coming any day now. I mean, I read about the 2040 concept plan. Now, however, 2040 isn't looking so far away anymore. So you know I'm excited we're here. This is a lot of work and it's been tough and a lot of people have worked on it really hard. I'm sure you folks have too. It's so important that we get this</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.12, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, of this Final EIS for information regarding the Project's greenhouse gas analysis.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>right and consider the needs of our whole community, even the needs of people who aren't here tonight some who may have never participated or engaged in the process at all.</p> <p>But in order for our planning efforts to succeed in connecting the southwest communities and supporting our local community land use vision, it's imperative that you, the Steering Committee and each of the ratifying communities adopt a locally preferred option that's both cost effective and meets the needs of a wide a range community members.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
119	Arendes, Carine	<p>Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>Good evening. My name is Corrine Edereby (phonetic) and I'm here tonight to share some concerns that I've heard from the community about affordable housing in the southwest corridor. There's been two interrelated concerns that have come up. One is impacts due to construction and the possibility of being relocated. And the other one is impacts after it's built, how is that going to affect, you know, the housing crisis in the community?</p> <p>One of the questions that's been raised is why don't we care more about businesses than households or why we would care more about households than businesses? And I don't think this is really the right question to be asking. Instead, I think we need to understand how do the impacts of relocation differ between families and businesses? When a business moves, the entire business moves together and working relationships remain intact. And I'm sure it's a really difficult process regardless, but that's not what happens when a housing community is forcibly relocated. People don't remain together. Instead, people scatter to wherever they can possibly find a roof that they can afford so people end up losing contact with friends.</p> <p>They lose daycare options, the opportunity to borrow and trade tools from neighbors and places to stay, basically their entire social safety net disappears. And this has an impact on our kids too, which spills over into the classrooms and our schools and has the potential to disrupt our entire community.</p> <p>I think it's also really important to remember that many of the people who will be most impacted by this project aren't necessarily here tonight. However, some folks have been taking some community meetings in much less formal situations than this where there's been translation available and free daycare offered and some of those folks have gone ahead and written a community letter and I just want to read one sentence from that letter. "So our hope is to stay in our neighborhood and be able to benefit from increased access to public transportation through better connections to where we need to go, access to living wage jobs in and around the corridor, and most importantly healthy, affordable and safe housing."</p> <p>This won't happen unless we act consciously. You know, we have to take steps to try to take action on this. Their number one request is affordable housing preservation and construction. And I really, sincerely hope that our communities do take action to both construct and protect existing affordable housing. Thank you.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and residential displacements, and Master Response 18 regarding your concerns about affordable housing. See Section 4.4, Communities, of both the Draft EIS and the Final EIS for analysis of potential impacts to neighborhood cohesion as a result of residential displacements. Please see Appendix J2.4, Petitions, of this Final EIS, specifically Comment P01, for the response to the letter submitted by Unite Oregon that is mentioned in your comment.</p>
120	Armstrong, Justus	<p>Take in a moment just to pass those graphs out for a second. Good evening Members of the Committee. My name is Justus Armstrong. I am a resident of southeast Portland. Thank you for having me.</p> <p>I'd just like to talk a little bit about some of the projections for the frequency of transit service proposed in the DEIS for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail project. So the DEIS states that throughout configuration would include nine trains per hour traveling to downtown Portland -- downtown Tigard that is, during peak periods in 2035, with headways as low as 6.7 minutes between the operation of the trains. However, when you consider the performance of the current MAX lines, this is highly implausible. So I calculated the actual headways or the time -- average time in between stops of the MAX trains at each line, from the blue line to the orange line today, based upon the schedule available on TriMet's website. As you can see in the first graph, figure 1, the current time between stops of train operation at each line compared with the projections in the EIS for each line, and the projections down the road as well as the projections for the opening year.</p> <p>So for instance, as you can see the orange line was projected that there would be 7.5 minutes between trains by 2030, and 10 minutes between trains in the opening year, 2016. But currently, that number is actually at 13.1 minutes. You can see the same thing with the green line, which is actually at 15.1 minutes to when it's promised to be at 10 minutes in its opening year, as well as the yellow line. It appears that the only MAX line that has lived up to its projections is the red line, which has a much lower bar of 15-minute headways or four trains per hour.</p> <p>And now in the second graph, figure 2, you can see the same information in terms of trains per hour and how that service frequency has been consistently short of the projection in the EIS. And so the record of current MAX operations shows a consistent pattern of offering service at a level less than what was predicted in the EIS's. So how can we expect light rail in the southwest corridor to operate nine times per hour when most of the other lines haven't even been able to reach six trains per hour?</p> <p>Perhaps a more accurate projection for the final EIS of the project will be written on the basis of five or six trains per hour, not nine. If somehow we saw a drastic increase in the speed of light rail in Portland, we might be able to possibly reach the 2035 projections for the southwest corridor. But given the transfer speed of the light rail, this is also highly implausible. You can see in figure 3 on the next page, the average speed of light rail in Portland has been trending downward consistently since the year 2000. This is data available</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>To learn more about the transportation modeling used to project ridership, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>With regard to past MAX service frequency predictions, actual peak period headways are close to predictions for most MAX lines when examined on the applicable one- and two-hour peak period. The public comment made regarding inaccuracy of peak period service frequency uses a three-hour peak period that has never been used in the regional travel demand forecasting model in this region. Planning and NEPA documents for the Westside Corridor in the early 1990s predicted a need for five-minute peak period headways east of Beaverton Transit Center by 2005. The Red Line was extended from downtown Portland to Beaverton Transit Center to handle peak period ridership demands in 2009. The current actual peak period frequency is approximately six minutes between downtown Portland and Beaverton Transit Center. The planned Red Line Extension project will extend Red Line service to Fairplex Station by 2024, resulting in improved frequencies west of Beaverton Transit Center to better meet peak period ridership demand.</p> <p>The Orange Line MAX currently provides 10-minute frequency during the peak period and 15-minute service during the remainder of the day, as predicted for the opening year in NEPA documents for that project. The Yellow Line MAX currently provides 15-minute frequency throughout the day, including peak periods. Initially the Yellow Line MAX provided 10-minute peak period frequency using single-car trains, but these were replaced with double-car trains to increase capacity with 15-minute headways. The Green Line MAX also currently provides 15-minute frequency throughout the day, including peak periods. The regional travel forecasting model version used for Green Line predicted higher than actual park and ride usage, which heavily influenced the predicted Green Line ridership. Improvements in travel model performance over the past decade have provided greater confidence in the predictions for park and ride use.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>from TriMet's annual ridership reports. So overall, MAX has a consistent track record of over-promising and under-performing, and it's likely to be no different if the southwest corridor plan moves forward.</p> <p>Given the failure to deliver effective service, we can clearly see that expanding light rail in the southwest corridor would be a faulty transit investment. Thank you.</p>	
I21	Arumbakkam, Arvind	<p>Hello</p> <p>I live in the area that will be served by the new proposed Max line. Is there a consideration to increase the frequency of bus services that serve the area as an alternative? Compare the costs of both options?</p> <p>Bus services in the morning prior to 830am are OK for commuters going downtown, but are very poor in the evening for commuters leaving work between 1730-1900.</p>	Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail, future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project.
I22	Ast, Haylergh	<p>I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.</p>	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I23	Auburn, Barbara	<p>Rating 5</p> <p>I believe the proposed route connects major business and population centers. I am pro all light rail efforts and regret line to Mt.Sylvania campus is not an option. Good luck.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 12 regarding your support for a tunneled route through the PCC-Sylvania area.</p>
I24	Austen, Kathy	<p>Rating 5</p> <p>Tigard needs public transit into downtown Portland.</p>	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I25	Austen, Kathy	<p>I heard the deadline to comment is today, but I've yet to find it (or an associated time) on your website, so to make sure this gets in before 4pm here's a brief version. I'll peruse more documents and comment further later (and see if it makes it in under the undisclosed wire).</p> <p>Adding MAX as a transit option in the proposed area may reduce long term overall car traffic, but the route of permanent rail lines must be along the highway, not in the "surface street." Taking space away from cars (and bicycles) on Barbur/Hwy. 99 is not good long term (or even good short term) planning. If riders need to cross traffic to get from MAX to the sidewalk (as they do at Holiday Park in the Lloyd Diristrict) it encourages risky behavior on the part of pedestrians which endangers pedestrians, drivers, and the MAX. That's not good for anyone. Running alongside the highway with very separate stops (like the Blue, red, and Green lines do at 82nd and 60th on the east side) is much better long term planning, and allows cars and the MAX to move faster.</p> <p>Remember that though the MAX along Hwy. 26 to Beaverton has laudable ridership, Highway 26 has still needed to be widened. Taking travel lanes, or *potential* travel lanes, away from Barbur Blvd. now will be a long term transit catastrophe (think Mount Hood Freeway where homes were destroyed in an attempt to widen a travel corridor).</p> <p>Increasing bike safety along Barbur/Hwy. 99 and maintaining existing travel lanes for cars is the best way to serve businesses and residents along Barbur. Putting light rail in the Interstate "right of way" is the best way to serve commuters who might be coaxed to shift from solo driving on I-5 to being MAX riders.</p> <p>Do this project like you did the Green Line along I-205. (You did NOT put the Green Line down the middle of 82nd Ave.)</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period, including the public notice provided.</p> <p>To learn more about traffic analysis for the Project, see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support for improved bicycle facilities on SW Barbur Boulevard.</p>
I26	Baack, Don	<p>I have requested additional information from John Gillam, will send you a copy of that request. If he cannot provide it, please find someone on your staff to provide it.</p> <p>1. MAJOR OMISSION FROM YOUR DEIS DOCUMENT IS CONSIDERATION OF THE 2007 city council adopted RED ELECTRIC Plan whiz has a route over the Newbury Structure and connects to Slavin Road and thence to the Hooley Pedestrian Bridge. I will send a map with the council approved route shown as a separate email. This should not be new information to Metro as I have mentioned it several times in correspondence with Metro/TriMet staff. This omission must be corrected before this DEIS plan is submitted.</p> <p>2. The DEIS calls for a 2 year construction period to rebuild the east bound Capitol Highway flyover to connect to Barbur northbound. Does your financing plan have any mitigation funding for business interruption of Hillsdale businesses which will be significantly affected by the closure of eastbound Capitol Highway?</p> <p>If yes, how much? How as it calculated?</p> <p>Please explain the process a business must follow to qualify for business interruption mitigation. How much paper work is required, and please specifically explain the cash flow schedule: ie if the road is closed the first Day of May, on what month and day of the following months would the compensation for business interruption begin How would the amount be calculated?</p> <p>If Hillsdale is not in your financial plan, how could it be placed in your financial plan?</p>	<p>The Preferred Alternative as studied in the Final EIS would not preclude construction of the Red Electric Trail. Section 4.7, Parks and Recreation Resources, of this Final EIS provides information about the Project's impacts to the planned Red Electric Trail.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS, specifically Section 3.3, Short-Term Transportation Impacts, to learn more about impacts during construction, including impacts to the SW Capitol Highway flyover.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.3, Economics, for information about anticipated impacts to businesses during construction and potential mitigation measures to address these impacts. The Final EIS does not address direct business support or coordination at the level of detail requested in this comment. To learn more regarding business interruption mitigation, please contact TriMet's Community Affairs team at 503-962-2150 or <a href="mailto:swcorridor@trimet.org">swcorridor@trimet.org</a>.</p> <p>To learn more about project costs and the Project's funding plan, please see Section 5.3, Cost and Funding Evaluation.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		This is a very important consideration for the many small business owners in the Hillsdale area as well as those along the entire length of the Barbur Project. Finally, what is the budgeted amount of business interruption for all of the businesses along Barbur from Terwilliger to the Transit Center? These are important issues for our community.	
I27	Baird, Ellie	Please make this happen. I want more trains.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I28	Baird, Gale	Rating 5 Much-needed transit expansion and improved opportunities in light of increasing population density and traffic in this corridor of PDX metro.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I29	Baird, Leslie	Please drop the "Taylors Ferry Refinement" and rebuild Barbur at Capitol Highway and run the light rail straight down Barbur. We live at 52nd and Taylor's Ferry rd. and are very concerned about this current design. We already have a lot of traffic on TF rd. and can see that your proposal would add to this terrible traffic situation we already have in the area. We especially have issues when PCC Sylvania is in Session. Thanks for your consideration on this issue.	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS, and preference for an alignment along SW Barbur Boulevard instead, which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
I30	Baldwin-Sayre, Carrie	I work as a physician at NUNM Health Center, a clinic serving a high percentage of Medicaid and underserved patients in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our clinic is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I31	Bandstra, Jillianne	The tri-intersection of Barbur, Capital and Taylor's Ferry is already so backed up. Adding a max at this intersection will make the traffic during high times even worse. Especially for those that have to cross at the intersection to reach schools.	Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.
I32	Banning, Craig and Becky	My wife and I own a 15 unit apartment complex at 4210-4230 SW Viewpoint Terrace, Portland, OR 97239. This property has been identified as property TriMet may be interested in purchasing "all or some of". It is unclear how much of the property would be needed. The SE corner has 4 covered parking spots with a 2 bedroom apartment above them. We are fearful of losing any part of this property, including the access to the 4 parking spots, There is only enough parking for the existing tenants and parking is critical for the viability of the building. This rental property is our livelihood and we feel grave concern.	Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.
I33	Barker, Janis	I have lived on 49th Avenue off Taylor's Ferry for 25 years. There's no question that the proposed routing of light rail through the intersection of SW Capitol Hwy and Taylor's Ferry at grade would have a large negative impact on traffic flow. No plan is perfect but this refinement would affect not only people who live close to the intersection but all that use Taylor's Ferry and Capitol Hwy daily. This number has increased dramatically as the population has grown. Please don't be penny wise and pound foolish. The Barbur route which includes fixing the bridge over I-5 to accommodate light rail will be more expensive in the short run but will be more cost effective in the long run, disrupting traffic flow significantly less than creating a route on Taylor's Ferry with an intersection at grade.	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS, and preference for a an alignment along SW Barbur Boulevard instead, which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
I34	Barker, Joel	A couple references are incorrect: * In the letter I recently received regarding property acquisitions, it says that property acquisition is discussed in section 3.1. I did not see anything there that was helpful. I think you meant somewhere in section 4. * In 4.1.2, page 115 of the PDF version you reference "Section 4.1.6, Potential Mitigation Measures, includes a summary of the process and timing for property acquisition, including notification of property owners." That should be 4.1.4.	Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions. Your comment regarding the reference to potential mitigation measures in the Draft EIS has been noted and corrected in the Final EIS.
I35	Barrett, Philip	Thank you for giving me this opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (the Draft EIS) for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project (the Project). My comments focus on 4 issues: a) Crossroads area planning and design; b) earthquake hazards; c) adequacy of the Draft EIS; and d) the No-Build Alternative. Crossroads area planning and design The transportation setting in the Crossroads area is extremely complex. Transportation planning and design challenges include: a) 7 interdependent surface street intersections;	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center, which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 for more information about the selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative. In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), and support for rebuilding the intersection and bridge over I-5 at SW Barbur Boulevard and SW Capitol Highway (the "Crossroads intersection"), which were both studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B, including information regarding the Crossroads intersection. The I-5 congestion pricing project was developed subsequent to the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project. It is that project's responsibility to consider earlier projects, including the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project, in its analysis.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>b) historic neglect of transit, pedestrian and bicycle uses;                      c) an aging interstate freeway bridge that urgently needs a seismic upgrade;                      d) management responsibility divided among multiple jurisdictions; and                      e) multiple interrelated planning studies and construction projects underway.</p> <p>The Initial Route Proposal for the Crossroads area includes Design Refinement #2, which routes MAX trains at grade through the intersection of Taylors Ferry Road and Capitol Highway – the portal to my neighborhood in outer southwest Portland. MAX trains should not, under any circumstances, run along Taylors Ferry Road. Considering the functional and aesthetic impacts on directly affected neighborhoods, running MAX trains along Taylors Ferry Road simply is not an acceptable option for cutting Project costs.</p> <p>Traffic at the intersection of Taylors Ferry Road and Capitol Highway is already a nightmare during both morning and afternoon rush hours; adding MAX trains and new "storage lanes" to the mix is incomprehensible. The functional and aesthetic impacts of building a new train bridge and increasing traffic congestion at that intersection will significantly reduce the livability of neighborhoods in outer southwest Portland. Running MAX trains along Taylors Ferry Road threatens to push these neighborhoods into long-term decline, directly impacting property values and the local property tax base.</p> <p>MAX trains should run down the centerline of Barbur Boulevard for the entire length of Segment B (Alternative B1). Because it has been a transportation corridor for at least 100 years, keeping MAX trains on Barbur Boulevard has by far the lowest cumulative environmental impacts.</p> <p>Whatever the cost, reconstructing the I-5 overcrossing to support straight-through MAX train traffic on Barbur Boulevard is by far the best option for the community. That structure is about 60 years old and is now approaching the end of its useful life. The existing freeway design is deficient for both lane width and overhead clearance. Existing surface street alignments are increasingly inadequate to support pedestrian and bicycle use or to handle growing volumes of local traffic - let alone additional traffic generated by (a) expansion of park-and-ride facilities at Barbur Transit Center and at SW 53rd or (b) the traffic apocalypse that awaits the area if congestion-price tolling is implemented on I-5.</p> <p>With Design Refinement #2, Metro and TriMet have gone to great lengths to bypass the I-5 overcrossing structure at Capitol Highway. While reconstructing the I-5 overcrossing is the right thing to do, I recognize the need to study bypass alternatives. Fundamentally, there are 4 single-purpose (light rail only) options for bypassing the I-5 overcrossing structure:</p> <p>a) bridge along the Barbur Boulevard centerline;                      b) tunnel along the Barbur Boulevard centerline;                      c) bridge to the southeast; and                      d) bridge to the northwest.</p> <p>The Draft EIS analysis of bypass alternatives is inadequate in both scope and detail. It seriously considers only the last of the 4 bypass options: routing MAX trains off of Barbur Boulevard and onto Taylors Ferry Road. The Draft EIS should reexamine all 4 bypass options in a transparent side-by-side comparison. Two of those options are likely to be preferable to the proposed Taylors Ferry Road route: a bridge along the Barbur Boulevard centerline and a bridge on the southeast side. The community deserves to know how and why Metro and TriMet rejected apparently viable alternatives to the Taylors Ferry Road alignment.</p> <p>Finally, many arterials and side streets in outer southwest Portland were built far below modern development standards for pedestrian and bicycle use. It is imperative that the Project address this historical deficiency with an aggressive local access program. At a minimum, the Project should provide sidewalks and bike lanes on Taylors Ferry Road from Barbur Boulevard to SW 80th and on Capitol Highway from Huber to Multnomah Village. The cost of these improvements could be shared by transit and community development sources.</p> <p>The Draft EIS - particularly the analysis of Design Refinement #2 in Appendix E - is wholly inadequate for assessing the Project's functional and aesthetic impacts in the Crossroads area.</p> <p>Issues that the Draft EIS should address include:</p> <p>a) neighborhood traffic and livability impacts of Design Refinement #2, including the threat of declining property values;                      b) benefits of reconstructing the I-5 overcrossing structure at Capitol Highway;                      c) comprehensive analysis of all 4 options for bypassing the I-5 overcrossing at Capitol Highway; and                      d) opportunities for enhancing pedestrian and bicycle access in the Crossroads area.</p> <p><b>Earthquake Hazards</b></p> <p>With an MS in geology (University of Montana, 1982), I have a long-held interest in Pacific Northwest earthquake hazards (seismicity, landslides and tsunamis).</p> <p>After nearly 10 years of Project planning, the Draft EIS presented an Initial Route Proposal with last-minute Design Refinements. Three of these Design Refinements propose single-purpose (light rail only) bridges that systematically bypass all of the highway bridges now carrying Barbur Boulevard. Design Refinements #1, 2 and 4 address, respectively: 2 wooden viaducts in Barbur Woods; the I-5 overcrossing at Capitol Highway and the I-5 overcrossing between SW 60th and SW 64th. I presume that all 4 of these bridges: (a) are</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle mobility and station access improvements.</p> <p>Traffic impacts related to Refinement 2 are not analyzed in the Final EIS, because Refinement 2 was not included in the Preferred Alternative. See Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of the Final EIS for a summary of traffic analysis completed for the Preferred Alternative in the Crossroads area.</p> <p>An analysis of four different bypass options, as listed in your comment, is not required as part of the environmental analysis, and the Draft EIS analysis is adequate in terms of analyzing impacts in the Crossroads area. The Draft EIS considered both a bridge to the southeast (Alternatives B2, B3 and B4) and a bridge to the northwest (Refinement 2). For the Final EIS, the Preferred Alternative includes Alternative B2, including a light rail structure southeast of the Crossroads intersection. The Draft EIS additionally considered Alternative B1, which would have reconstructed the existing I-5 overcrossing structure. The project team found that there were significant grade issues, as well as construction and property impacts, related to the possibility of either a tunnel or bridge along the centerline of SW Barbur Boulevard. Either of these options would likely have required reconstruction of the existing structure as well. Additionally, tunnels that were considered in other parts of the alignment were removed due to cost-benefit considerations. Please see Appendix I of this Final EIS, Preferred Alternative Selection and Project Refinements, for more discussion of the alignments considered and removed at the Crossroads intersection.</p> <p>Opportunities for enhancing pedestrian and bicycle access in the Crossroads area were analyzed in the Draft EIS, both as elements of the Project and as station access improvements, as described above.</p> <p>Section 4.8, Geology, Soils and Hydrogeology, of the Final EIS has been updated since the Draft EIS to include additional discussion of seismic hazards. A map of high earthquake hazard areas has been added to Appendix B4.8, Geology, Soils and Hydrology Maps, of the Final EIS. Seismic risks to the Project would be mitigated through design in accordance with engineering standards and applicable regulations.</p> <p>The Project's Purpose and Need does not include seismically upgrading existing structures that are not part of the Project. Where the Project would replace structures, the new structures would be built to the latest seismic standards. These structures include the SW Capitol Highway flyover over SW Barbur Boulevard, the SW Barbur Boulevard trestle bridges, and the SW Barbur Boulevard bridges over SW Multnomah Boulevard and SW 26th Avenue.</p> <p>As described in the above responses to concerns about the Crossroads intersection and seismic hazards, there is not a need for the Project to conduct a supplemental EIS to address these issues, as you requested in your comment.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period, including notifications to affected addresses, and the public involvement related to the design refinements. The information that you cite as an "irregularity in Draft EIS administrative procedures" was not part of the Draft EIS analysis. Rather, in response to requests for information from Metro's Southwest Corridor Light Rail Community Advisory Committee, the project team provided maps that showed additional detail on the design refinements.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail should the Project propose light rail on SW Taylors Ferry Road.</p>

Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>at high risk of collapse or catastrophic damage in a major earthquake and (b) will be critical for effective recovery after a major earthquake hits the region.</p> <p>Metropolitan Portland eventually will experience major earthquakes from 2 tectonic sources (see Figure 1): M9.0 events in the Cascadia Subduction Zone offshore of the Oregon and Washington coasts and equally, if not more, damaging M6.8 events in the Portland Hills fault complex that directly underlies the inner two-thirds of the Project corridor. Multiple recent studies from DOGAMI and the Oregon Seismic Safety Policy Advisory Commission (OSSPAC) have begun to (a) inventory critical infrastructure that is vulnerable in a major earthquakes event and (b) propose earthquake resilience strategies for seismic upgrades of critical infrastructure. Unfortunately, none of these studies has specifically addressed risks to highway bridges in metropolitan Portland.</p> <p>Whether intentionally or by coincidence, Design Refinements #1, 2 and 4 allow Metro and TriMet to sidestep responsibility for advancing regional earthquake resilience objectives. In a climate of perennial financial constraints for public projects, earthquake resilience can be achieved only by aggressively leveraging investments in public works projects whose primary purposes may be unrelated to the mitigation of earthquake risk. In this respect, opportunism is an essential element of earthquake resilience policy: the best time to make seismic upgrades is when age or modification for a new use justifies replacement or major reconstruction of a facility. Effectively, every major transportation project in metropolitan Portland must be, in part, an earthquake resilience project.</p> <p>No fairy god-mother is coming to fix metropolitan Portland's earthquake resilience problem. It is inconceivable to me that Metro and TriMet could spend \$3 billion on the Project and make no progress on seismic upgrades of critical transportation infrastructure. As government agencies, Metro and TriMet have an inherent obligation to do their part for earthquake resilience; abrogating that responsibility is a violation of the agencies' public trust. Instead of squandering scarce public funding on single-purpose bypass structures, we should be investing those funds in multi-purpose transportation infrastructure solutions that advance regional earthquake resilience objectives.</p> <p>Figure 1. Tectonic setting of major earthquake threats in metropolitan Portland (DOGAMI, 2018).</p> <p>The Draft EIS treatment of earthquake hazards is wholly inadequate. Issues it should address include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the Project's tectonic setting (Cascadia Subduction Zone and Portland Hills fault complex) and associated earthquake threats;</li> <li>b) federal, state and local government policy concerning earthquake resilience in metropolitan Portland;</li> <li>c) how earthquake risks were considered in Project planning and design; and</li> <li>d) what earthquake mitigation measures were adopted for the Project.</li> </ul> <p>The Draft EIS should examine in detail how reconstruction of the I-5 overcrossing at Capitol Highway can achieve both transit and earthquake resilience benefits. With respect to regional priorities for seismic upgrades of critical infrastructure, I presume that this structure ranks near the top on both vulnerability and critical functionality scales (a cursory visual inspection of the bridge structure using Google Street View is sobering indeed). The cost of reconstruction could be shared by transit and highway management organizations (FTA and FHA at the federal level; TriMet and ODOT at the local and state levels). The Draft EIS should also seriously consider reconstructing all 4 seismically vulnerable highway bridges along Barbur Boulevard: 2 viaducts in Barbur Woods; the I-5 overcrossing at Capitol Highway and the I-5 overcrossing between SW 60th and SW 64th.</p> <p><b>Adequacy of the Draft EIS</b></p> <p>The information presented in the Draft EIS is wholly inadequate to assess the Project's functional and aesthetic impacts in the Crossroads area. At this juncture of program development, I have no confidence that Metro and TriMet can produce a Project plan that works for everyone who uses the Crossroads area - including those of us who live in directly affected neighborhoods.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Draft EIS is wholly inadequate in its assessment of earthquake hazards that threaten the highway bridges now carrying Barbur Boulevard. Seismic upgrades of these structures - particularly the I-5 overcrossing at Capitol Highway - are urgently needed to advance regional seismic resilience objectives.</p> <p>I strongly recommend that Metro and TriMet issue a Supplemental Draft EIS focusing on (a) complex transportation needs, opportunities and constraints in the Crossroads area and (b) earthquake hazards. To inform the Supplemental Draft EIS, Metro and TriMet should convene a collaborative planning forum that engages all stakeholders in the development of robust, community-friendly transportation solutions for the Crossroads area. Suboptimal solutions are bound to emerge if the public can only guess what considerations might be motivating Project planning and design decisions.</p> <p>The Supplemental Draft EIS should also correct an irregularity in Draft EIS administrative procedures that may have compromised the integrity of the public involvement process. Midway through the public comment period, Metro and TriMet released more detailed alignment maps for Design Refinements #2 and #4. The timing of this action creates 3 problems: (a) distribution of new information to members of the public was inevitably selective; (b) significant information on the maps is not addressed in Draft EIS text (e.g., the unsubstantiated assertion that freeway clearance deficiencies on the I-5 overcrossing at Capitol Highway would be corrected by raising the bridge elevation above surface grade, rather than by lowering the freeway elevation); and (c) Project planners can never be certain which version of the supporting materials is reflected in any particular public comment.</p> <p>The No-Build Alternative</p>	

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>If running MAX trains along Taylors Ferry Road is the only way the Project can be built, Metro and TriMet should choose the No-Build Alternative and indefinitely delay construction of Southwest Corridor light rail. For a tiny fraction of the Project's \$3-billion cost, targeted spending on new park-and-ride facilities and expanded express bus service should buy at least 20-25 years of adequate transit support in the Southwest Corridor. By then, more comprehensive regional transportation solutions - such as the addition of dedicated transit lanes to I-5 - are likely to emerge.</p> <p>Summary of Recommendations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MAX trains should not, under any circumstances, run along Taylors Ferry Road (Design Refinement #2). Considering the functional and aesthetic impacts on neighborhoods in outer southwest Portland, running MAX trains along Taylors Ferry Road simply is not an acceptable option for cutting Project costs.</li> <li>2. MAX trains should run down the centerline of Barbur Boulevard for the entire length of Segment B (Alternative B1). Because it has been a transportation corridor for at least 100 years, keeping MAX trains on Barbur Boulevard has by far the lowest cumulative environmental impacts.</li> <li>3. Whatever the cost, reconstructing the I-5 overcrossing to support straight-through MAX train traffic on Barbur Boulevard is by far the best option for the community.</li> <li>4. The Draft EIS should reexamine all 4 of the single-purpose (light rail only) options for bypassing the I-5 overcrossing at Capitol Highway. Two options are likely to be preferable to the proposed Taylors Ferry Road route: a bridge along the Barbur Boulevard centerline and a bridge on the southeast side.</li> <li>5. Project plans should include an aggressive program to improve pedestrian and bicycle access in the Crossroads area. The cost of these improvements could be shared by transit and community development sources.</li> <li>6. The Draft EIS should examine in detail how reconstruction of the I-5 overcrossing at Capitol Highway can achieve both transit and earthquake resilience benefits. The cost of reconstruction could be shared by transit and highway management organizations (FTA and FHA at the federal level; TriMet and ODOT at the local and state levels). The Draft EIS should also seriously consider reconstructing all 4 seismically vulnerable highway bridges along Barbur Boulevard: 2 viaducts in Barbur Woods; the I-5 overcrossing at Capitol Highway and the I-5 overcrossing between SW 60th and SW 64th.</li> <li>7. Metro and TriMet should issue a Supplemental Draft EIS focusing on (a) complex transportation needs, opportunities and constraints in the Crossroads area and (b) earthquake hazards. To inform the Supplemental Draft EIS, Metro and TriMet should convene a collaborative planning forum that engages all stakeholders in the development of robust, community-friendly transportation solutions for the Crossroads area. The Supplemental Draft EIS should also correct an irregularity in Draft EIS administrative procedures.</li> <li>8. If running MAX trains along Taylors Ferry Road is the only way the Project can be built, Metro and TriMet should choose the No-Build Alternative and indefinitely delay construction of Southwest Corridor light rail.</li> </ol>	
I36	Baze, Zachary	<p>I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur..</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
I37	Bear, Alexander	<p>I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
I38	Beck, Nathan	<p>As a long-time community member of SW PDX I'm glad to see this project progressing. I am all for expanded mass transit in PDX as well as supporting the infrastructure along with it (pedestrian &amp; bike access). My concern about the current proposal is in regards to the recent change to the route. Having the MAX leave Barbur Transit Center and going up Taylor's Ferry is not a good option. It will have a huge impact on the Crestwood Neighborhood and all traffic that flows through Taylor's Ferry. The Capitol Hwy Taylors Ferry intersection is already a huge problem during peak hours. Routing the MAX through this intersection will create even more problems. I know that the Barbur/Capitol HWY intersection (and bridge) has it's problems as a route, but these problems won't go away by skirting the MAX line around it. The cost of revamping the entire intersection will be worth it in the end. That also goes for having pedestrian access from the Crestwood Neighborhood to the PCC stop via a pedestrian bridge. I'm sure cost-cutting has an impact on theses features, but if you're going to do the job, why not spend the money up front and do it well? I'd like to see my tax dollars spent on something that will enhance the community for a long time.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project specifically and mass transit in general. Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle improvements included in the Project.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS, and preference for an alignment along SW Barbur Boulevard instead, which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I39	Beil, Kurt	I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.  Also, regarding the terminus of the SW corridor MAX line, I am in favor of the branch route. It is unnecessary for people going to Tualatin to have to go through downtown Tigard.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I40	Bengtson, Joanne	I'm wholeheartedly in favor of light rail coming to the SW corridor. Right now, my 4-mile commute from home to work takes 30 minutes - mostly spent waiting in line at signals and behind other drivers.  I'm hoping to use light rail when I'm retired (it may take 10 years for construction) for all the connections it can provide me with to other places in the region without having the headache of maintaining a vehicle.  I think it's important that commuters have a viable alternative for moving around the region that won't contribute to worsening traffic, continued dependence on oil and increased pollution. I didn't balk when taxes went to funding all the other lines, I hope voters show me the same courtesy so that I can participate in a user-friendly, safe transportation system.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I41	Benham, Susan	I think it's important not to waste money in planning this light rail project. Relatively new buildings should not be destroyed (like the one Village Inn is in).	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
I42	Bentch, Jennifer	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I43	Bergman, Andrew	Rating 1  I don't believe that there will be that many people using between Tigard Triangle to Tigard to Bridgeport; have minimal impact on the current traffic situations in Tigard and Bridgeport ( very few people live in Bridgeport ) . This just a way to force extending the line into Tualatin; all this for the over crowding and un-affordability of Portland.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.  To learn more about the transportation modeling used to project ridership, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.  Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.
I44	Bernatovic, Ivan	Rating 1  I do not approve Refinement 2- I am completely against it! Im concerned about the amount the noise and vibration impact in my house, loss of sunlight and the effects on the vegetation and animals living in the Woods Memorial park. I bought my house because of the proximity to the park, the tranquility of the trees and the quiet of the area and I DO NOT wish this to be disturbed. Im concerned that my property will loose in value because of the vicinity or the railroad. the proposed location of the Taylors Ferry alignment is at the headwaters of Woods Creek. Im concerned about the storm water issues that as is the city is unwilling to address, adding more infrastructure will additionally affect the storm water issues and quality of drinking water I absolutely reject the Refinement 2!	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
I45	Bernknopf, Emily	As a new resident to Tualatin, I am a frequent user of the Bus, MAX and WES services to get around the Metropolitan area as I am unable to drive. I believe that the new proposed Light Rail project would be a huge benefit to the communities it serves and would enable those on the outer edges to take employment further into Portland with much reduced commute times. At present, it is harder to ensure connections are not missed between services, so having the option to get the Bus to the proposed Bridgeport Station would ensure that people have a viable back-up plan to continue their commute.  Route Proposal: I would love for the route to come further into Tualatin, however as long as the connecting services are running optimally this should not be too much of an issue. I have no issue with the remaining proposed route.  DEIS Study: My main concern regarding the study is the amount of People/Families that will be displaced. I understand that movement is necessary to build the project, but absolutely all avenues to ensure least displacement as possible should be considered, more moved towards commercial displacement where possible.  I believe there are far more positive actions to support this project and certainly look forward to it's completion!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the alignment farther into Tualatin.  Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.
I46	Bernknopf, Robert	As a resident of Tualatin, I commute to the Barbur Boulevard Transit Center and the Portland Metro Area nearly every single day. The travel times being as long as they are currently can be unbearable at times especially if there are any unexpected delays. The Light Rail Project seems to potentially solve problems like these. I support the construction of the Light Rail Project.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
147	Besaw, Ian	Just wanted to say that I fully support the proposed MAX alignment down Barbur (SW Corridor project). Also, I've heard that there's proposed projects to fix the disastrous current configuration of the on ramp to the Powell bridge from I-5 South / Naito Parkway ("Naito Parkway" and "Bridgehead Reconfiguration" projects). I fully support these projects as well and sincerely hope that all of them proceed forward. Thank you!	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
148	Besaw, Marjorie	I work at NUNM and rely heavily on transit down Barbur Blvd to commute to work 5 days a week. I support fully the proposed alignment of the proposed lightrail line down Barbur! This would make my commute and living in the sw Portland better all around. I also support the reconfiguration of the bridgehead to Ross Island Bridge and making Naito Parkway into a more pedestrian friendly road for the neighborhoods and transit commuters in the area alike. Having lived in SE Portland for a decade and recently moving to SW I can say with certainty that the most difficult quadrant to quadrant drive in Portland is between SW and SE. You are cut off by river, downtown, and highway and have to navigate some of the worst in town (rather than highway) traffic in Portland. Easier access onto Ross Island Bridge would relieve so much traffic pressure and make the drive between SE and SW Portland so much more tolerable!	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
149	Besore, Eric	I am against the "SW Corridor Refinement 2" that would run the light rail up Taylor's Ferry Road. I believe that the light rail should stay on Barbur if it is built at all. There is no reason to bring it into a residential area that will make traffic worse and remove homes of residents.	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.
150	Betts, John M	U have been waiting for the MAX to come this far South	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
151	Birmingham, Kathryn	THIS WOULD IMPACT ME!!! I think it's a HORRIBLE idea. DO NOT PUT MAX DOWN BARBUR!! I've seen what putting MAX down the middle of Interstate and East Burnside has done to the livability and character of the surrounding community and it's not what I want for my community. I prefer the Beaverton MAX model where MAX runs parallel but independent of pre-existing highways. I don't want my tax money used on this project!!! There's been other big money boondoggles that waste money, have unexpected consequences, create new problems. I suspect putting MAX down Barbur falls into that category. Barbur or I-5 are the only routes I can think of that connect me to the rest of Portland. Right now my household use Barbur to get downtown or as a jumping off point to one of the bridges. Putting MAX down Barbur will increase congestion but THERE AREN'T ALTERNATIVE ROUTES (other than I-5 which is already congested) TO BYPASS BARBUR TO GET DOWNTOWN. The construction is going to be a nightmare. I have asthma; can't stand for long periods or comfortably walk a few blocks. I'm not personally served by MAX. I like the way Barbur is now. I don't see how putting a MAX line down Babur will improve anything.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.
152	Bishop, Greg	I am a psychologist on Beveland Street, and I urge you to use the Elmhurst Street alternative. I have been at this location for 15 years and work with adolescents and their families. Many clients have appreciated the close proximity to Well and Good coffee house and Lowe's as ways for parents to spend some time when I work with the teens individually. Because I rent in a converted house with other mental health professionals, I have a professional community where I work, which is essential for me since so much of my work is in isolation. We not only have a community in our building, but I have attended several barbecues that have been held on the street so that I have gotten to know the other small business owners. Please don't destroy this community - and use the Elmhurst alternative instead.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for the SW Elmhurst Street alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Refinement 5 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.
153	Black, Sylvia	I do not want a MAX line to Tigard	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.
154	Blaumer, Jessica	I think it would be a great idea, especially for the commuters.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
155	Bondi, Colin	I support the proposed max line to TIGARD. I strongly support additional light rail and my view is a line to TIGARD should be next on the list.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
156	Bonella, Randy	I have made other comments so this is in addition to earlier comments. Missing from the opportunity to provide community input is the B2 +R2 refinement option. It is late to the mix and poses some interesting and difficult issues. I strongly suggest that vetting for this option needs additional focus. Pedestrian flow, Traffic Flow, Headwaters environmental issues and above all safety come into play. With the money being put into this project the State really needs to step up and fix this intersection. Moving the entrances and exits at the same time of this project would be by far the best thing to do. without fundamental changes I fear that we only exacerbate an already bad problem and compromise safety.	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.
157	Bonella, Randy	Segment B: Unless there is a major rework of the Crossroads section at Capitol Hwy, Barbur, I5, Tailors Ferry Road I think options B2 and or B3 would best serve all modes of transportation. Preference would be to B2 in the event alignment to I5 would prevent improvements to Barbur Blvd and or other cost impacts. I believe that this is in accordance to your recommendations.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for a light rail structure south of SW Barbur Boulevard at SW Capitol Highway in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B2 and B3 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>Options B2, B3 would help alleviate congestion on Barbur at the Barbur Transit Center the Crossroads and 53rd TC. Transitioning the train from the middle of barbur to the side of I-5 before the crossroads is critical. Improving Barbur Blvd as a whole is also a key consideration and if moving the alignment to I5 means it wouldn't get done then option B2 would be the most preferred.</p> <p>Option B1 has the potential for creating a choke point at the Crossroads section at Captiol Hwy, Barbur, I5 and Taylors Ferry Road. It is already a complicated choke point and having the trains transition hat close to this intersection is a mistake. Heavy pedestrian traffic across multiple traffic lanes just doesn't feel right.</p> <p>Option B4 I don't have any real input due to the only main difference is the location of the 19th Ave/Spring Garden Station. Which Ever one of those would see the most traffic would be the best option.</p>	
158	Bonifield, Miranda	<p>Hi, my name is Miranda Bonifield. I live in Hillsboro, but I've spent enough time in this area to know that I really love it. I also love using the MAX. I love using the bus. I think it's tremendously fun and convenient. Whenever I travel to other cities like Atlanta, D.C., or New York, I utilized public transport all the time.</p> <p>That being said, I share some concerns of previous individuals who have talked about the decreasing ridership of public transit overall, the high capital costs, et cetera, et cetera. So I'd like to talk a little bit, really quickly, firstly about the way the EIS is structured, and then about another example of flaws within the EIS. From the moment I began reading the EIS, it became clear to me that this document is overly optimistic in pretty much all of its predictions. For instance, the document states on page 6 of chapter 1, you don't really have to dig for this, that demand for public transit is slated to increase between now and 2035. The only warrant that's provided for this is increased population in the area, and the fact that there's supposed to be not enough public transit available.</p> <p>However, the EIS fails to provide any numbers on previous trends in transit, the EIS fails to give any sort of justification for its projected increase in ridership. So, you know, that doesn't look like good scholarship to me. I've had some pretty good college professors and pretty good Econ professors when I was in school, and they all told me that you need to actually look at the metrics. You need to look at the actual data, and you can't just have some wild guess out there that it seems like the EIS is giving. It's just one more example of flawed reasoning in the EIS. Page 8, literally two pages later, argues that a new light rail line would be good for future high-density development, and provide greater mobility to and from jobs in the Portland area and city attractions, and things like this. But there are several issues with that.</p> <p>First of all, a heightened state of development doesn't necessarily correlate with, for instance, the decrease in energy or vehicle usage. David Brownstone, who is an economist from the University of California, did a study on this and found that a high-density development and urban planning, things like light rail didn't actually have any kind of impact that was great enough to be useful. Additionally, despite the billings that we've spent on the MAX line projects and transit development in the past, despite improvements in the job market so more people are commuting to work, despite the fact that the numbers of walkers and cyclists commuting to work has actually grown by 79 percent, and despite the increases in our area's population, ridership per capita continues to decline, while automobile commutes have increased by 21 percent.</p> <p>So with all of this on the table, how is spending \$2.5 billion on another light rail line that people aren't going to use as frequently as we would hope a good idea for our taxpayer -- for our use of resources, for our region, for congestion in the area? The answer is, it isn't. So thank you very much.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for public transportation and your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>To learn more about the transportation modeling used to project ridership, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.18, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts, of this Final EIS regarding indirect effects of the Project related to land use and development patterns.</p>
159	Bonn, Lori Ann	<p>It's about time! Being so close to downtown on the SW side the current transit system took too long and too many transfers - inefficient. Having MAX on Barbur would make commute stress free and I would feel I am contributing to the community. I am in support of this line. Thank you for the opportunity to comment! Lori</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p>
160	Boomer, Elaine	<p>I am opposed to the current plans for the Light Rail for Tigard.</p> <p>We live about .5 miles from Hwy 99 and do NOT want to see the businesses removed and a parking lot in their place. Have been waiting for a Chick-Fil-A to come to our area, and now we hear eminent domain will kill it before it even is built. Put Light Rail somewhere else - we have enough traffic with the highway, don't need a train, too!! Don't bring more noise and unsavory people to our neighborhood.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of this Final EIS, regarding concerns about noise impacts and mitigations.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime.</p>
161	Boones, Paul	<p>Hi, my name is Paul Boones, and I live about a block from here.</p> <p>I'm generally opposed to this project and that. First off, how do you justify a light rail when you already have west? It's 1.1 miles from the Tigard -- Tigard triangle to the west station in Tigard. It's 1.2 miles from The Village Inn to the west station in Tigard or Tualatin. We're going to be spending billions of dollars on this thing. It would be a lot less expensive to improve west than build another parallel system.</p> <p>I was also on the Corridor web page today and it says it's going to minimize impact on housing and businesses. Well, as a commuter there, I'm looking for something that says minimize impact on commuters. In all probability, I will never be using this service here but I am interested in going from home to the Burger King. And as I see it, it's only going to make my commute from home to Burger King worse.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding your interest in WES Commuter Rail improvements.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 15 regarding your interest in an extended I-5 alignment.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		But what I would support is I would support building from the Barbur station down and run along the I5 corridor -- along the I5 freeway there. That would have minimum impact on everything.	
162	Booth, Lee	Rating 5 I can easily walk to one of the proposed stations in the Triangle, and it would be easier to get downtown or to Bridgeport on a regular basis.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
163	Bowers, Barbara	As I think about this major opportunity to reconfigure the movement of people via public transportation, bicycling, and walking I am excited to contribute to this multistage process. SW Portland needs light rail not only to connect people to jobs in downtown Portland, but also for people going in the other direction.  I favor a Naito route with a bridge configuration for Ross Island Bridge that will correct a bottleneck along this segment of the route . It has been a problem since I first began visiting here in the early 1980's and has only become worse. The change to a ramp on Kelley Avenue will remove traffic from its existing location and as I understand your Summer 2018 Newsletter allow for nearly 3 acres of land development. Couple this with an Equitable Housing Strategy and Portland will improve on its livability.  As a walker I use Terwilliger often and have experienced using the crosswalk at Doernbecher Children's Hospital. It is situated at a place with poor visibility for both auto and pedestrians and needs reconfiguration. Hopefully, plans to use an elevator to transport people from light rail to the hospital area will include a change to this intersection to make for a safer crossing.  I prefer light rail proceed along Barbur Blvd. with buses also being able to share the space. Placing it here will attract new development, upgrade existing businesses, and provide the street with sidewalks and bicycle lanes. There will be a uniform look that will be urban rather than its current 1950's, post-war look. Also, access from side streets will improve. One other thing that stood out for me in considering Barbur vs. I-5 is the safety factor of having light rail run on a city street where there is good visibility - especially at night.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A. Please see Master Response 4 and Appendix I of this Final EIS, Preferred Alternative Selection and Project Refinements, for more detail on route selection in Segment A.  Please see Master Response 18 regarding the Southwest Corridor Equitable Development Strategy (SWEDS).  It is unclear which crosswalk this comment is referring to near the Doernbecher Children's Hospital. The Marquam Hill Connection will include changes to only one intersection near the medical campus. The intersection of SW Terwilliger Boulevard and SW Campus Drive will be signalized with improved pedestrian crossings to connect the medical campus to the inclined elevator.  In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.  Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle improvements included in the Project.
164	Boyd, Ovid	Wow, those bike lanes in the visuals for the DEIS suck. More better please.  Parking lots seem like a terrible waste of land around Max stations. Do something more useful. Of all the station adjacent land for all the Max stations, I think NE 7th Ave is the best utilized. Do more of that and less of Cleveland Max station.  I still think you really better connect to PCC and OHSU, although I know you've already decided no. Still think it is worth the long term investment.	Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support of improved bicycle facilities.  Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS for an overview of park and rides, and Master Response 18 regarding your preference for housing development at park and ride locations.  Please see Master Response 12 regarding your support for improved connections to PCC-Sylvania and OHSU.
165	Boyer, Christopher	As a business owner on Pilkington near Lower Boones Ferry Road, I am seriously concerned about all 3 of your alternative proposals for a light rail from Portland to Bridgeport Village. The traffic is already bad for during commuting hours near the I-5 /Lower Boones Ferry Road intersection and the two park & ride areas near Bridgeport Village are full to capacity most of the time with just bus transit. A light rail terminus at Bridgeport Village would cause terrible traffic gridlock in the area and eliminate or seriously negatively impact many successful businesses in Bridgeport Village and nearby on Lower Boones Ferry Road. I am strongly opposed to all 3 of your proposals , especially options C1 & C3 which also would cause major traffic tie-ups and eliminate numerous popular establishments on Bangy Road.	Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.  Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.  In your comment, you expressed specific concerns about the I-5 alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Alternatives C1 and C3 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.
166	Bridger, Glenn	COMMENT 1 - Segment B, Alternative B4  I support the development of Alternative B4 which places the train line adjacent to Interstate 5 rather than in the middle of SW Barbur. This alternative is best for Southwest Portland as well as the entire corridor for the following reasons.  1. SW Barbur in this area is the commercial main street for SW Portland residents and needs to be nurtured as such. It is not a major highway, such as Pacific Highway in Tigard; it is not just one of many travel options like Interstate and other streets that have been taken over by a Train. By no placing a major visual and physical barrier down the middle, it will be better able to continue to develop as the SW commercial center.  2. SW Barbur needs to retain capacity to serve as an overflow to the parallel Interstate 5 highway. We need this not for the benefit of those drivers who divert on to SW Barbur, but to keep them on SW Barbur and not moving onto our local streets where they do not belong. Placing the train on SW Barbur removes most all flexibility on accommodating traffic needs, from making the timing of signal lights subject to the Train to narrowing the ability of the street to accommodate trucks and heavy traffic.  3. Tolling of the Interstate Highways in Portland is a very real probability during the life of this project. Tolling of highways always prompts diversion of traffic on to free alternate routes. SW Barbur will have higher traffic volumes when this goes into effect.  4. Placing the alignment next to Interstate 5 will not make the Train boarding areas less accessible. The boarding platforms may be as much as 100 feet removed from pedestrian crossings on SW Barbur, but were they located ON SW Barbur, they would not be located that close to the crossings. On SW Barbur, the boarding platforms will be located "mid-block" between signals, because the roadway space next to the crossings will be used for left turn movements and traffic stacking to make those turns.  5. Can't find the Train stop? Signs will direct you the short few feet to the station, just as they do for most every rail transit service in the world.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.  Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard.  Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.  The I-5 congestion pricing project was developed subsequent to the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project. It is that project's responsibility to consider earlier projects, including the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project, in its analysis.  Regarding boarding platform locations, boarding platforms at stations along SW Barbur Boulevard will be adjacent to pedestrian crossings, either at intersections or at mid-block crossings.  To learn more about consistency with the Barbur Concept Plan, see Section 5.1, Ability to Meet Purpose and Need, of this Final EIS. Each alignment alternative studied in the Draft EIS was generally consistent with the Barbur Concept Plan.  Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS, specifically Section 3.3, Short-Term Transportation Impacts, to learn more about impacts during construction, including impacts to the SW Capitol Highway flyover.  In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail to the east of SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Refinement 1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>6. The Barbur Concept Plan DID NOT find a preference for either alignment and purposefully remained silent on this. Statements to that effect that have been made over the past few years in person and writing were just plain wrong. I would like the DEIS authors to provide a direct quote from the Study stating that preference, or remove that concept from the DEIS.</p> <p>7. Train travel time will have greater operational flexibility by occupying their own right of way. This will give Max operations more control over their own activities.</p> <p>8. Construction impacts to the businesses and residents along SW Barbur will be less for construction next to Interstate 5.</p> <p>9. Portland, Metro, and Oregon DOT have been ignoring improving SW Barbur for years, in hopes of using this project to reconstruct SW Barbur into the city street it now functions as.</p> <p>I ask the SW Corridor Steering Committee place the Train next to Interstate 5 where it belongs for better operation and reconstruct SW Barbur as the city street we need. Each are better on their own right of way and will better serve SW Portland for the next 50 years as such.</p> <p>COMMENT 2 - Design Refinement 1: Maintaining the access between Hillsdale Town Center and Barbur via Capitol Highway is very important to the commercial health of Hillsdale. I support Design Refinement 1 which will provide this continuous access by not requiring construction at the ramps between SW Barbur and SW Capitol Highway. This refinement provides new bridges with pedestrian and bicycle facilities connecting to SW Slavin Road and SW Barbur over the Vermont and Newbury (Iowa Street) gullies, and in addition provide a two-lane vehicle bridge adjacent to the new bridges.</p> <p>COMMENT 3 - Report Section S.7 and Appendix C Environmental Justice Compliance EJ evaluation and conversation conducted at to "high" a level. Low income and minority populations are spread throughout many parts of Southwest Portland and the suburbs, but are not distributed along the lines of the census tracts. They have specific needs and impacts none the less. I recommend a more granular approach to the EJ needs, focusing upon the specific concentrations that are in smaller units than Census tracts. I will focus your attention on one specific community that is impacted and requires accessibility attention as a part of this project. I recommend the remainder of the corridor also be analyzed at this more intense level, identifying specific needs of each smaller community and assuring that those needs are met through this analysis. SW Slavin Road is a dead end street located south of SW Hamilton Street, between SW Barbur and Interstate 5. This primarily multifamily housing community contains a Public Housing complex Slavin Court, as well as a concentration of other affordable housing. Historically, these residents were able to cut through an apartment complex located between SW Barbur and SW Slavin Road in order to access transit service along SW Barbur, primarily serviced the bus stop referred to as "4900 Barbur". Also available at this transit stop is the Lee Buhler Cutoff, a trail leading to employment and educational opportunities at the OHSU complex. Rasmussen Apartments closed off this access route, leaving the residents to walk about ¼ mile to a stop, or scrambling up the side of an ODOT-owned hill and climbing a barrier to access the convenient transit stop. A secondary pedestrian route for this community is planned by the Portland Parks and Recreation Bureau as the Red Electric Trail. This trail section connecting Hillsdale and the Hooley Pedestrian Bridge over Interstate 5 is routed along SW Slavin Road as presently in use, together with incorporating much of the former roadway and adjacent areas as it continues to the intersection of SW Capitol Highway and SW Barbur. Note that SW Capitol Highway in this area was formerly Slavin Road. Requests for improving these two access routes for this community have been made to the Oregon Department of Transportation and the City of Portland. These requests came from Southwest Neighborhoods, Incorporated (SWNI) which is the coalition of 17 neighborhoods that make up SW Portland. This request originated from the Equity and Inclusion Committee of that organization, and is based upon the heavy reliance of these residents upon public transit, walking, and biking. Adhering to the precepts of the Environmental Justice guidance should assure these former and planned, and hopefully quickly reconstructed access routes are a part of this project design and construction. Specifically, the dead-ended SW Slavin Road community needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct east/west access from SW Slavin Road to the 4900 Barbur transit stop, and</li> <li>• Direct southerly access to Hillsdale and points west and south along the Red Electric Trail.</li> </ul>	<p>Appendix C, Environmental Justice Compliance, of the Final EIS assesses whether the Project would have disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority and low-income populations. Appendix C also describes the opportunities that have been provided for minority and low-income populations to have full and fair participation during the planning and development of the Project. In your comment, you expressed concerns about existing access limitations for minority and low-income residents living at Slavin Court and surrounding multifamily housing. Because these access limitations are existing conditions and would not result from or be worsened by project impacts, your suggested connections from SW Slavin Road to the 4900 bus stop and to the planned Red Electric Trail are not included in the Preferred Alternative as mitigations. However, your concerns and suggested connections have been shared with project partner staff from TriMet, the Portland Bureau of Transportation and ODOT. Please also see Master Response 7 regarding bicycle and pedestrian improvements in general.</p>
167	Brown, Richard	<p>Rating 1 A waste of money that can go more and better bus routes. You can put Bus /HOV lanes on the 205, 217 and I5 and run express buses for less. To boot it does nothing about limit transit to Wilsonville were job growth is happening.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail. Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the Project to Wilsonville.</p>
168	Brown, Seth	<p>Rating 4 I {work/ OR/ study} at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur..	
169	Brown, Seth	I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur..	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
170	Brown, Steve	I support the eastside Barbur route through Barbur woods; we do not support a Westside access across Barbur due to the potential erosion and --- from water damage arising from water on the hillside. Westside also prevents cycling access on --- and Barbur Blvd. Fix the bike/ped gap on Barbur!	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail to the east of SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Refinement 1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.  Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support of improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the Barbur Woods area.
171	Bruno, Pricilla	My name is Priscilla Bruno and good evening. Thank you so much for being here tonight. I will say, though, I am a resident of Beaverton, however, I spend -- I do a lot of volunteer work here at the community of St. Anthony, and therefore, I spend half of my time in Beaverton, half of my time in Tigard. The reason why I'm here today is that I always support my community and therefore, I want to ask you to please give an ear to the plight of the people that are asking to maintain their communities.  At the same time, I want to tell you how much I congratulate you for this project, this incredible project that is going to bring so much to our communities. It's fabulous. It looks really, really good and maybe in its conclusion who knows if I will get to be a user, but I am sure that my grandchildren will. And because they live in this area and they have to commute every day to college and also my daughter who goes and parks her vehicle over there in the parking lots for commuting and she goes to work this way. This will save a great amount of time. And again, this is great improvement and thank you so much for being here.	Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period, including notifications to affected addresses.  Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
172	Brusewitz, Jennifer	I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
173	Brush, Jason	I live near a max but it does not take me there, instead I take transfers to get to school which is time consuming. I support the project to be done in the Naito area as it will allow me to rely less on my car and more on public transit with a more convenient option.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for the SW Naito Parkway alignment in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternatives A2-BH and A2-LA in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
174	Bubenik, Frank	Does Tualatin want to lose a third-generation, family run restaurant which has been operating in town for forty-one years? No! I do not think we do and I am willing to fight to keep it in town rather than either be demolished or relocated.  Relocating a brake shop or hair salon is not the same as relocating a restaurant. A key to the success of the Village Inn is its location. That cannot be replicated. How about creating several alternative terminus designs? At a meeting I attended with Trimet representatives on 6/22/18 they presented a design alternative that moves the bus circle/transfer area to the south lot and leaves the Village Inn intact. I think this is a better plan as it keeps buses on the south side of the intersection preventing buses from having to make a left from SW 72nd Ave onto Lower Boones Ferry. At peak travel times this left turn gets quite congested and backed up. Imagine adding several busses into that traffic condition. Trimet and Metro have time to develop alternative plans that will give Ryan Sweeney and his mom, Connie Watt, the certainty they need to continue operating and reinvesting in their family business.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
175	Buckley, Cory	My partner and I recently bought a house in the Greenburg neighborhood. My partner has a car and commutes to work easily. However, I work in SW Portland and I do not own a car. I commute into town every day. It takes me about an hour to get to work with the current public transit situation (92 Express or 12 bus) and sometimes longer than an hour to get home because of rush hour traffic. I am most excited about the prospect of saving some time to get to and from work on a regular basis. This could potentially save me up to 30 minutes every day. My concern is with ease of access for the Greenburg community. Hunziker seems way too far South of Main Street for anybody from my neighborhood to easily use the Max on a daily basis. Additionally, I imagine business will be wanting the foot traffic from Max travelers. I used to live up at 185th and Baseline and the businesses around the Beaverton Central Max station seemed to receive the full benefit of the Max foot traffic. I would like to see Tigard businesses benefit from this expansion the same way. Thank you for your time and understanding.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  In your comment, you expressed concerns regarding the Hall Station in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Refinement 6 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.
176	Burks, Gypsy	I am excited about the improved access for pedestrians and cyclists along the Barbur corridor, as it is currently such an unsafe place for cycling.  I currently park at the Barbur Transit Center and take the 94 or 12 Bus o downtown Portland for my daily commute, and I take my 4year old to preschool on this route.	Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support of bicycle and pedestrian improvements as part of the Project.  Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and locations.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>*One of my concerns about the plan is that there is expected ridership of up to 45,000 people on a daily basis, but the project only calls for adding up to 3,600 parking spaces. I am not familiar enough with the route south of Barbur TC to know if this will be sufficient, but I know that I currently struggle to find parking at Barbur TC anytime after 8am, and that I don't live close enough to walk to the proposed MAX station. Is there enough apartments and high-density housing near this line that providing parking for only 7% of the expected riders is sufficient? As I'm sure you're well aware, Southwest Portland is not friendly for cyclists or pedestrians to travel to a MAX station without their vehicle.</p> <p>I'm also really surprised that this infrastructure investment is only expected to get 1 out 5 commuters to switch from their current transit mode -- I'd love to see a higher goal of getting people out of their cars, but at the same time, i still vastly prefer the 94 Bus to any MAX train, so i dont even know what I'd choose (insert unrelated rant about poor MAX security and fare enforcement here).</p> <p>*my other major concern about the propose route is the modification at the intersection of Barbur/Capitol Highway/Taylor's Ferry. This is already a horribly confusing, congested and unsafe series of intersections. The southbound on-ramp off of Barbur should really be closed or relocated due to the congestion it causes; there's no safe route to the schools located on the other side of this intersection, and there's no safe place to cross here --- so i was really hoping this intersection would be totally revamped as part of the lightrail project, but instead it sounds like the train is going to get moved closer to Woods Memorial Park. This is SO UNFORTUNATE!!!! Those woods are a sanctuary for those of us who live nearby, and the sound of frequent train service that will cross over the watershed is going to have a significant impact on the recreation and natural values of this park area.</p>	<p>To learn more about the transportation modeling used to project ridership, see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about safety and fare enforcement.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed concerns related to a SW Taylor's Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p>
177	Burns, Don	Hard to decipher the maps but it looks like additional transfers will be added to my commute which only makes it longer. I was hoping 94 would be extended to 7 days, and into the evening. I don't see any personal advantage to these plans. I can't be alone in this. I live near Pacific Hiway and 124th. Commute to SE Waterfront. Routinely travel to Beaverton and Sherwood.	Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project.
178	Burns, Don	I also was hoping that it might be easier to actually get into Tualatin and/or Bridgeport, from the Southern outskirts, without having to first travel South (rush hour only) to Sherwood, or North to Tigard. And from Tualatin to Lake Oswego?	Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for other destinations to be served by the Project.
179	Busch, D	As a long-time user of Trimet bus service on I-5 to downtown (#96), I am very supportive of bringing the Max to Bridgeport. Minority support for an infrequently-visited chain restaurant in the midst of the planned Park and Ride should not affect a project that benefits thousands of transit users. Connections to Oregon City, West Linn, Wilsonville and points south (Salem) need improvement from the hodgepodge system in place currently, and will certainly need attention in terms how riders connect to Max in the future.	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project.</p>
180	Buss, Deni	Rating 3 I travel 68th Ave to Pacific Hwy daily. The street light at 68th and Pacific Hwy is in favor of traffic traveling on Pacific, which leaves an incredibly long line of cars sitting at 68th waiting to turn onto Pacific. With the addition of a Max station just before this intersection, there needs to be some serious consideration of widening 68th to four lanes as well as changing the duration of the street light in favor of traffic leaving 68th in order to reduce the massive congestion already here.	<p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS for more information on the traffic analysis and proposed mitigations.</p> <p>Please reference TriMet's <i>Conceptual Design Report (2020)</i> for illustrations of the Project's potential improvements to access for the 68th Station, including additional description and illustrations of the intersection of SW 68th Parkway and Pacific Highway (99W) (find the Conceptual Design Report at: <a href="https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm">https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm</a>).</p>
181	Byrd, Stephanie	Rating 2 The route could be much improved by providing direct access to OHSU, Hillsdale, and Multnomah Village. As it is, it doesn't provide convenient access to the major commercial centers in between Portland and Tigard. It seems like a waste of money.	Please see Master Response 12 regarding your support for a tunneled route through the OHSU, Hillsdale and Multnomah Village areas.
182	Calcagno, Eva	<p>Parking: Please do not make the mistake of Sunset Transit Center! Overbuild parking to allow growth in capacity. Please add a parking garage at 13th and Barbur to accommodate east-west drivers (from Beav, Hwy and Lake Oswego). I am very concerned about impact on neighborhoods from people trying to park on side streets. It will happen so please mitigate w/ park and ride capacity. L.O. drivers won't go to Barbur Transit Center - they'll continue to drive or stop in neighborhoods. Also please consider the high amount of emergency vehicle traffic North and South on Barbur and Terwilliger. Train traffic will impact emergency response time. Also, address/fix the Ross Island Bridge access so the container truck traffic can access Ross IS. Bridge without using Terwilliger/Barbur intersection (they are going to Holgate train yard)</p> <p>I'm pleased to hear the plan to put L.R. next to the trestle bridges on Barbur - makes sense. Thank you for keeping 2 driving lanes in each direction and adding bike lanes - yeah! My biggest concern was that adding L.R. would reduce capacity on Barbur because it is the only overflow for I-5 on Macadam if there are blockages.</p>	<p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS for more information on park and ride sizes and locations.</p> <p>In terms of potential spillover parking into residential neighborhoods, TriMet will work with local jurisdictions after the Project opens to assess parking impacts and implement parking management policies as required.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.16, Public Services, of this Final EIS regarding emergency response routes and potential impacts on service times.</p> <p>With the related transportation improvement of the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration, container truck traffic traveling north on I-5 would be able to utilize the SW Macadam Avenue exit to access the Ross Island Bridge more directly via the redesigned SW Kelly Avenue and SW Corbett Avenue from the SW Macadam Avenue ramp, instead of utilizing the SW Terwilliger Boulevard exit and accessing the Ross Island Bridge via SW Barbur Boulevard and SW Naito Parkway.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail to the east of SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Refinement 1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 for more details on active transportation improvements included in the Project.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
183	Carlson, Laura	I do not support the SW Corridor line. The usefulness of rail lines is very limited as they are not versatile or flexible systems. The price tag is exorbitant and not a wise investment. As fast as transportation methods are evolving it doesn't make sense to spend so much on a system that may not even be relevant upon completion or fairly soon thereafter. The plan revision in the Capitol Highway/Taylor's Ferry Road area would increase congestion and make that area hazardous.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.  In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylor's Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
184	Carlson, Timothy	I couldn't be happier to see this project moving forward. I would love the ability to avoid traffic and lower carbon emissions by taking a light rail to work (and play). I'm also very pleased to see some of the accompanying proposed upgrades for pedestrians.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support for improved pedestrian infrastructure.
185	Carlton, Brooke	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur..	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
186	Carnell, Katy	Rating 5 Tigard has been needing a fast, efficient, and safe way to get downtown for years now. It's about time commuters are able to get from Tigard to Portland.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
187	Casas, Cynthia	I go to school at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
188	Caster, James	I oppose this light rail project because it's outrageously expensive, and both the construction costs and operating costs will be subsidized by those of us who will never use it, it will slow auto traffic at rail crossings, hundreds of homes and businesses will be demolished, and a large portion of riders will be those who currently ride buses, resulting in very little if any reduction in vehicle travel. A rapid bus system, possibly with dedicated bus lanes, would be far cheaper and infinitely more adaptable than fixed rail. The people of Tigard already voted against this wasteful and intrusive project, and the fact that it's now considered a done deal illustrates that big money and Metro are dictating our future, rather than the will of the people who live here.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.  Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.  Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.  To learn more about the transportation modeling used to project ridership, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.  Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus rapid transit improvements instead of light rail.  The Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project is under the authority of the Federal Transit Administration, Metro and TriMet; the Tigard charter amendments passed with Ballot Measures 34-255 and 34-210 do not apply to these authorities, only to the City of Tigard. Please contact the City of Tigard directly for how the charter amendments are being applied to their involvement in the Project.
189	Castles, Sandra	Are you nuts? Picture this....a truck over turns in the Terwilliger Curves blocking all three southbound lanes. Where does the I-5 traffic go? Nowhere but Barbur Blvd. Now take away 1 southbound lane of Barbur Blvd and tell me how that traffic will move. You will have so many frustrated & angry drivers shooting off onto Terwilliger, up OR Route 10, or perhaps even Parkhill Drive...to say nothing about the drivers that will be trying to turn left from Barbur onto Terwilliger, or that will need to drive all the way up Barbur to Capitol Hwy/Taylor's Ferry Rd to access I-5 Southbound. DUMB! DUMB! DUMB!  Please don't tell me that trucks don't over turn in the curves..in the past 12 months there have been 2 such incidents, both complete blockers, 1 in each direction, and I believe it took 6 hours to clear each wreck. Barbur can't handle the displaced I-5 traffic right now with 2 lanes for each direction. Reduce the lanes to 1 in each direction & keep the same traffic volume and tell me how that will work? Tell me that this is a good idea.  Yes - "more people will ride the max and fewer will drive..." Increase the density of housing, build more apartments, add more people .....I don't believe there will be a serious reduction in the volume of traffic. You have missed the mark on this route.  Sad to say but this is a bad plan.	Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard.
190	Caton, Larry	The route in Segment 2 should be chosen to provide the best access for people living in the area, whether their travel plans include commuting to downtown Portland, Tigard, etc. or getting to businesses in Segment 2. I imagine this would be best achieved by routing on Barbur Blvd. I can see why people would rather have the line run along I-5 for less local disruption, but I think the I-5 alternatives complicate pedestrian access to the trains.  Barbur Blvd is a terrible and dangerous (though the most direct) route to ride into downtown Portland on a bicycle. The final route should include bicycle lanes where the cyclists are separated from automobile traffic. I nearly always rode my bike on Terwilliger Blvd	In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.  Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support for separated bicycle facilities on SW Barbur Boulevard.  Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		to downtown because Barbur Blvd was too dangerous. My son now works downtown and is faced with the same choice. My other son would commute to Tigard. My entire household would use the new MAX line regularly.	
191	Chambers, Charlynn	I would like to know how the business displaced will be compensated. I think that's an important part of the plan that needs to be shared and should effect the outcome	Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and business displacements.
192	Chapel, Tammi	I'm calling about the SW area max train, the possible options for a Tigard / Tualatin area stop - I think it's something that's been a need for this area for a long time. I'm a regular Trimet rider, and I'm in Wilsonville and it takes quite a bit of transfers and wait time to try and get to the Beaverton transit center during the midday because there are very few options that connect to Tigard and Tualatin for those of us that live in this area. Any type of max train coming to this area would be absolutely spectacular we definitely need it.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
193	Chen, Jason	I think that the SW Corridor is a good idea overall that would be helpful for supporting folks who live in this area. I have no strong preference across the different options, but I think whatever minimizes environmental impacts and costs while maximizing convenience is good. I am concerned about the Marquam Hill stop and the walkway, as I am unsure if it would be overly steep due to the elevation gain.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. Please see Master Response 9 regarding the Marquam Hill Connection.
194	Chicarelli, Morgan	I work at NUNM in South Portland and am a regular public transportation user (bus). The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
195	Chisholm, Sarah	The DEIS presents numerous conclusions and mentions specific properties that will be impacted by the project without any supporting documentation or even basic design completion. My home is mentioned specifically, my address 015 SW Bancroft made public, as property #3420, and will be negatively impacted directly by two of the three alternatives. This has impacted my ability to sell my property and the real estate values in our neighborhood have quickly become massively unstable. While my property is mentioned, there are no preliminary drawings or documentation to back that up. This incomplete report cannot be left out in the public for two years before the bond measure even hits the ballot without terrible consequences to home and business owners along the Barbur corridor. Metro Council needs to take this impact seriously. This pocket of homeowners purchased homes within 2 miles of downtown Portland because we value public transportation as well as walking and biking to town. This plan will certainly create havoc getting to the Homestead area sandwiched between Hamilton, Terwilliger and Barbur because it is already difficult to get in and out of the neighborhood and the options have not adequately documented how cars will be managed on Barbur once the max line is built. I must ask the question; Is Metro Council punishing urban homeowners for the benefit of the suburbanites? So folks can take public transit to Bridgeport Village Lifestyle Center rather than our own Portland Downtown?	Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions. The Preferred Alternative as studied in the Final EIS removes vehicular access to the Homestead neighborhood from SW Bancroft Street (a new stairwell and ramps would maintain non-automotive access at this location). Remaining access points from SW Barbur Boulevard (SW Condor Avenue, SW Lane Street, SW Hamilton Street and SW View Point Terrace) would be maintained, as would existing stair access at SW Lowell Street.
196	Christensen, Brian	Good evening. I'm a resident of Summerfield in Tigard, and I just had a few concerns that's already been discussed very well by others that are more verbal than I am. Anyway, I'm just concerned about a few of these things such as this four years of construction on Barbur Boulevard along with the rest of the project. And this is at the same time that I-5 is considering being a tow road, and Barbur is a nice option. So I was wondering if that is going to be coordinated and not happen at the same time.  And I'm concerned about the over-projection of the use of it also. The whole system -- the existing system is not being used as they say it would have been used. It costs more money than they say it would. I don't have all the facts, it's already been discussed, but my concern, too, is a maintenance facility in Tigard that's supposed to maintain and take care of 42 to 60 train vehicles. That's going to take a lot of traffic for the employees, and it's going to increase traffic in Tigard and that area, which is already increasing. So the woman earlier talked about how this would be more traffic because of this system, and I think she may be right. You should look into that. The last thing was the Park & Ride at Bridgeport terminal, it seems like it's going to increase an already terrible intersection to try and get on that freeway or to get through that area, and to bring 950 parking spots at the end of the train terminal and a four-story building. That just seems like it's going to be a nightmare. t's all I have to say. Thank you.	To learn more about mitigation for short-term transportation impacts, access to the Hunziker O&M Facility and impacts to congestion at Bridgeport Village, please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS.  The I-5 congestion pricing project was developed subsequent to the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project. It is that project's responsibility to consider earlier projects, including the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project, in its analysis.  To learn more about the transportation modeling used to project ridership, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.  Please see Section 5.3, Cost and Funding Evaluation, of this Final EIS for more information related to costs and funding of the Project.
197	Christensen, Katherine	Hello, I attached Marianne Fitzgerald's DEIS testimony because I agree 100% with everything she has written. We live in next door neighborhoods along Barbur - mine being Multnomah and we are our Neighborhood Associations' Transportation chairs. Marianne has much more experience and she writes very clearly what our 2 neighborhoods' concerns are for the Southwest LRT design and implementation. Being a bike commuter with frequent trips to downtown Portland, I cannot believe we are forced to use such a dangerous route. Barbur is the only route for most of us and nightmare for all forms of transportation. Adding a poorly implemented light rail will make this even worse for all. I frequently travel thru Milwaukie and the light rail crossings are to be avoided at all cost! Luckily there are alternatives there. Barbur is our only alternative other than I5 and that is very inconvenient or unavailable for our shorter trips thru SW Portland. Having the LRT crossing Barbur will add long stops and delay our travels no matter which method we choose. Bike commuting across tracks especially as they move diagonally across our path is dangerous and causes frequent crashes with likely severe consequences to commuters. I believe a poorly implemented LRT will eliminate SW Portland North/South bike commuting as it will just be too dangerous. As Marianne stated, we have waited long enough for a safe way to get through SW Portland and it has been delayed forever with the promise to come with the LRT.	Please see the response to Comment I170 (from Marianne Fitzgerald) for a detailed response to the issues raised in that comment.  Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support for improved bicycle facilities on SW Barbur Boulevard.  Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I98	Christian, Robert	I'm all for more Public Transportation! YES for the South West Corridor Plan! Cars are the predominant problem in every city, especially Portland, OR More pedestrian and bike paths, too! Make a Green Loop chain all over Portland!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support for improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
I99	Christiansen, Kara	I work at The National University of Natural Medicine, in Southwest Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur and a designated crosswalk at the off-ramp of the West-bound Ross Island bridge, as there is no safe pedestrian or bicycle path from the westbound traffic to NUNM. Most importantly, I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur..	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I100	Christoffersson, Rea	Greetings:  I have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Southwest Corridor light rail project, and am writing to strongly suggest one change: Please relocate the Bridgeport Station and adjacent bus bays to a place that would preserve the Tualatin Village Inn restaurant and its parking area. This Village Inn (VI) is no ordinary restaurant-it is a local treasure. Demolishing it would make its many regular customers very sad and angry. Why? VI serves three meals daily at reasonable prices, and is the only place nearby where people of modest means can get a healthful, sit-down meal served by a friendly, capable team. With a four-item branch available for under \$10, VI provides a welcome meal out for many who could not otherwise afford it. Senior citizens, the disabled, minorities, and young families-as well as local travelers and tourists passing through on 1-5-all enjoy the food, service and ambiance at the VI. My husband and I have eaten here for 13 years, yet we are still newcomers compared to many VI customers. In designing a MAX route, it is not enough to protect the existing homes and jobs of minority and low-income populations-you must also save firms like the VI that serve these people.  This restaurant has been in the same family for three generations, and has been operating for over 40 years. This VI was founded in 1977 by Bob Baily just a stone's throw from its present location. It's been handed down through the family and is now a rare woman-owned firm, run by a mother-and-son team. Many Village Inn staff members have worked there for a decade or more, demonstrating incredible loyalty, given the normal high staff turnover in the restaurant business. The owners manage their staff well and treat them with care and respect; their team passes this good treatment along to their customers.  There are other possible station locations. The Village Inn is surrounded by big-box chains-DSW Shoes; Bed, Bath, and Beyond; and Crate and Barrel, to name a few. Such stores come and go-one bad year and they could move on, so locals don't accord them the same esteem as the VI. Why not choose one of these alternate locations for the Bridgeport MAX Station? At best, many people in this area are skeptical about the benefits of mass transit, so sensitive public relations are essential. Some denigrate MAX vehicles as ""toy trains."" I don't agree-I believe light rail serves a real public good. But when government agencies plan to demolish a family business beloved by local citizens in order to expand mass transit, people wonder why. Is it because a small family concern might not have the resources to fight off demolition? While this may not be the actual reason behind plans to demolish the VI, to many people it certainly looks that way. It simply doesn't pass the smell test.  If you want strong community support for the Southwest Corridor and future projects, you would be wise to choose a different location for the Bridgeport MAX Station. We love our Village Inn!	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
I101	Christoffersson, Rea	This is the message that bounced back to me. I obtained this erroneous e-mail address from the www.swcorridorplan.org website about the beginning of June. It was part of the "How to Participate: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)" article on the site, dated Spring 2018. It appears the word "plan" has been omitted from the current e-mail address.  Obviously, changing the e-mail address during the public comment period caused serious problems; the comment period is very short, at best. Such a snafu may also make some skeptical people think Metro is deliberately trying to suppress public comments. To me, it looks as if you're doing a good job, but that your technological support could be improved.  I hope this gets through to you on both the new public comment address and your personal address.	Please see Master Response 13 regarding the Draft EIS public involvement process.
I102	Clapp, David	Regarding the Village Inn dilemma, the last time our family ate at the Village Inn, it was to join my mother, to enjoy a meal, where my parents loved to have breakfast, after church service. So we went, taking mom on a Father's Day, dad having passed, many years ago, and the meal, Was so bad, my wife and I refer to a bad meal, as the Village Inn treatment, as I went to pay the bill, the manager was at the register, there was no interaction, regarding the meal, no eye contact, and no, thanks, for enduring, the bad food. So we will not be back to the Village Inn, but remember mom and dad's memories there.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding the Village Inn property.
I103	Clark, Jesse	Rating 5	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		better transit options and reduced vehicle traffic	
I104	Clark, Michael	My main concern is accessibility. Currently parking availability is inadequate at the Tigard Transit Center and the MAX line will only increase demand further. Traffic bottlenecks on 99W make it difficult during rush hour to navigate through downtown Tigard/Tigard Triangle and reach Tigard Park & Ride; much less other potential park and rides planned for this area. Bus service is very limited in most Tigard neighborhoods; the closest bus stop is over a mile from my home and does not go to the Tigard Transit Center. The only option is for me to drive to a transit station and hope I can find parking. What is being done to address these accessibility issues?	Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and locations. Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project. Please see Master Response 11 regarding your desire for roadway improvements.
I105	Cohen, Bill	Appreciate your talk at Tualatin Aging Task Force. My main comment is to applaud the changes to avoid Beveland and not cross Hall twice. I really don't have a beef about Village Inn (never eat there) except to see potential harm to a locally-owned business. PS I am in an encore career after 25 years with ODOT/DMV, much of it commuting via carpool to Lana Ave. I was a policy analyst/compliance inspector re CDL Third Party Testing for the last 13+ years until retiring last year.	In your comment, you expressed support for the Elmhurst Alignment and the Tigard Transit Center Station East of Hall, which were studied as Refinement 5 and Refinement 6 in the Draft EIS, and which span both Segment B and Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin). Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
I106	Cohen, Samantha	This MAX Line will be absolutely vital as the metro area expands. Given that Tualatin and Tigard pretty much rely on I-5 and Hwy 99 to commute into the Portland Area, this will greatly reduce traffic. Plus, as a commuter myself, I would consider relocating into SW Portland if there were a MAX line. I find it very attractive to be close to transit.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I107	Conley, Kimberly	Rating 1 I absolutely do not want the Max going down the middle of Barbur from downtown Portland to Barbur transit. The hundreds of property acquisitions will be a terrible thing for surrounding neighborhoods. Many businesses we are patrons of will be forced out and also people will lose their homes. The Max should definitely travel along side I-5 the entire route. The plan states they chose the proposed route for several reasons, one being "minimizing impacts to housing and businesses, as much as possible" which is the opposite of what will happen if it runs down the middle of Barbur instead of along I-5 like it should. Not to mention the years of construction and the massive traffic backups that will cause on Barbur. A Max from Portland to Vancouver is needed more than this project in my opinion with regards to I-5 traffic problems.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B. Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions. Please see Master Response 15 regarding your support for an extended I-5 alignment. To learn more about mitigation for short-term transportation impacts, please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS. Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for a MAX line from Portland to Vancouver instead of the Project.
I108	Connelly, Jim	I do not believe this is a great use of taxpayer money, nor does it alleviate the current issue of congestion in a timely manner. This route continues the stereotype of Tri-Met's lack of foresight to serve the greatest number of passengers. The route does not capitalize on a direct and quick trip from origin to destination, thus resulting in increased costs and a limited impact on reducing congestion. Much of the new construction in the area is occurring much further down 99W towards Bull Mountain and outside the capture area for this new line. If this project is supposed to relieve congestion, how does ending in Bridgeport meet this objective. This has not been clearly communicated to the public. Additionally, the money spent on this new Max line would be better spent on rapid bus service that you see in cities like Seattle. Rapid bus service can fill in the areas where the Max line does not reasonably service or where the "cost" in time to drive to a Max station does not provide enough benefit as compared with driving directly into downtown Portland. Lastly, rapid bus service can be adjusted based on a changing economy, however a Max line is permanent and cannot change to meet the demands of an evolving economy and population.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Reducing congestion is not one of the goals of the Project; instead, the Project seeks to expand mobility options and improve transit travel time and reliability for travel between Tualatin, Tigard and Portland. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis. Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus rapid transit improvements instead of light rail.
I109	Considine, Marilynn	I work at NUNM and the Barbur/Naito alignment in South Portland--not to mention the traffic congestion caused by the Ross Island Bridge--has occupied a good deal of my professional attention in the past several years. NUNM has long supported the Naito Parkway alignment option for light rail. However, given our understanding of the difficulties of designing a light rail solution on Naito Parkway, today I am supporting the recommendation of the DEIS for the Barbur Boulevard alignment --WITH THE CAVEAT that the Ross Island Bridgehead project be approved as a companion project for South Portland and included as a part of Metro's 2020 regional funding measures for the SW Corridor regional transportation projects.  Improvements on Naito and the Bridgehead have been needed for many years and the Bridgehead reconfiguration offers a singular opportunity to fix longstanding traffic problems in our area. These improvements address the safety issues that have long posed dangers to those accessing our campus. The proposed improvements will also finally knit the Lair Hill community together again, which has been sadly bifurcated since Naito was constructed in the forties. The traffic in South Portland affects the entire region. Without these improvements, the SW Corridor may suffer as traffic on Naito and the Bridgehead will continue to worsen with many more people anticipated to move into the area.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I110	Cook, Tricia	Rating 1 Not needed. Very expensive to bring more problems to this area, police costs, safety for riders and homeowners. Way to bring more expense to homeowners and create unsafe conditions for those adjacent properties.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime and safety.
I111	Corcoran, Dan	As the metro area expands rapidly, we can envision a need for light rail expansion far beyond its existing footprint. However, we cannot be so short sided to think that we will not ALSO need the roads on which the proposed plan would take over. Replacing lanes on Barbur Blvd with rails is short sided. If even 20% of commuters rode the new line, you are forcing 80% into half the space. Instead think long term when making an investment of \$216+ Million Dollars per mile. Open up capacity on existing infrastructure and	Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard. To learn more about transit travel time and reliability, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		investments by placing the line off the roadway. Also, please reduce the number of stops to very few. Use buses to collect riders to transit centers. Use large park and ride locations for people to leave their cars behind. Then get them to their destination quickly! (Like 15 minutes instead of the 30+ projected). On the worst traffic day imaginable it may take 30 minutes to go from Bridgeport to Downtown. So 90% of the time a car is a faster way to commute. This is the same along 84, along 205 and along 26. Buses could do the job that the Max is doing (and significantly cheaper). Drastically reduce the number of stops so the train can actually be a Metro Area Express. Leave the small stops and local routes to buses and street cars. It will add cost, but doing a transit project well, with the future in mind, is of far greater value to the public across all modes of transportation.	Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail.
I112	Cortes, Karen	The Southwest corridor would go a long way in making the commute to Tigard/Tualatin easier. The current bus options are few, and poorly located. If not light rail something needs to be done to improve public transit in the area. Within Beaverton I can get anywhere within an hour, but to Tualatin that time doubles, it can be better. Hope the project starts soon	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I113	Costa, Rachel	I absolutely love and appreciate the SW Corridor plan, and I'm so saddened by the vitriolic ignorant comments I've heard from some people regarding it. I live in Tigard and I hate that in order to take a MAX downtown or get home using the MAX, I have to drive or bus up to Beaverton, and I usually end up grabbing groceries or running errands while I'm there. I'd love to be able to have that opportunity and use my dollars in Tigard to help support businesses where I actually live!  I also very much appreciate the other improvements going along with the light rail line, they're needed in order to make Tigard and the surrounding areas a more walkable, bikeable, livable city. Adding road lanes is an expensive bandaid for future growth because of the nature of induced demand, and I wish more people in the city and elsewhere would understand this.  I can't make it to the committee meetings and presentations (usually because of the very traffic the SW Corridor plan will be implemented to help alleviate) so I hope this comment is helpful!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support of bicycle and pedestrian improvements as part of the Project.
I114	Costarella, Derek	Rating 3 Just run it along I-5 already!	In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
I115	Cox, Steve	I've seen the plan and even traveled most of the proposed route along Barbur into Tigard. While I'm not thrilled with the density along Barber, particularly near the Transit center I understand it is necessary to maintain the urban growth boundary. I only ask that please consider the impact on the urban canopy and take into consideration the trees and the long-term impact the project can have on the environment. I strongly urge you to leave plenty of wide spaces and plant- strong, long lived trees that can soften the ever-growing concrete and steel landscape that is replacing the outer Portland neighborhoods. Particularly as the route heads into Tigard there are some large Douglas Fir trees and one beautiful Sitka Spruce on the south side of Barbur across from Buster's BBQ that must be 80-100 yrs old.  As you drive through SW Portland it is the green hills that make the area beautiful. As Portland is experiencing the current building boom- everywhere people are building to the maximum lot line and planting with small trees that will never begin to replace larger trees that help define the landscape and provide habitat. While bioswales are fine here and there nothing can replace small plots of earth with substantial trees such as an oak, sequoia, firs and others that can soar to 70 feet or more. Please consider allowing generous strips for trees along the route and saving older trees whenever possible.	In all three segments, the Preferred Alternative alignment and related transportation improvements would traverse areas of forest that are governed by local tree codes. All three cities within the study area regulate tree removal based on size (measured in diameter at breast height, or DBH), location and condition, and prescribe specific mitigation options for tree removal.
I116	Crail, Doreen	1) very concerned with option to run Max right by Woods Park 2) I didn't see where the horrible intersection is addressed -Taylor and Capitol, right before Capitol Barbur/I5 3) was surprised that so many businesses might be impacted. We want to make Barbur better not worse by reducing business options. I realize it was worse case. Hope no negative impact for Barbur World Foods - this store is a very important part of the neighborhood. 4) I don't have much specific route feedback other than stating that options which encourage walking to a station and walkability along Barbur are preferred. 5) Happy to see there won't be traffic lane reduction on Barbur. I expect traffic there will still have net increase, especially if I5 tolls happen.	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.  Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and business displacements.  Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian improvements and walkability.  Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard.  To learn more about the traffic analysis, please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS.  The I-5 congestion pricing project was developed subsequent to the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project. It is that project's responsibility to consider earlier projects, including the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project, in its analysis.
I117	Crane, Jonathan	How does this benefit Tualatin? With Tualatin roads already in gridlock, how will local people in Tualatin get to Bridgeport without adding further traffic burdens to roads that already seem tapped out? Also like to see more info on the basic fixes that must be in mind to address exit 290 interchanges before taking on a project of this magnitude.	Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.
I118	Creamer, Brian	You need to look for a better way to get the train from twilliger to I-5 in Tigard both options give at Multnomah Neighbor meeting do not work suggests going underground so you do not have to fit the hill or just trash the project	Please see Master Response 12 regarding your support for a tunneled route through the PCC-Sylvania area.
I119	Creamer, Brian	quite wasting money on light rail and 10,000 bus and hire more driver will serve more people then the light rail will. and cost lot less.	Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I120	Crespo, Shelby	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for the light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I121	Cromley, Margaret	Rating 1 Massively expensive an obsolete before completion. The population density is too low in SW and the route is downtown Portland-centric. How about a Max line that takes people from SW to Hillsboro or some other jobs center?	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. An alignment connecting Tigard to Hillsboro with light rail was not considered for this project because such an alignment would not meet the purpose and need of the project. That alignment would also fail to support existing land use and transportation plans, including the Southwest Corridor Land Use Vision, the Southwest Corridor Plan, and the Barbur Concept Plan. More information about the process by which the Preferred Alternative was identified can be found in Appendix I – Project Background and Alternatives Considered of this Final EIS.
I122	Cronin, Bruce	Build it.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I123	Curtis, Shannon	I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I124	Czech, Christopher	Hello. We are recent arrivals to the Tigard Greenburg neighborhood and first-time home owners. I currently rely from time to time on the TriMet, and my partner relies extensively on it. My biggest comment is that I feel it is CRITICAL that a MAX station be located in Downtown Tigard. It would be great if there was a bicycle storage station there as well, as I expect you would see many people in the surrounding neighborhoods bicycle commuting to the Max station and then into the city. With I-5 and 99W being so much of a travel nightmare (and getting worse), this would be a great option for many. I am looking forward to being able to directly connect to the Portland Airport via the MAX in the future. I know this is a reach, but I would also LOVE to see the WES converted over to a more regular MAX line. I've always wondered why this connection was left partial, and I would finally be able to commute to work via public transit in a timely manner, as I am currently at Nike WHQ. As an avid runner and frequent pedestrian, I am hopeful that these transit projects will enhance pedestrian safety and park-trail connectivity to and through the downtown area. (I was disappointed to see the Greenburg project didn't add a sidewalk along Tiedeman at Greenburg to help to safely connect us to the trail just across the WES track. This is a frequent safety concern of mine.) I expect local business owners will also appreciate the connectivity enhancement both in terms of public and pedestrian transit. The downtown revitalization efforts look and feel great, and I know we would both like to patronize local businesses more easily without having to drive all the time.	The Preferred Alternative includes a station at SW Hall Boulevard in downtown Tigard. Bicycle parking and amenities will be provided at station areas to meet the requirements of each jurisdiction. TriMet is working to understand the unique access needs at each station as well as the projected use in order to provide an appropriate amount of bicycle parking. Where feasible, TriMet is also looking for opportunities to incorporate bicycle share programs at stations. Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. Please see Master Response 10 regarding your interest in WES Commuter Rail improvements. Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support of better pedestrian safety and connectivity in downtown Tigard.
I125	Daly, Kathryn	I am the Southwest Neighborhood Transportation Committee representative for Arnold Creek Neighborhood Association and serve as a Co-President of the Arnold Creek NA. The Arnold Creek Neighborhood is one of the many neighborhoods within Southwest Portland which will be impacted by this proposed project. Our neighborhood will be most greatly impacted by the Initial Route Proposal at the intersection of SW Barbur Boulevard, Capitol Highway and Taylors Ferry Road, commonly known as "West Portland Crossroads" (Crossroads). I had been in favor of the SW Corridor Light Rail Transit Plan until the most recent Initial Route Proposal which affects the livability within our residential neighborhood and the accessibility to surrounding communities. Please consider my comments on the future alignment of the SW Corridor Plan. SUPPORT for Alternative B1 (Center Barbur) with Reconstruction of the Intersection of SW Barbur and SW Capitol Highway. Nearly 60 years ago, a decision was made to reduce the number of I-5 southbound on-ramps originally designed for the then-new I-5 freeway. In retrospect, this decision was short-sighted and has created the severe traffic congestion that residents of southwest Portland have endured for decades and live with today. This on-ramp at the Crossroads, exit 295, is the first access to I-5 southbound from the downtown Portland area, a span of 8 miles. The existing Crossroads infrastructure was constructed in 1959 and is not likely to survive a far milder earthquake than the predicted Cascadia subduction earthquake. Both I-5 the north and the southbound on-ramps are deficient from federal transportation standards and the severe traffic issues and safety concerns on SW Barbur, Taylors Ferry and Capitol Highway are due in part to the PCC Sylvania campus development and its success, and due to the growing population and residential development. Addressing the outdated and insufficient infrastructure at the Crossroads is long overdue.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), and support for rebuilding the intersection at SW Barbur Boulevard and SW Capitol Highway (the "Crossroads intersection"), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS; opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near Barbur Transit Center, which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS; and support for the Barbur Undercrossing alignment, which was studied as Refinement 4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B, including information regarding the Crossroads intersection. Regarding your comments about traffic analysis, in 2013–2014, the Southwest Corridor Plan underwent a "Refinement" phase that included analysis of key intersections in the corridor, including the intersections in the Crossroads area. The purpose of the Refinement phase was to learn more about the potential impacts of the conceptual high capacity transit options. All seven intersections of the Crossroads were modeled in that analysis, with metrics reported for the critical intersections. The findings of that analysis were used to inform the scoping and study area definition of the EIS, which includes five of the seven intersections. The intersections of SW Huber Street with SW Capitol Highway and the northbound I-5 on-ramp are not included as study intersections in the EIS traffic analysis, because they are not expected to have adverse effects based on the previous analysis. The I-5 congestion pricing project was developed subsequent to the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project. It is that project's responsibility to consider earlier projects, including the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project, in its analysis.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>To address the pressing issues related to this intersection, area residents renamed West Portland Town Center the "West Portland Crossroads" to reflect those issues that inhibit the Town Center from realizing its potential as a neighborhood commercial center. The Barbur Concept Plan vision for the Crossroads focus area is that the congested intersections of the Crossroads are redesigned to improve traffic flow, but also with improved pedestrian and bicycle safety. The Barbur Concept Plan notes there is no way to solve the transportation circulation in the Crossroads one intersection at a time. In 2015, ODOT's Barbur Road Safety Audit recommended a long list of improvements needed at one of the least safe intersections in the City of Portland (Vision Zero). One of the long-term recommendations is the need for an intersection/interchange preliminary design study to identify future needs at this location and identify property impacts. Both studies indicated a need to evaluate and rectify unsafe conditions. ODOT has instead decided to implement a near-term "jughandle" solution that reroutes traffic from Barbur onto local streets in an attempt to shift the unsafe conditions to the SW Taylors Ferry and SW Capitol Highway intersection. There was a recent pedestrian fatality at SW Barbur and Capitol Highway, and I was directly impacted when an automobile "t-boned" my car at SW Capitol and Taylors Ferry intersection in 2016. Because of these many complex transportation issues within Crossroads, the DEIS motor vehicle traffic analyses in Chapter 3 is deficient and must study ALL seven intersections to assess traffic impacts in the Crossroads and make the long-term investments needed for the safety of all people traveling through this intersection.</p> <p>The DEIS Segment B Intersection Analysis on page 3-19 states "There are four intersections - where the No-Build Alternative would not meet operating targets and light rail alternatives would worsen the operations." The SW Taylors Ferry Road and I-5 southbound off-ramp is one of these four intersections identified in the DEIS. The Initial Route Proposal with the deviation from center-Barbur at the Crossroads, appears to be a deliberate effort to AVOID addressing the long-standing issues with the Crossroads and if implemented, will make the remediation of existing problems unlikely. Without the requisite analysis of all seven intersections and the traffic impacts on the surrounding communities, a selection of the Initial Route Proposal is short-sighted at best, and irresponsible at worst.</p> <p>In addition, alignment B1 offers a full minute less travel time (Table 5.2-2), better supports the Barbur Concept Plan and redevelopment within the Crossroads, and would create a safe overcrossing for motor vehicles, light rail and people in the event of an earthquake and weather-related conditions. Please reconsider the Initial Route Proposal and adopt Alignment B1 as the Locally Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>I request that Metro and its partners make the much-needed, long overdue and complex changes to the many intersections of Barbur Blvd, I-5, SW Capitol Highway, SW Taylors Ferry and SW Huber to make it safer for all; motor vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists, transit and freight, who travel through the West Portland Crossroads. After serving on the Board of Directors of DKS and working with Perteet, Parametrix, David Evans and other regional transportation engineering firms, I know the depth of analysis the FTA can provide to these regional projects. I encourage the Southwest Corridor Plan Steering Committee to avail themselves of this expertise.</p> <p>NO SUPPORT for Refinement 2, Taylors Ferry Road due to the following concerns. If Refinement 2 is selected in Metro's SWC Locally Preferred Alternative, an in-depth discussion of these concerns with residents and businesses should be held during the next phase of the project.</p> <p>Traffic: Traffic congestion in our neighborhood near SW Taylors Ferry Road and SW Capitol Highway occurs between 7 AM and 7 PM. The I-5 on and off-ramps are congested during commute hours and worsens when Portland Community College's Sylvania campus is in session. While it is unsafe to walk or bicycle through this area, freight and automobiles exiting at #295 are backed up onto the freeway, waiting to clear the many Crossroads' intersections. The proposed at-grade crossing through the SW Taylors Ferry and SW Capitol Highway intersection will make traffic and safety conditions worse. The traffic analysis in Chapter 3 studied only one intersection (Taylors Ferry at the I-5 off-ramp) and not all seven intersections as noted above.</p> <p>The Taylors Ferry Road Vision Plan adopted by Portland City Council in 2004 recommends removal of I-5 exit ramp and numerous changes to this area, as does the 2015 ODOT Barbur Road Safety Audit. The proposed mitigations - a traffic signal, a motor vehicle "storage lane" and a marked crosswalk - are not sufficient to alleviate our traffic congestion and safety concerns. The DEIS must also consider the current effort to implement Congestion Pricing on I-5 between SW Multnomah Blvd and downtown Portland and the additional motor vehicle traffic this will add to SW Taylors Ferry Road, SW Capitol Highway, SW Barbur Blvd. and other nearby roadways.</p> <p>ODOT jughandle project: ODOT has funded but not provided detailed information to our neighborhood on their proposal to eliminate the left turn from northbound SW Capitol Highway to I-5 southbound other than the 2015 Barbur Road Safety Audit description (Page E-6, key assumptions). My objection to this "jughandle" proposal is that it will add more motor vehicle traffic to many neighborhood roadways at multiple intersections without adding needed safety improvements for all people traveling through the Crossroads. I concur with other neighborhoods that also rely upon this on-ramp and recommend adding a left-turn signal where northbound SW Capitol Highway enters the I-5 southbound ramp a much simpler solution to ODOT's safety concerns at SW Barbur and SW Capitol Highway.</p> <p>Safe Walking and Biking Needs: While more critical to residents in Multnomah, Maplewood, Crestwood and Ash Creek, there is a narrow path next to the eastbound travel lane on SW Taylors Ferry Road that was constructed as a bike path in the 1980s which is</p>	<p>Construction of the Project would not include modifications to vehicular movements at the intersection of SW Barbur Boulevard and SW Capitol Highway, such as a left-turn signal from northbound SW Barbur Boulevard to SW Barbur Boulevard and I-5 South. However, a separate ODOT project is being advanced in coordination with the Southwest Corridor. That ODOT project would modify the Crossroads intersection area to direct traffic from northbound SW Capitol Highway to turn right at SW Taylors Ferry Road, then turn right again onto SW Barbur Boulevard to head south or to access I-5 South. ODOT considered adding a left-turn signal from northbound SW Capitol Highway to SW Barbur Boulevard and I-5 South instead; however, the traffic analysis for this scenario showed a substantial increase in congestion on streets surrounding this intersection.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis, including traffic analysis related to park and rides.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle mobility and station access improvements.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding property acquisitions and business displacements.</p> <p>Regarding your concerns about impacts to Woods Creek and Woods Memorial Natural Area (Woods Park), please see Section 4.7, Parks and Recreation Resources; Section 4.9, Ecosystems; and Section 4.10, Water Resources, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project.</p> <p>Please reference TriMet's Conceptual Design Report for illustrations of the Project's potential improvements to access for the 68th Station, and additional description and illustrations of the undercrossing approaching the 68th Station (find the Conceptual Design Report at: <a href="https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm">https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm</a>).</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>used by Arnold Creek hikers wishing to enjoy the natural beauty and recreational facilities of Woods Creek and Gabriel Park. This narrow path is constrained where it crosses Woods Creek and unsafe for pedestrians and bicyclists trying to access the transit service and facilities in West Portland Crossroads. SW Taylors Ferry Road needs to be transformed into safer access between neighborhoods and the Barbur Transit Center. Project SA-16, Taylors Ferry Sidewalks and Bikeway, must be constructed concurrently with the light rail project to allow people to safely walk and bike through this intersection. Refinement 2 includes additional "storage lanes" and retaining walls and sound walls that will make it more complex and expensive to add pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the future. If Refinement 2 moves forward, Project SA-16 must be included as part of the SW Corridor Project Plan and not an optional project that would be assumed to be constructed sometime between now and 2035. If Refinement 2 moves forward, the light rail structure over I-5 must also include bicycle and pedestrian facilities that allow people to cross I-5 more safely than the current conditions on SW Capitol at Barbur.</p> <p>Property Displacement Impacts: Arnold Creek has two proximate commercial areas - Crossroads Town Center and Mt. Park Town Center. I am concerned about negative impacts to Barbur World Foods, a very popular grocery destination for many of Arnold Creek residents and the anchor of the Crossroads Town Center's success and to Walgreens, the closest pharmacy to Arnold Creek. The DEIS does not discuss how the alignment would affect access to Barbur World Foods and Walgreens. The DEIS Appendix F does not differentiate whether properties would be partially or fully impacted by the proposal and the Refinement maps don't illustrate the detail of the proposal. Without supporting detail and analysis, I am concerned how this refinement affects access to an important commercial area for our neighborhood.</p> <p>Environmental Concerns: The proposed location of the Taylors Ferry alignment is at the headwaters of Woods Creek. While Arnold Creek is located within the Tryon Creek Watershed, I have concerns about existing stormwater issues within the nearby neighborhoods and water quality impacts that would be affected by this proposal. Woods Creek and Woods Park are not discussed in Chapter 4 and only briefly mentioned in Refinement 2. The impacts on the Woods Creek watershed and Woods Memorial Park must be addressed in the SW Corridor Plan.</p> <p>Park and Rides: While Arnold Creek has several neighborhood exit routes; SW Huber, SW Pomona, SW Capitol, SW Barbur, SW Boones Ferry Road, and SW Taylors Ferry, all but Boones Ferry Road will be impacted by this project. The IRP proposes to add 1775 parking spaces at the two park and rides near Arnold Creek (825 at Barbur Transit Center and 950 at SW 53rd). This additional motor vehicle traffic driving through our neighborhood to access the park and ride stations will compromise livability and safety in our neighborhood. Station Access Projects need to be constructed at the same time as light rail construction to make it safer to travel through our neighborhood by foot, bike, car or transit. The motor vehicle analyses and mitigations in Chapter 3 only discuss intersections directly at the entrance to the park and rides and should address the safety on the roadways that access these park and ride stations.</p> <p>Bus Transit Service: Arnold Creek has very limited access to bus transit services with two lines near our neighborhood boundaries - #38 along Boones Ferry Road and #43 at SW 35th and Huber. Our residents can elect to walk to the Barbur Transit station, but bicycle access necessitates traveling at the Crossroads which has unsafe crossing for pedestrians and bicyclists. The DEIS does not discuss what would happen to bus #43 which travels along SW Taylors Ferry Road. Over the last 20 years, TriMet has reduced service by the #43 and eliminated direct service to the Barbur Transit Center which resulted in lower transit ridership and increased motor vehicle traffic accessing the park and ride. The SW Corridor Plan should enhance transit service along SW Taylors Ferry Road and directly connect #43 with the Barbur Transit Center station and add weekend transit service. This is especially important because TriMet's Service Enhancement Plan calls for bus #43 to cross the Sellwood Bridge to connect with the Orange Line rather than traveling to downtown Portland, making it essential that #43 riders directly connect with transit service to downtown Portland and Tigard at the Barbur Transit Center station.</p> <p>SUPPORT of Refinement 4, Barbur Undercrossing, with reservation.</p> <p>In summary, I support the concept of Light Rail Transit on Barbur Boulevard but do not support some of the cost-cutting refinements that lack long-term vision for our region.</p> <p>The existing bridges at SW Barbur/SW Capitol Highway Crossroads and the Barbur I-5 Overcrossing between SW 60th and SW 64th were substandard when they were built in 1959 and 1985, respectively, lack safe pedestrian and bicycle facilities and are highly likely to be destroyed in an earthquake. The Initial Route Proposal lacks the vision to support projected growth in our region by avoiding needed pedestrian and bicycle improvements to access transit. The Proposed Refinements 2 and 4, if they are selected for further study, must include pedestrian and bicycle facilities on the light rail structures to enable people to walk and bike safely to the light rail stations and other services in our neighborhood.</p> <p>Please SUPPORT Alternative B1, Center Barbur and REJECT Refinement 2 Taylors Ferry to design the SW Corridor project in a way that anticipates long-term growth in our region and safety of everyone who travels through our neighborhoods.</p>	
1126	Dangaran, Ryan	<p>Rating 2</p> <p>I do not understand how this plan could leave out the majority of Tualatin. Most of the city of Tualatin will still have to drive to even get to a stop which in my mind defeats the point of transit access. Tualatin needs to learn to advocate for itself; really disappointed in</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the alignment further into Tualatin.</p> <p>To learn more about transit travel time and reliability, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		city leadership. The amount of Tigard stops also will slow down the commute significantly. Wish there was one less stop in Tigard and that the line would extend further into Tualatin.	
I127	Darling, Stacey	This plan would completely destroy downtown Tigard. The WES already travels through this area and the number of riders is minimal. Why would this be any different? Don't ruin the sweet spots left in suburbia with mass transit that no one will use.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.
I128	Davis, Mike and Jeanne	This is an historic building built in 1939 and purchased by my family 1958. The B1 route on Barbur blvd would render our building useless, it would remove all parking. We prefer using the B4 Alternative route.	The building referenced in this comment (at 8525 SW Barbur Boulevard) was evaluated by the cultural resources team, FTA and the State Historic Preservation Office, and the finding was that the building would not be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.  Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.  In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
I129	Dawson, Rachel	So during my testimony, I'll be referring to these graphs that are being passed down the line currently. So just briefly, I'll introduce myself before you receive those graphs. My name is Rachel Dawson. I'm a resident of West Linn. Now, I had some concerns regarding the Southwest Corridor DEIS, specifically in regards to projections concerning the ridership as well as capital costs. Now, the first graph that I'm going to be referring to is average fiscal year weekday boarding rides, and I've included the 2035 DEIS prediction so you can compare what is happening now, what has happened in the past, and what is being predicted in the future. And notice that I included the year 2018, but that's fiscal year to date in May Notice between the years 2000 and 2018, a span of 18 years, ridership has increased by around 85 percent, with the inclusion of four light rail rides. However, between 2018 and 2035, a span of 17 years, this is a shorter span with the inclusion of one light rail ride. The DEIS predicts that boardings on light rail will increase by 174 percent. Now, given that boardings have been decreasing since 2012, these predictions seem implausible to me in the DEIS currently.  Now, additionally, historically, light rail project capital costs, as well as other capital costs, such as WES, have been underestimated, meaning that the predicted costs in the SDI's, DEIS's and FDIS's have been lower than what the actual capital cost has been. And I have noted this in the second graph there. You'll see it includes the blue line, the green line, WES, and the orange line, and at the end included the southwest corridor line. Now, in 2016, the cost of the southwest corridor line was predicted to be \$1.8 million, 2016 dollars. This has been increased to around up to \$2.8 billion in the DEIS. Now, this accounts for inflation as well as increases in property. However, that's a difference of a billion dollars. And if this pattern continues that we've seen with past capital costs, that price is only going to increase by the year of expenditure.  So decreasing ridership, increasing capital costs seem -- seem more like an economic disaster than a successful project as the DEIS proposes that it will be. So I ask that you reevaluate the predictions that you have in the Southwest Corridor DEIS, looking at what has happened in the past and what is happening now. Thank you.	To learn more about the transportation modeling used to project ridership, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.  As the project scope and design progress through the NEPA process, capital cost estimates change. Costs published in the Draft EIS reflect the project described in the Draft EIS, typically at 3-5% design, and not the project that is finally agreed upon and constructed. Initial cost estimates are refined in the Final EIS and ultimately reflect the final proposed project in the Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA). This final cost estimate is what the FTA considers in its project ratings and funding decisions. Comparing a draft cost estimate to a constructed project is not an accurate representation of a study as a whole. All TriMet light rail projects have been built within the budget set through the FFGA.  See Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.
I130	De Lange, Nina	Rating 5  I think a spur to PCC is crucial, and SW Portland could benefit overall from more transit with better options (such as expanding the Barbur Transit Center to accommodate more cars).	Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS, particularly Section 2.2.4, Preferred Alternative: Segment B, for a description of the connections to PCC-Sylvania.  Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and locations.
I131	Deangelo, Steve	Good evening. My name is Steve Deangelo. I'm a downtown business owner. I'm a commercial property owner. I've been a resident since 1989, and I'm President of the Tigard Downtown Alliance.  I have serious concerns on our congestion and traffic impacts for now and in the future. One of the major impacts for me and my business, I'm in the catering event business and I have timely deliveries. So now the cost of my goods and services are going up based on the fact that I have many times trucks that are on the road just sitting in traffic for 20, to an hour and 35-45 minutes. We can charge port-to-port charges, that's one solution, but the simple fact is congestion in traffic will raise the costs of the goods and services that we sell to our customer.  Transportation planning for the future is a must and it was underplanned in the early days, and that's no one's fault today. But it's certainly important that we plan for the future and look for a multi-style transportation. Southwest corridor will connect the fastest growing parts of the state to many areas of the metro region with new alternatives. It's somewhat intriguing to me that one of the fastest growing population areas is the last to be improved. One of the things we do annually with Tigard Downtown Alliance is we take a field trip. Last year we took the opportunity to go to our neighbors in Milwaukie and study the impacts of the orange line. When I set up the trip, I asked the leaders of that tour to tell me the good, the bad, and the ugly. And interestingly enough, there wasn't a lot of bad and ugly. There was a lot of really positive effects from the orange line. I'm most excited about the economic development opportunity within our downtown region and the things that the Southwest Corridor will bring. The revitalization of our downtown is a personal passion of mine, and I think you've been able to see some of the impacts that our organization has made and the City's commitment to a revitalized downtown. So I believe southwest corridor is going to help us with that.  Of course, the other impacts that are positive include all safety, pedestrian/bike improvements, which we still badly need in this area. And the opportunity to create more affordable housing, I think, could also be a byproduct of this project. I do have some concerns. I	Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.  Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle improvements included in the Project.  Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and Master Response 18 regarding your comments about affordable housing.  Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS for more information on park and ride sizes and locations.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>certainly would urge the Steering Committee, Metro, and TriMet to really value the displacement of the businesses and the impacts that it takes. I know it's never easy. I know it's part of the process, but please be sensitive to all these businesses and those impacts.</p> <p>And lastly, as I look at the DEIS, I have some deep concerns about the size of the Park &amp; Ride lots at this end of the terminus. It appears those numbers are dramatically down. My business aligns with the commuter rail parking lot, 110 spaces there. I looked over the fence today at 3:00 just to double-check, and that thing was full. Parking challenges continue to impact our downtown here, so I urge you to consider those Park &amp; Ride size locations as well. Thank you so much for your time.</p>	
I132	DeBolt, Amy	<p>The revision that includes the max going up Taylor's Ferry road and the on to Capitol hey is beyond absurd. There's no way that is actually a feasible plan. Taylor's Ferry is already routinely backed up past 48th Ave on a regular morning, no one can turn left from Capitol to turn left on to I-5, its a complete mess! And now you want to further snarl our traffic because it saves a few dollars. Do it right the first time. This is supposed to be helping west side traffic not turning our neighborhood into a constant grid lock situation. Now I see you want to completely rip out all the businesses on 99, how is this helping anyone who actually lives here? Back to the drawing board!</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS, and an alignment that would run along the south side of Pacific Highway (99W) in the southern portion of Segment B (Outer Portland) and the northern portion of Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin) and would add a station at SW 68th Avenue, which was studied as Refinement 4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p>
I133	Delaney, Justin	<p>I do not believe the negative impact on traffic congestion and the future of transit has been adequately studied or contemplated. Light rail causes enormous traffic congestion in the Portland central city, and recent reports are that ridership is not increasing on light rail. With the advent of Uber, Lyft, electric vehicles and, soon, autonomous vehicles, our community view of mass transit as the clean future of transportation is being called into question on a daily basis. Given the exhorbitant cost of this light rail line, the significant auto impacts it will have, and its dependence on a future vision that may no longer hold true, this seems like a risky project that needs more study. Thank you.</p>	<p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p>
I134	Denecke, David	<p>I am a resident adjacent to SW Barbur and have attended one information session with your staff. Without going into detail about what was said and learned, I would like to give you suggestions for you to tweak the Barbur Blvd section of the plan. My suggestions reflect I think reflect the thinking of at least some of my neighbors near the corner of SW Hamilton and SW Barbur.</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Move alignment of train to West side of Barbur at least along Barbur from downtown past SW Hamilton. [Reason: This stretch of SW Barbur is very congested even now. Most cross traffic is trying to get either to or from Barbur to SW Corbett and down to SW Macadam. There are no good substitutes for getting down the hill to the East. Alignment of the trains on the West side of Barbur would avoid interfering with traffic trying to get to or from Barbur. Traffic back up on Barbur for the left hand turn at SW Hamilton is really BAD and dangerous now. Comparatively little traffic enters Barbur from the West between downtown through SW Hamilton. A West side alignment on Barbur would interfere less with turns onto and off of Barbur to/from the East. [Note: The SW Naito alternative would remove part of this problem and would (could?) put the train's alignment on SW Barbur on the West side as the train reaches SW Barbur].</li> <li>2. Noise Mitigation: The trains are quite noisy and would add more noise, both high and low amplitude, for many more hours per day to the already noisy Barbur traffic corridor. I suggest that Barbur have along it sound walls, at least on adjacent streets where a majority of home owners request them.</li> <li>3. The traffic entry onto / off of the Ross Island Bridge is a whole separate project which deserves even more attention than does the train. Part of the overwhelming traffic tie ups on SW Barbur is due to cars (and especially trucks) that can't / won't take I-5 to get on Hwy 26. The bridgehead configuration should therefor be designed to force all Ross Island traffic to use I-5 / I-405, unless that traffic originates locally. SW Kelly, Corbett, Naito and streets below Duniway Park should NOT be main arterials to reach the Ross Island Bridge.</li> <li>4. Traffic on SW Naito: If the train alignment is not on Naito (or maybe even if it is), as part of the bridgehead solution, the usefulness of SW Naito for downtown entry and exit should be greatly improved by better signaling downtown, giving more volume to incoming traffic down Naito in AM and vice versa in PM, and by removing lane restriction along McCall Waterfront Park except during specific short intervals when there is a specific event at Waterfront Park. These lane restriction needlessly back up traffic many blocks South on Naito. If the City is concerned about bike traffic the City should be move bikes onto a separate bike lane through Waterfront Park (there is one now). Also the entry ramp from Naito to East bound to the Hawthorne Bridge should allow priority access to the right land of the Hawthorne Bridge. The two lanes from downtown to the Hawthorne Bridge should merge into one (left lane), at least during rush hour traffic.</li> </ol>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on the west side of SW Barbur Boulevard in a portion of Segment A (Inner Portland), which was not studied in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p> <p>In the Final EIS design, southbound left turns will be prohibited from SW Barbur Boulevard to SW Hamilton Street. Instead, a new southbound left-turn lane will be added at SW Bancroft Street, with the left-turn pocket extending north of SW Thomas Street to provide sufficient left-turn storage space The existing left-turn pocket at SW Hamilton Street is approximately 140 feet long, while the new left-turn pocket at SW Bancroft Street will be approximately 900 feet long.</p> <p>To learn more about noise impacts and mitigations, see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Modifications to SW Naito Parkway north of SW Harrison Street are outside the scope of both the Project and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration.</p>
I135	Denton, William	<p>Increasing Max lines will increase transportation accessibility for people of all incomes, while simultaneously being one of the most effective ways to reduce traffic congestion. It would be a big win for the people of Washington county.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p>
I136	DePue, Sylvia	<p>I appreciate all the work and effort everyone is putting into this project to get it to this stage.</p> <p>I have lived in the same house for more than 50 years before I was part of Portland and no stop sign at Capitol and Taylor's Ferry. Yes Traffic has changed!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* I support B-2, going behind tri-met</li> <li>*I do NOT support refinement/designer 2 which goes up the side of Taylor's Ferry Rd.</li> <li>* please study the impact of the</li> </ul>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard and a station behind the Barbur Transit Center station in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B2 in the Draft EIS, and opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center, which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process, including notifications to affected addresses.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>1. rail crossing Capitol e/w and Car traffic flow at high am/pm volume times traveling N/S</p> <p>2.also the impact of cars using 41 between Capitol and Taylor's Ferry/Barbur.</p> <p>3. Please do an impact study regarding the freezing weather on the fly away. Which raise 17' above.</p> <p>During snow /ice storms In this area the temperature on Capitol is warmer than just a few feet higher on top of Baird St.</p> <p>4. It impacts more businesses (25), and employees (250) vs B-2 impacts(18) businesses and 108 employees.</p> <p>5. It impacts a park, creek and wetlands. Please do an impact study.</p> <p>6 . Please synchronize the lights at Capitol and Taylor's Ferry with the light at Capitol and Barbur. Make sure the yellow caution is long enough to get through the Intersection at its widest point.</p> <p>7. There needs to be a safety crossing sat Taylor's Ferry and Capitol.</p> <p>For the next stage please consider expanding the area to which notices are sent. I live just under .2 of a mile from Barbur and did not receive a notice.</p>	
I137	Dietz, Annette	I am so excited to have a light rail line in SW Portland!! I think the Barbur alignment will be great once complete. I'm sure it will be challenging during the construction phase but I think it will be worth it.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I138	Doe, John	Rating 5 Sensible path, nice to join pcc sylvania to pdx.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I139	Doherty, Joanne	Rating 5 This way people from the Bridgeport/Tigard area can get to Portland much faster on Saturdays and Sundays!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I140	Done, Rachel	Rating 4 I Rachel D., at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur. I also study at PSU. I commute from beaverton currently, but have lived in the barbur area before. Working full time and as a full time student my time is precious. So if there is anything that will make that faster I am for it. The only thing that would be nice is if this plan makes sure it overlaps with Beaverton bus lines for easy transfer, or even a branch off more into beaverton.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I141	Doran, Tim	STOP SPENDING SO MUCH MONEY ON EXPENSIVE LIGHT RAIL AND SPEND IT ON NEW HIGHWAYS AND ROAD IMPROVEMENTS!	Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for highway investments instead of light rail.
I142	Doreo, Nancy	I study at NUNM on Naito Parkway and I would like to support the bridgehead construction project as it would lighten the traffic burden around our campus and clinic. It is heavily congested and unsafe for pedestrians and bicyclists. We have difficulty getting to and from school and the patients at the clinic are also impacted by the terrible traffic.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I143	Doss, Chris	Rating 1 A2-LA is the only option that will safely alleviate traffic activity between Barbur and the Ross Island bridge. It will improve the flow of traffic between the west and east side of the river and allow preservation of what remains of historical south Portland which has been significantly disrupted by previous planning efforts.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway that preserve limited access to the Ross Island Bridge in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-LA in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I144	Draper, Leslie	Have you seen the traffic around Bridgeport Village?? Adding bus turnarounds and a max stop will be horrible for this area. I'm very mad that TriMet will also be forcing Village Inn to move they've been there for 40 years as a local establishment and family run restaurant. As a resident of Tualatin and work in Tigard I find this route unnecessary and do not think many residents will be using it. Have you met many Lake Oswego residents who WANT to ride a bus or max?? Probably not. And I'll be very upset if our crime increases as it did when we lived in Milwaukie when the max came closer to our house when we lived there.	<p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime.</p>
I145	Durham, T	<p>I have attended several Southwest Corridor Planning meetings over the past 12 months. As a community member, I believe these meetings are useful because they allow citizens some insight into the process but they are not necessarily filled with relevant facts or the necessary details to make informed choices. After attending the last several SWCP presentations, numerous changes/modifications were presented.</p> <p>Several of the changes/modifications are very concerning to me as a weekly bus commuter (Bridgeport TC to Downtown Portland). My observations/opinions come from a personal history of using Tri-Met bus/light rail services since 1993. I initially began using Tri-Met while attending PCC, this experience led me to seek employment with Tri-Met (1993 to 2004). My time at Tri-Met led me to my current career so I am very grateful for Tri-Met. With that being said I have great concerns about the SWCP. It should also be noted that I have the financial means to drive my personal vehicle to work every day but I choose to use Tri-Met express bus service as a efficient and environmentally responsible way to commute to work.</p>	<p>To learn more about transit travel time and reliability, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 15 regarding your support for an extended I-5 alignment.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about business and residential displacements.</p> <p>To learn more about mitigation for short-term transportation impacts, please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period, including notifications to affected addresses.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>The insistence by the City of Portland and Tri-Met to place the light rail right route on SW Barbur Blvd to Tigard is my first concern. Many community members who live along the proposed route or who plan to access the system at various light rail stops/transit centers are probably unaware of the impact of vehicular/pedestrian traffic interactions with light rails reliability and performance. Example: In the event an accident occurs between a light rail train, vehicle or pedestrian along the route, the commute time will easily double if not quadruple.</p> <p>No historical service interruption data has been provided by Tri-Met at any of the meetings I have attended. When I ask Tri-Met representatives about this very issue, they are unable to provide me with any data. The most common response is to re-direct the conversation about how wonderful the areas around light rail stops and transit centers will become. My follow up question to the representatives is along the lines of how successful has the Rockwood Gresham area become or why did the Beaverton Round development go bankrupt, again no answers from Tri-Met or Metro.</p> <p>The proposed route from Bridgeport to PSU is 11 miles, with continuous interfacing between vehicular and pedestrian traffic. This route includes a substantial incline from downtown Tigard to SW Capitol Hwy then several short inclines &amp; declines along the route into Downtown Portland which impact travel times and light rail speeds. The SWCP has stated the expected commute time from Bridgeport to PSU to be 30 min. A quick comparison between this route and the long established light rail route between Rockwood Gresham and Old Town is roughly 10 miles and takes approximately 35 minutes during non-rush hour trips on a largely flat route with minimal vehicular/pedestrian interactions. Current commuter bus travel times between Bridgeport and Downtown Portland between the hours of 5am and 8:30am weekdays varies between 22 and 35 minutes. Rockwood Gresham to Old Town during the same time is at a minimum 35+ minutes.</p> <p>Placing the light rail route along I-5 from PSU to Bridgeport with minimal vehicular/pedestrian interaction would nearly ensure a travel time of less than 35 minutes which is the main purpose of light rail service according to the SWCP brochures.</p> <p>"The purpose of the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project is to directly connect Tualatin, downtown Tigard, southwest Portland, and the region's central city with light rail, high quality transit and appropriate community investments in a congested corridor to improve mobility and create the conditions that will allow communities in the corridor to achieve their land use vision."</p> <p>I can go on listing many additional concerns with the proposed expansion of light rail from Downtown Portland to Tualatin. Increased crime, transient camps and garbage, business and residential displacement along the proposed route. Increased traffic delays at major and minor intersections from Downtown Portland along Barbur Blvd to Downtown Tigard, SW Hall Blvd, SW 72nd Ave and Bridgeport in addition to the regular delays with commercial heavy rail service along SW 72nd Ave.</p> <p>I believe additional community input and review of the SWCP is necessary. If this plan moves forward in it's current state, I will be changing my commuting habits. My EV vehicle will take me from my home to a clean safe parking garage next to the office building I work in every day. If you want to believe light rail transportation is fast and effecient, take a moment to plan a trip from Downtown Tigard to Portland International Airport during non-rush hour times using Uber or Lyft. Next, go to Trimet.org and plan a trip from Pioneer Square to Portland International Airport using MAX, I'll bet you will be surprised. Tri-Met respresentatives admitted to me during one community meeting that all over Tri-Met system ridership has declined and the most likely reason was the continued expansion of various ride share services. A concerned voting community member.</p>	
I146	Dutt, Jake	Its great! Would the MAX have a private right of way along side of barbur in order to avoid the viaducts or would there be some sort of tunnel? Also will this be an extension to the yellow/green line or will it be called a "new" line such as the purple line	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p> <p>Trains on the existing MAX Green Line will continue through Portland to serve the Southwest Corridor. To avoid confusion for current riders, it is TriMet's practice to postpone referring to a new line by its color until about a year before the new service begins, around the start of the public process to discuss potential bus service changes that will complement the new MAX service.</p>
I147	Dyer, Linda	<p>Rating 1</p> <p>How will you accommodate a double rail line on Barbur Blvd without reducing the traffic lanes?</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard.</p> <p>Travel lanes will be maintained while accommodating a light rail line through right of way widening and property acquisitions alongside SW Barbur Boulevard.</p>
I148	Edwards, Kimberly	I do not want think the max is a good idea because I don't think it's cost effective and as ride sharing programs increase, and technology adapts to our time, by the time this is built more people will be opting for alternative transportation and less and less people will use it. It also invites crime and Portland already has many other existing things they could be working on and improving instead.	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime.</p>
I149	Edwards, Rosemary	<p>Rating 5</p> <p>No comment</p>	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I150	Elisa, Finos	I'm an employee at NUNM in South Portland. The #1 complaint we have from visitors, patients, and customers are coming to our clinics/campus is a nightmare due to dangerous traffic congestion and that access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians, even folks who ride Trimet have a hard time finding us. One of the bus stops is across a very dangerous	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		stretch of road that has 2 lanes of fast traffic coming tight off the Ross Island Bridge, and there are few street lights and NO crosswalk at that point. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM, which is an institution that is looking to expand and grow our educational opportunities and our clinics and wish to be more accessible to the community. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead AND Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.	
I151	Ellenberg, David	Hi. I like the Barbur plan. Keep MAX close to where people live.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
I152	Ellis, Stuart	I looked through some of the maps and cant figure out how many lanes of traffic are intended along Barbur. Do you intend to maintain two lanes in each direction? If not, this project would seem like it would result in severe negative impacts to traffic. Also, what is the plan to deal with the daily afternoon back up on Barbur northbound leading onto Naito Pkway? If this is not addressed, max trains will just get stuck on Barbur and create more problems. I think you need to come at this project from the perspective that automobile traffic is not going to be reduced, but rather Max may have the ability to offset some portion of the increase in traffic that will occur over time. All of the current space for cars will be needed in the future, plus space for the Max. It isn't clear to me how you intend to provide space for both. If you don't intend to maintain space for cars, then this whole project will be a huge mess.	Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard.
I153	Elmi, Liban	Hello. Hi, my name is Elmi Liban. I have been living in Tigard for the last 10 years. Yeah, I've been living in Tigard the last 10 years and I have a number of questions that have raised concerns about this project to me. I would like to know how this project would be funded and would that increase our taxes as well as property tax? And also the diversity inclusion, like, you know, will this really affect the low income and would it keep the area more affordable, and certain communities would not be driven out of the area. And there has been - - I know, I have friends in Seattle, so when they built it, the railway up there, the area where the low income community used to be had been wiped out now. And the rent went up and it's not an affordable area any longer. And in these kinds of cases, how we can assure that's not going to happen. And basically, that's my question. Thank you.	To learn more about how the Project would be funded, see Section 5.3, Cost and Funding Evaluation, of this Final EIS. Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns about housing affordability.
I154	Ender, Timur	Rating 3 I would really ask METRO to look at improving bicycle safety across Vermont & Newbury bridges on Barbur. Residents have had high hopes that this project would address that. It is unacceptable to continue to kick the can down the road with improving safety on these bridges. Generally speaking, it would be great to see a higher caliber of bikeway design than what is shown in the pictures released by METRO	Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support of improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities as part of the Project.
I155	Enelow, Noah	Rating 5 Having good transit access from all parts of Portland to downtown is just so important.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I156	Engen, Matt	Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I appreciate you giving us the opportunity to speak. I know some of you, and I am here in my official capacity as a Tigard resident and someone who lives within about a mile of the proposed terminus of this extension. I'd like to talk about something that isn't directly related to right-of-ways or alignments or whatnot, but something that has come up historically for not only this line but other lines as TriMet has expanded, and that being the topic of public safety. And specifically, the ways in which this project can address crime and the perception of crime and issues around misbehavior on the MAX. And I suggest just a couple of things that I think will not only improve the area, but also the line, and honestly, as a voter would make me more comfortable and other residents in supporting this when it comes time to fund this project. Quite simply it's this; that TriMet should embrace the same strategy they did with the green line when it terminated in Clackamas Town Center, and at that location, they included a transit police person and anchored policing resources at the end of the line dedicated specifically to addressing issues in and around that location.  Currently, for TriMet-related issues and crimes specifically in this part of town, your resources come from Hillsboro, and if they are unavailable, they come from downtown Portland. It would seem to me that having a specific, dedicated, proactive police presence at the end of the line would be most efficient. And to the degree you could save the Village Inn, it would be a fantastic spot for them to spend their local resources for both coffee and pie.  My second point is -- it gets a little more into the alignment. It's a little more to cost intensiveness, to the degree in which the alignment cannot have active crossings at the major thoroughfares now on Barbur, and coming up downtown will not only save future lives as in MAX versus pedestrian impacts, but also MAX versus car impacts. And every time you can elevate those crossings, much like through the orange line into Milwaukie out to the southwest, you will prevent future crashes. Whether it's this year or next year, just a factor of running trains at grade. And not only does that impact also involve people, but also the operators as well as impacts on time performance. Just those two thoughts towards public safety. Thank you.	Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime and safety. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.  It is TriMet's preference to grade separate all light rail crossings. However, this is not always feasible due to budget constraints. Where at-grade crossings are proposed, TriMet ensures these are designed and built to the most current safety standards. Typically, elevated guideway is significantly more expensive than guideway that is at-grade. It can also result in different adverse effects than at-grade structures, including impacts related to noise, visual change and the community. Overhead catenary poles are still required on structures for light rail systems; therefore, utility relocations would be reduced but still required everywhere there is a bridge column, and traffic signals would need to be modified due to changed sight distances created by a structure. Additionally, escalators and elevators at elevated stations increase both the construction costs and ongoing operating expenses.
I157	Erickson, Carol	Placing the corridor along Hall Blvd. would be a disaster! 72nd would be a better route and not so invasive to all us close to Hall Blvd. I want to know what route will be passed asap. Thankyou.	In your comment, you expressed opposition to an alignment east of SW Hall Boulevard in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Refinement 6 in the Draft EIS, and a preference for an alignment on SW 72nd Avenue,

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			which was studied prior to the Draft EIS and removed from consideration in April 2014. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.
I158	Esar, Tim	Members of the Steering Committee, do I have your attention? I spoke several years ago; I did not. You guys -- it wasn't necessarily the same crew, but basically, the group sat there half asleep hoping to wait for the citizens' committee to be over and not heard. My name is Tim Esar, a 30-year resident of Tigard, and one of the citizens who fought to give Tigard a voice in the rail decision. We did vote on it. It was far from overwhelming. I'm opposed to light rail in Tigard. It just doesn't make sense for Tigard or this southwest corridor area. It does nothing to address our already onerous burden of vehicular traffic trying to flow through our area. I reject this anti-vehicular stance that as a way to manage traffic, to restrict it with -- as ODOT is doing with fees on the I-5 and further congestion measures. It's blocking our way to get vehicle traffic through our area. And it doesn't even serve the outlying areas that are trying to feed in because they can't get to the end points of this rail system anyway. So they're still going to have flow in and there's nowhere to park when they get here. I think this is a gross misallocation of public funds that would be better spent on more flexible bus lines. Bus driver transit still consumes too much of the roadway we use. This is a rural, suburban area. And I myself have lived in Europe. I've used the rail systems there. It is fantastic because it has high density. We do not have the clusters of high density that support that. I don't think the neighbors around here in our community want that. It's not an urban place. This rail system does not serve that. Barring no other alternative to putting in this rail system, I would urge that we do pursue options that bring rail closer to the corridor of Tigard into the transit center just so that it does actually serve the purpose of connecting people and getting them around. Dropping it in outlying areas is futile. I'm opposed to light rail in Tigard and in the southwest corridor. I just think this is not the right time for it here. Thank you for your time.	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and locations, and Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS regarding traffic analysis related to park and rides.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for a station in downtown Tigard closer to the Tigard Transit Center in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin). Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p>
I159	Espinoza, Marco	<p>I ask for translator because I want to make sure that I am -- all things in my language. First, I want to thank you for being here and being willing to listen to us. My name is Marco Espinoza and I'm on the staff of St. Anthony's. I'm here because I talk to a lot of the Hispanics that live in this area, and they're -- a lot of them are very concerned that this construction of this new train line would force them to move out of their living situation. They wouldn't have a place to live. And I tell them that it's not all decided yet. That we should be working with the different organizations that are involved in this to encourage them to do it in a way that has less impact on living and housing. And I wish to encourage those that are involved with the project to consider ways to reduce the impact such as obtaining or building or otherwise getting housing that's low-income housing.</p> <p>As I said before -- I want to say I'm definitely in agreement with the project. It's an incredible project. I just think that as a community, we can work together to work to find a way that those that are impacted can either have the impact be less or have the opportunity to move to a place and that their economic impact won't be as severe. It won't be as much as they fear. Thank you.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns about indirect displacements and suggestions for building additional housing.</p> <p>To learn more about the Project's public engagement process, including notifications to affected addresses, see Chapter 6, Public Involvement, Agency Coordination and Required Permits, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p>
I160	Faber, Mary	<p>Rating 5</p> <p>No comment</p>	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I161	Farr, Nolan	<p>Thank you but no thank you. Rather than upend miles of roads, businesses, neighborhoods and our commute - we would much rather you focus the \$2.6Billion?!? on improving the current systems in place. Almost all of the TriMet buses have been upgraded, most are now fueled by natural gas (which is great) but if you're really looking to boost ridership is perhaps additional buses and route times is the most cost effective? We have all seen how much technology has altered/improved transportation in the past couple years and quite frankly, it's very possible that we'll have automated buses by 2027 - might even have automated vehicles that are able combat congestion on their own? Rather than spend an eye popping \$2.6Billion (TriMet/Metro issues debt to finance this project, the actual cost to the tax payers is closer to \$5Billion with interest) on antiquated systems, why not spend much smaller amounts on projects that will have an immediate impact?</p> <p>Metro/TriMet should be focused on improving the local on-ramp/off-ramps or heck, maybe we put that \$100Million+ of bridge research the taxpayers paid to get over the Columbia? What about collaborating with ODOT and PBOT to fix our pitiful bridge system that was designed 50+ years ago? Improvements there would dramatically improve the reliability of the bus system already in place. Bottom line, the taxpaying citizens are begging you to stop using archaic models and solutions that are proving costly and have little to zero improvement to our congestion.</p> <p>It's happening right in front of you - voters were on board for the WES (Wilsonville to Beaverton) despite the extremely high costs - recent data out proves that the experiment is failing - ridership is notably dropping and revenues are virtually never going to pay for the investment and ongoing overhead... time to change the paradigm but appreciate all the hard work you all do.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for highway investments and bridge improvements instead of light rail.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p>
I162	Fastenau, Kathy	<p>Rating 1</p> <p>I heard the deadline to comment is today, but I've yet to find it (or an associated time) on your website, so to make sure this gets in before 4pm here's a brief version. I'll peruse more documents and comment further later (and see if it makes it in under the undisclosed wire). Adding MAX as a transit option in the proposed area may reduce long term overall car traffic, but the route of permanent rail lines must be along the highway, not in the "surface street." Taking space away from cars (and bicycles) on Barbur/Hwy. 99 is not good long term (or even good short term) planning. If riders need to cross traffic to get from MAX to the sidewalk (as they do at Holiday Park in the Lloyd Dirstrict) it encourages risky behavior on the part of pedestrians which endangers</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period, including the timeframe for providing public comments on the Draft EIS.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>Where pedestrian crossings are proposed to access stations, TriMet ensures these are designed and built to the most current safety standards.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		pedestrians, drivers, and the MAX. That's not good for anyone. Running alongside the highway with very separate stops (like the Blue, red, and Green lines do at 82nd and 60th on the east side) is much better long term planning, and allows cars and the MAX to move faster. Remember that though the MAX along Hwy. 26 to Beaverton has laudable ridership, Highway 26 has still needed to be widened. Taking travel lanes, or *potential* travel lanes, away from Barbur Blvd. now will be a long term transit catastrophe (think Mount Hood Freeway where homes were destroyed in an attempt to widen a travel corridor). Increasing bike safety along Barbur/Hwy. 99 and maintaining existing travel lanes for cars is the best way to serve businesses and residents along Barbur. Putting light rail in the Interstate "right of way" is the best way to serve commuters who might be coaxed to shift from solo driving on I-5 to being MAX riders. Do this project like you did the Green Line along I-205. (You did NOT put the Green Line down the middle of 82nd Ave.)	In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B. Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard. Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support for improved bicycle facilities as part of the Project.
I163	Fenimore, Marian	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the SW Corridor Plan. There are three areas that I have to comment on: 1. The Refinement #1 on the Barbur in the Woods area bridges 2. Barbur Refinement B from Terwilliger to Capitol Hwy 3. Refinement 2 Taylors Ferry I-5 Overcrossing  1. The refinement #1 on the Barbur in the Woods section should absolutely contain a safe bike lane either on a new bridge on Barbur or on a Light Rail bridge over the viaduct. We need to ensure safe and plentiful bike lanes and corridors for cyclists on the west side as this has been a dangerous road for cyclists for a long time. 2. Barbur Refinement B from Terwilliger to Capitol Hwy should contain safe bike lanes across all bridges and roads along this section. Also we need green boxes for cyclists in the west side and particularly on Barbur. It is also imperative that we retain 2 traffic lanes in each direction along this corridor of Barbur as well. 3. The Refinement 2 Taylors Ferry 1-5 Overcrossing is a real problem. It goes through a popular business, Barbur World Foods which offers a meeting place for community members and cultural foods for the diverse ethnic populations that live in the area. This proposed rail line also goes through an Auto Body Shop and other homes along the upper Taylors Ferry Rd area. In addition, the proposed Light Rail Structure will disturb a small section of Woods Memorial Park and an adjacent green space which is the headwaters of Woods Creek. This is a highly sensitive area that the city Parks Bureau has been working to restore over the past two decades and which is a natural area for flora, fauna and many species of birds and wildlife. The environmental impact that this option would have on the community, local businesses and our natural spaces and parks is significant and would have lasting changes to the culture and natural landscape of our neighborhood and community. This must not happen!  If the rail line ran along Barbur as in the B1 base alternative it would avoid these negative impacts. It would also correct other design flaws in these overpass bridges along Barbur by requiring that these bridges be rebuilt to accommodate the new requirements for 1-5 clearances. This route is where the road on Barbur is wide and there are fewer businesses and homes that would be impacted by light rail infrastructure.  Again, thank you for this opportunity to comment on your proposals.	Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support of improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities.  In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
I164	Ferguson, Valerie	I would like to go on record as a NO vote for light rail  From Tigard to Portland. Living near max will not help this neighborhood 97219 and cause more congestion's and come issues. Too expensive and loss of a car lane and bike lane. No thank you	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.
I165	Ferris-Smith, Matt	Please reconsider your assumption that park-and-ride facilities are necessary for the success of this project. As the DEIS notes, the 7 proposed park-and-ride facilities, expected to store approximately 4,200 private motor vehicles, will generate increased motor vehicle traffic. This will have a negative impact on traffic safety and the environment, and will undercut the potential for this project to meet our region's climate change and Vision Zero traffic safety goals.  Instead of constructing park-and-ride facilities, please: 1. Use the land near stations to build housing. As much as possible. 2. Use the money saved by forgoing vehicle storage to dramatically improve walking and biking connections to transit stations.  Page 1-8 of the DESI recognizes the need to improve walking and biking facilities: "Driving on congested roadways is often the only choice for people to access their jobs. In addition, the incomplete sidewalk and bicycle networks in the corridor require riders to access transit by car and, as a result, park and ride lots in downtown Tigard and near Bridgeport Village are often full."  I urge you to minimize or eliminate construction of motor vehicle storage areas, and to instead maximize the potential for new transit stations to serve people arriving by foot or bike. Thank you!	Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS for more information on park and ride sizes and locations, and Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, regarding traffic analysis related to park and rides. Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to affordable housing. Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle improvements included in the Project.
I166	Figel, Suz	This is a very bad idea. Too expensive, takes people's homes and businesses, will not help people get to work, and brings crime to the neighborhood. Don't do it. Build more lanes on Hwy 5, 205. Private highways next to public ones that charge tolls and give people choices work great in Florida. NO MORE TRAINS!!!!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime. Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for highway investments instead of light rail.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I167	Finney, Debbie	Please do not make getting around Barber more difficult. It already takes an hour to cross I-5 Park pick up prescription, bank, etc. and then circumnavigate Burlingame Fred Meyer's and head back across the bridge. These business will die if there are more traffic difficulties. Please put max along freeway or macadam.	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 15 regarding your support for an extended I-5 alignment.</p>
I168	Fischer, Edward	<p>Here are some comments on the DEIS for the SW Corridor LRT Project:</p> <p>General observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congratulations on completing a very complex study within the forecast schedule.</li> <li>• Unfortunately, I believe the DEIS write-up lacks specifics and presents conclusions that are not substantiated by evidence or even explanation in many cases. Support for conclusions is frightfully absent.</li> <li>• The overall tone of the DEIS seems not like an unbiased assessment, but in fact a rather biased argument supportive of an LRT. It seems a bit like an Orwellian "Big Brother" attempt to convince the public to "trust us, we know what we're doing". Examples include the many adjectives like "slight", "not significant", "minor"; a serious lack of specific evidence or explanation for conclusions; and a suggestion that the Newberry and Vermont bridges have some "historical significance" and that not touching them is a historical positive.</li> </ul> <p>Specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the "jurisdiction or agency targets" noted at the bottom of the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph? It would have been nice to see a table of comparison.</li> <li>• Section 3.1.4: in the list of intersections that do not meet targets in Segment A (p.3-4) I find it hard to believe that the intersections of Sheridan/Barbur, Caruthers/Barbur/Broadway, 6th/Broadway, 5th/Sheridan, and Terwilliger/Sam Jackson are not listed. They are all within 1/2 mile of the proposed LRT alignment and during the PM peak (in particular) when employees of the medical facilities on Marquam Hill are trying to get to US 26 either eastbound across the Ross Island Bridge or westbound via 1-405 those intersections experience long delays and queues. In particular the Sheridan/Barbur and Caruthers/Barbur intersections deserve particular attention as they will very likely experience increased delay when the light rail is running every 3.5 to 7 minutes (both directions) through those intersections.</li> <li>• Section 3.2.1: The opening description of the "system-wide" analysis is a very broad (high-level) description with no specifics of explanation. The conclusion that "...future traffic levels would generally be lower with the light rail alternatives than with the no-build alternative" is not explained or supported. What is the evidence? What are the modeling assumptions used to determine that? As written it is insulting to the reader to be expected to believe that without any substantiating or supportive explanation or evidence. People who have experienced Interstate Avenue or East Burnside before and after Light Rail would scoff at the assertion that LRT will result in lower traffic congestion than no-LRT. What happens to the traffic? Do the reduced levels represent changes in mode choice? How much mode shift? Based on what assumptions? Or are the traffic volumes shifted to another part of the regional corridor? Like 1-5, or Macadam, or Capital? In which case, what's the impact to those facilities? How can this be considered a "system-wide analysis" if an evaluation of diverted traffic is not even mentioned?</li> <li>• Section 3.2.1, Segment A: SW Corbett Avenue -- it would ease reader understanding if a diagram accompanied the text.</li> <li>• Section 3.2.1, Segment B: Again, there is serious lack of substantiation, evidence or even simple explanation of why or how traffic volumes would be less with LRT than with the No-build. These unsubstantiated or unexplained assertions, that are quite unbelievable to some, creates a real credibility issue to this study.</li> <li>• Section 3.2.5, Segment A Intersection Analysis, 1st paragraph: The second sentence beginning "In some cases, the light rail alternatives would improve the intersection operations ..." is without specifics or explanation. It is difficult to interpret Table 3.2-5 to support the assertion. The only intersections on that table that appear to show a decrease in V/C from the No-build seem to be Corbett/Bancroft and Corbett/Hamilton -- but, again, there is no explanation and it seems that these two intersections are effected by a change in vehicular operations that make a comparison questionable.</li> <li>• Section 3.2.5, Segment A Queuing: Intersections that should be included in the lists of intersections with queuing impacts and improved queuing include (as noted above): Sheridan/Barbur, Caruthers/Barbur/Broadway, 6th/Broadway, 5th/Sheridan, and Terwilliger/Sam Jackson. While the LRT would cross through only Sheridan/Barbur and Caruthers/Broadway/Barbur, the queuing effect will likely be distributed upstream to those other intersections here noted.</li> <li>• Section 3.2.5: Again in this section there is no reference to or display of evidence for the conclusions. Some of the assertions are just hard to believe (example: 3rd bullet on p. 3-19) and yet there is no evidence or explanation. Is this "black box" software developing conclusions that cannot be verified? ("trust us, we know what we're doing"?)</li> <li>• Section 3.2.5, Segment B Queuing -- again some of the results in table 3.2-6 are not believable. Terwilliger/Barbur, for example, today is a mess that threatens to back up traffic past the Terwilliger/I-5 NB Off-ramp on to the mainline of NB 1-5. How on earth could putting a light rail through the Terwilliger/Barbur intersection that will create added queuing on northbound (and southbound)</li> </ul>	<p>The Draft EIS includes adjectives such as "minor" where appropriate to convey the severity or magnitude of an impact. These qualitative descriptions are based on quantitative information where possible. Detailed supporting information is provided in appendices and attachments to the Draft EIS.</p> <p>Jurisdiction and agency targets for the traffic analysis are documented in Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of both the Draft EIS and Final EIS.</p> <p>The Final EIS calculated volume to capacity (V/C) ratios in accordance with approved traffic analysis methods, which are consistent with prevailing practice. Standing queues created by downstream intersections can produce more congested conditions than reflected by V/C ratios. The Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS includes grade-separated light rail at the SW Barbur Boulevard/SW Sheridan Street/SW Caruthers Street intersections.</p> <p>Attachment B contains additional context for traffic analysis and results related to your comments on Section 3.2.1 and Section 3.2.5.</p> <p>Regarding your comments on the SW Barbur Boulevard trestle bridges (Vermont and Newbury structures), FTA has determined that these bridges are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, because they are early examples of multi-component bridge designs that were used to save costs during the Great Depression. However, their historical significance does not preclude their removal or replacement for the Project. The Preferred Alternative would replace both bridges, which would result in adverse effects under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and would require mitigation. For more information, see the <i>Cultural Resource Survey for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project, Multnomah and Washington Counties, Oregon</i>, which is provided as Attachment C to this Final EIS.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>Terwilliger traffic (high NB- WB left turn volume) result in a reduced V/C? Very questionable! This type of presentation leads to suspicion of incorrect, inaccurate, or a deliberately deceitful analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 4.6.2, p. 4-61: I am not an historian, but I am a civil engineer and I do appreciate the historic value of many of Oregon's Bridges. Portland has many of them. However, I find it laughable to consider either the Newbury or Vermont structures on Barbur as "historic". That's nonsensical. They're old, wooden outdated structures that should have been replaced decades ago. The reality is that to widen them while keeping traffic on them would be an enormous expense. This assertion, again without (that I saw) evidence of historical value, cheapens the integrity of document. Just point out the cost savings and stop trying to play nice guy with a disingenuous claim that they are "potentially eligible historic structures" (p.5-10). Old doesn't automatically mean historic -- especially if they're a hazard.</li> </ul> <p>I wish I'd had time to read supplements A &amp; B, however I was out of town for most of July and not able to do so. I hope you will consider my comments above more as concerns for the process and a hope those concerns can be rectified in the FEIS, rather than just criticism. It was (and is) indeed a monumental effort to complete such an exhaustive evaluation in a relatively short time. Your staff is to be commended for their efforts. I wish you the best of luck with the preparation of the final documents.</p>	
I169	Fisher, Vileka	<p>I am a student at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous. I do not feel safe on foot around the campus, and the access to NUNM for patients is terrible. Better infrastructure is integral to improving the transportation safety and accessibility issues in this neighborhood. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for light rail on Barbur, but most importantly I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. Please vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
I170	Fitzgerald, Marianne	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Southwest Corridor Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I have been involved in the Southwest Corridor Plan since its inception with the hope that light rail transit service in Southwest Portland will transform the urban highway known as Barbur Blvd. into the thriving community corridor envisioned in the Barbur Concept Plan. Unfortunately, the Initial Route Proposal (IRP) does not achieve that vision due to cost-cutting measures in the IRP refinements that limit the SW Corridor Light Rail Transit (LRT) Plan's potential in meeting that goal.</p> <p>I strongly recommend you select Alignment B1, Center Barbur, because it has the most potential for achieving the vision in the Barbur Concept Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The B1 alignment provides the most pedestrian/bike improvements where LRT is on Barbur, creates more visible station areas, has faster travel time than all other B options, and has the potential to increase ridership over all other B options. Table 5.2.2 notes a full minute of improved travel time with Alignment Alternative B1 while other impacts are similar.</li> <li>The cost to rebuild the transportation nightmare known as West Portland Crossroads (Table 5.2-2, \$10 million) would likely be similar to the costs of the flyover proposal (B2) and other I-5 overcrossings and undercrossings (refinements 2, 3 and 4 which do not have cost details). Rebuilding the SW Barbur Blvd/SW Capitol Highway structure over I-5 and its associated interchanges would support new development and redevelopment within West Portland Town Center as envisioned in the Barbur Concept Plan and could support increased residential density including affordable housing proposals and housing for Portland Community College students.</li> <li>Multiple studies of the intersection of SW Barbur and SW Capitol (ODOT 2010 and 2015 as well as the 2013 Barbur Concept Plan) recommend long-term improvements that have not been pursued; instead, "tweaks" are constructed that do not address inherent problems with the 1959 design.</li> <li>A frequent rationale in the DEIS and Refinements is to avoid construction impacts, which is not a valid argument when you are constructing improvements that have the potential for achieving a long-term community vision.</li> <li>Alignments B2, B3 and B4 do not include any improvements on Barbur within West Portland Crossroads that are needed to mitigate for the additional motor vehicle traffic traveling to the Barbur Transit Center Park and Ride spaces. Station Access Projects SA-16 (Taylors Ferry Sidewalks and Bikeway), SA 19 and 20 (I-5 pedestrian and bicycle overcrossing over I-5) and SA-22 (Pasadena Sidewalks and Bikeway) must be constructed to more safely access transit and other services from our neighborhood.</li> <li>The potential impacts to Markham Elementary School sport fields will have minimal impact on the school community (my children attended Markham Elementary; it's a big field and Barbur is pretty far from the school building).</li> <li>Refinement 2, Taylors Ferry, will make existing traffic issues worse and would not support the pedestrian and bicycle projects and transit-oriented development needed near the Barbur Transit Station. Refinement 2 should be rejected.</li> </ul> <p>When Interstate-5 was designed in the 1950s, many of the on- and off-ramp designs are the result of budget cuts that were made in this last section of I-5 construction, and we have been suffering from traffic congestion and safety issues within the West Portland Town Center for over 60 years. These issues will get worse over time as our region grows. The possibility of congestion pricing on I-5 from downtown to Multnomah Blvd. has the potential to increase motor vehicle traffic on Barbur Blvd. within the SW Corridor yet has not been considered in the DEIS. Like the Ross Island Bridgehead project, it is time to support fundamental changes in the transportation system throughout SW Portland and within SW Corridor to better support future growth and development in our region.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS, and opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center, which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle mobility and station access improvements.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to affordable housing.</p> <p>With the Preferred Alternative, impacts to Markham Elementary School sports fields are limited to easements along the western edge of the sports fields.</p> <p>Regarding your question about the potential for tolls on I-5, the I-5 congestion pricing project was developed subsequent to the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project. It is that project's responsibility to consider earlier projects, including the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project, in its analysis.</p> <p>In your comment, you also expressed a preference for an alignment on SW Naito Parkway with the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS, and opposition to light rail to the east of SW Barbur Boulevard in the Woods area of Segment A, which was studied as Refinement 1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p> <p>Regarding your comments on the SW Barbur Boulevard trestle bridges (Vermont and Newbury structures), FTA has determined that these bridges are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, because they are early examples of multi-component bridge designs that were used to save costs during the Great Depression. However, their historical significance does not preclude their removal or replacement for the Project. The Preferred Alternative would replace both bridges, which would result in adverse effects under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and would require mitigation. For more information, see the <i>Cultural Resource Survey for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project, Multnomah and Washington Counties, Oregon</i>, which is provided as Attachment C to this Final EIS.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed support for the Ash to Railroad alignment, including Elmhurst and a Tigard Transit Center Station East of Hall in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which were studied as Refinement 5 and Refinement 6 in the Draft EIS, and opposition to the I-5 undercrossing and Barbur Undercrossing, which were studied as Refinement 3 and Refinement 4 in the Draft EIS. The Ash to Railroad alignment was studied as Alternative C2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of this Final EIS regarding concerns about noise and vibration, including concerns related to Ash Creek Commons.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>Here are some specific comments on the alignments and refinements and how to reduce negative impacts.</p> <p>Segment A, South Portland: I strongly support Naito with Bridgehead (A2-BH) because it supports the Barbur Concept Plan and provides better access to the National University of Naturopathic Medicine (NUNM) and the South Waterfront area. A station area around Naito/Gibbs has more potential land for redevelopment than the station area around Barbur/Gibbs, provides better access to South Waterfront residents and businesses where there is more potential for new development than Marquam Hill. The region absolutely needs to fund and construct the Ross Island Bridgehead Project no matter what alignment is chosen in order to redirect regional traffic from local streets to more appropriate roadways.</p> <p>Segment B, Barbur: I strongly support Alternative B1, Center Barbur, and reconstruction of the West Portland Crossroads, as described above. Alignment Alternative B1 offers a full minute less travel time (Table 5.2-2), better supports the Barbur Concept Plan and redevelopment within the Crossroads, and would create a safe overcrossing for motor vehicles, light rail and people in the event of an earthquake and weather-related conditions.</p> <p>Segment C through Tigard to Tualatin: I agree with IRP C2, Ash to Railroad . Clinton was deemed not feasible and branched was too expensive to operate.</p> <p>Refinement 1, Viaducts: I do not support Refinement 1 to avoid rebuilding the Barbur viaducts for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The weaving needed to go from center-running LRT to eastside running LRT and back again will create safety hazards for all modes.</li> <li>- Bicycle and pedestrian facilities are needed in the vicinity of the viaducts and at a minimum the new LRT structure must include bicycle and pedestrian facilities.</li> <li>- The trestles are not designated historic structures and will not withstand an earthquake.</li> <li>- Upgrading this segment of Barbur with a new structure designed for all modes would make it safer for bicycles, pedestrians, transit and motor vehicles to travel through this corridor. The viaducts will need to be improved sooner or later to support future growth and the SW Corridor Plan must support future needs rather than exacerbate existing safety issues.</li> </ul> <p>Refinement 2, Taylors Ferry: I do not support Refinement 2 that proposes to run light rail along Taylors Ferry Road to a new structure over I-5 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The SW Capitol Highway/Taylors Ferry Intersection is already severely congested during commute times and when Portland Community College is in session and the at-grade LRT proposal and signals will make congestion worse. The traffic analysis only addressed one of the seven intersections within Crossroads that will be impacted by this proposal and all seven intersections must be studied.</li> <li>- The weaving needed to go from center-running LRT to westside running LRT and back again will create safety hazards for all modes.</li> <li>- Bicycle and pedestrian facilities are needed in the vicinity of SW Taylors Ferry Road and SW Capitol Highway. The proposed traffic mitigation is to add room for motor vehicles but not for pedestrian and bicycle facilities. This would make it less safe for people to walk and bike to the Barbur Transit Center and transit service, shops and services in West Portland Crossroads. Refinement 2 will make it less feasible to build the needed pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the future.</li> <li>- ODOT has proposed to redirect traffic flow through this intersection (the "jughandle" project, page E-6) which will make it less safe for people walking and biking in the Crossroads.</li> <li>- At a minimum the new LRT structure must include bike and ped facilities to make it safer to travel across I-5 near SW Capitol Highway as well as the Station Access projects noted above.</li> </ul> <p>Refinement 3, I-5 Undercrossing: I agree that this proposal is less promising because the potential closure of the SW 60 and Barbur intersection would impede access to the PCC Lesser Road entrance and the proposed service road to SW 53rd could have the effect of changing the PCC entrance from Lesser to SW 53rd.</p> <p>Refinement 4, 99W Undercrossing: I prefer Alignment B1, remaining center Barbur all the way to the proposed stop at SW 68th and 99W.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I support the new station area at SW 68th and 99W because it would provide better station access for the residential neighborhoods north/west of 99W and better separation between the station areas in the Tigard Triangle.</li> <li>- The undercrossing is difficult to envision and the tunnel seems an unnecessary expense. Keep light rail on Barbur/Pacific Highway all the way from the Barbur Transit Center to SW 68th.</li> <li>- The existing structure between SW 60th and SW 64th over I-5 was not built to state requirements in 1985 and lacks bicycle lanes and southbound pedestrian facilities. The new LRT structure must include bicycle and pedestrian facilities to accommodate safety in this section of Barbur.</li> <li>- I am concerned that LRT will create noise impacts at the Ash Creek Commons residential units that are not mitigated in the DEIS. The DEIS Table 3.2-5 notes the intersection of Barbur, SW 64th and the southbound I-5 offramp does not meet mobility standards and mitigations that protect the residents' health as well as motor vehicle congestion must be included in the SW Corridor Plan.</li> <li>- The Station Access Projects do not address this proposed station at SW 68th and new pedestrian and bicycle facilities are needed to fill in gaps on 99W and to access the stations from the residential areas.</li> </ul>	<p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS, particularly Section 2.2.4, Preferred Alternative: Segment B, for a description of the connections to PCC-Sylvania.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>Refinement 5, Elmhurst alignment in Tigard Triangle: I agree with this refinement because the station location is slightly more central to the big box employers in the Tigard Triangle.</p> <p>Refinement 6, Hall Station in Tigard: I agree with this refinement but am concerned that the Station Access Projects do not include improved connections to this station location. In particular, there needs to be a safe walking and biking route to connect the station to downtown Tigard at all times of the day/year. Other benefits of this refinement are that there is more room for the station and O&amp;M facility at Hunziker than near Ash Street, this proposal avoids displacing existing affordable housing on Hall and on Ash Street and avoids at-grade LRT crossings of Hall.</p> <p>Portland Community College Shuttle: I strongly support the transit shuttle between the Barbur Transit Center and station/park and ride in the Tigard Triangle (Baylor or SW 68th). I strongly oppose the shuttle along SW 53<sup>rd</sup> and recommend that the project cut costs by eliminating the proposed improvements to SW 53rd that are intended to create a new entrance to PCC Sylvania. If the improvements to SW 53rd are included in the SW Corridor LRT project, the park and ride at SW 53rd might become an extended parking lot for PCC students rather than serving ridership on the SW Corridor LRT. SW 53rd could support affordable housing and PCC student housing, and the new developments could pay for the needed infrastructure improvements in the future.</p> <p>Station Access Projects: The list of Station Access Projects needs to be re-analyzed to ensure that the stations in the LPA have adequate-and prioritized-projects that will facilitate safe walking and biking to all LRT stations.</p> <p>Transit service, and access to transit: These need to be improved throughout the SW Corridor in order to reduce reliance on single occupancy automobiles in our neighborhoods. TriMet's Service Enhancement Plan will need to be revised to support the SW Corridor Plan. Two changes could be made immediately that would improve bus ridership today: Bus #44 to PCC Sylvania should be upgraded to frequent transit service, and Bus #43 should directly connect with transit service at the Barbur Transit Center. Thank you for considering these comments in your selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative and in the next phase of studies and project development. I urge you to modify the Initial Route Proposal and consider the multiple benefits of Alignment B1 and its support of our community's vision in the Barbur Concept Plan, reject Refinement 2 and modify Refinement 4 to support long term growth and safety within our region.</p>	
I171	Fleishman, Craig	I don't want a light rail system from SW Portland to Tigard, too expensive to build and operate. Just a conduit for crime.	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime.</p>
I172	Fong, April Ann	<p>I am concerned about putting in a lightrail station and "streetscape improvements" at SW 53rd Avenue.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SW 53rd is an unimproved road that allows very limited traffic (foot, car, bicycle) and is in line with the "historic" ruralness and peacefulness of this neighborhood.</li> <li>Developing/Paving SW 53rd would divide a very small neighborhood that encircles PCC that I have loved. I'm concerned with losing the character and flavor of our quiet neighborhood. There is nowhere to go from this station except our neighborhood, which has very low traffic, low crime, etc.</li> <li>Using SW 53rd as a transit passage to PCC would make safety concerns for drivers, walkers, and bicyclists. From Barbur, cars drive very fast and can turn the corner onto SW 53rd quickly, but walkers and bicyclists would find it a challenging uphill journey. Uphill to PCC seems like a crazy bike ride or car ride, but downhill would be a tad hard to envision.</li> <li>Sylvania Natural Area Park is near and dear to my heart. I fear putting all the water from the street into Upper Red Rock Creek here. I know that the park already has water issues and I can't see how paving the entire side of that street would be good for water issues. Plus the ecosystem of that park is already challenged by the amount of edge that it has. More gas fumes, particulates, and people walking through would not be good for this natural area.</li> <li>If we already have a station at Barbur Transit, we have a place for shuttles to pick up students for PCC already. I don't think we need another transit station. If we did, I would suggest increasing the capacity of Barbur Transit.</li> <li>PCC has an agreement with the Far SW Neighborhood and historically has been a good neighbor. This agreement ("master plan") does not allow through traffic at SW 53rd Avenue .</li> </ol> <p>I may have more, I'll think on it.</p>	<p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS, particularly Section 2.2.4, Preferred Alternative: Segment B, for a description of the connections to PCC-Sylvania.</p> <p>Stormwater storage and treatment are components of the proposed improvements along SW 53rd Avenue.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.7, Parks and Recreation Resources, of this Final EIS, regarding your concerns related to impacts to the Sylvania Natural Area Park.</p>
I173	Fong, Christina	I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur..	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I174	Fong, Steve	<p>I work at NUNM in South Portland.</p> <p>The congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I</p>	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I175	Fontes, R A	<p>seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.</p> <p>Unrealistically High Ridership Projections:                      The DEIS projected ridership of roughly 42,000 per day is about the same as the combined ridership of the Red and Blue MAX lines between Hillsboro's and Portland's downtowns. The existing LRT line serves a larger population than is expected along the Southwest Corridor line, is much longer and has 20 stations, compared with SWC's 13 or fewer.</p> <p>Project teams overestimated weekday ridership for each of the last six projects seeking FTA support. Of the four before-and-after reports submitted to Congress, only the Yellow line early ridership projections were not revised downwards after initial approval by local governments. Of the three that were reduced, only the revised WES projections accurately forecast ridership. The Green line and eastside streetcar loop extension revisions were still above actual ridership. The Orange line before-and-after report is due within the next few months, but ridership never reached the initial target of 17,000 and was 12,220 as of TriMet's latest (May 2018) monthly performance report. The sixth project is the uncompleted Lake Oswego Streetcar extension. While this project's ridership is nonexistent, no-build forecasts are astounding. From base-year (2005) ridership of 1,870, combined line 35 &amp; 36 ridership between Lake Oswego and Bancroft is supposed to more than triple to 6,780 by the project's Alternatives Analysis horizon year of 2025, and almost quintuple to 9,300 in the project's DEIS horizon year of 2035. Instead, ridership has been relatively flat and actually is now below base-year levels, according to TriMet's Fall 2017 passenger census. Except for the Yellow line, none of these projects are anywhere close to having a trajectory which would bring ridership to horizon year forecasts.</p> <p>No Consideration Of Potential Effects From Autonomous Vehicle Technologies:                      Driver expenses are proportionately much higher for buses than for LRT. Therefore, eliminating drivers would reduce bus ops costs relative to LRT, so much so that two-car MAX trains will be unable to offer cost-effective transportation.</p> <p>We can expect shared autonomous vehicles (SAVs, a.k.a. "robotaxis") to take a major bite out of transit ridership; we just don't know how much. One study {Clewlow, Regina R. and Gouri Shankar Mishra (2017) Disruptive Transportation: The Adoption, Utilization, and Impacts of Ride-Hailing in the United States. Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California, Davis, Research Report UCD-ITS-RR-17-07} found that existing transportation network companies (TNCs) like Uber and Lyft reduce transit ridership by 6% even though rider costs are much higher than traditional, heavily subsidized transit. How much more will lower cost SAVs reduce ridership? One transportation consultancy, Fehr and Peers, models transit ridership dropping by very roughly 1/3rd and possibly 80% or more if SAV operators are successful at getting customers to pool their rides {http://www.fehrandpeers.com/autonomous-vehicle-research/}</p> <p>Any significant ridership drop will impinge on TriMet's ability to pay its share of capital costs as well as to operate the project. Common sense suggests that full-fare riders will abandon TriMet before those with super subsidies. Therefore, farebox recovery will drop more than ridership. As interest rates head back up towards "normal", TriMet's credit rating may well be lowered once credit agencies start noticing existing ridership drops associated with TNCs and start plugging in the potential effects of SAVs. Congressional and legislative support could come into question. After many years of TriMet tax increases accompanying flat to dropping demand, a relatively fast and deep ridership drop might be all it takes for unhappy small business owners to put forward an initiative severely limiting TriMet.</p> <p>All of this is on top of the fact that, after 32 years of operation, MAX fails to provide cost effective transportation. The latest National Transit Database (NTD) shows that in FY 2016 MAX only provided about 24 1/2 rides per vehicle revenue mile. That's less than 15% of MAX cars' average capacity of around 170 riders. The NTD also shows TriMet's hourly costs in revenue operation for buses at \$136.74 and LRT cars at \$208.72, or \$417.44 for a two-car MAX train. So MAX costs more than three times as much to operate as buses, but is carrying less than a bus's capacity. It can only get worse - much worse - in a world with AV technology.</p>	<p>To learn more about the transportation modeling used to project ridership, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>The effects of widespread adoption of autonomous vehicle technology are not reasonably foreseeable and are not analyzed as part of the Project's traffic analysis. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>To learn more about how the Project would be funded, in terms of both capital funding and operating expenses, see Section 5.3, Cost and Funding Evaluation, of this Final EIS. The general financials of TriMet are not within the scope of the EIS.</p>
I176	Ford, Christine	<p>Rating 1</p> <p>To take the train up the Taylors Ferry Road from Barbur Boulevard to Capitol Highway is insane. I would venture to guess that no one has see that area from 7:00 am to 9:30 am and 2:30 pm to 7:00 pm. The traffic is a nightmare in that area starting from Capitol Highway South of Barbur to the 9400 block of Capitol Highway, and from the northbound I-5 exit at Barbur Boulevard and 99 past the Capitol Highway intersection to at least Taco Time.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p>
I177	Ford, Christine	<p>Rating 1</p> <p>I don't have scientific reasons. I just do not feel the route chosen is the best route. There are too many people who oppose it which tells me that not enough thought has gone into it. It feels like decisions were made because it was cheaper rather than it being the better decion.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p>
I178	Fowler, Justin	<p>Thanks for reaching out to me regarding this! To clarify, we support the light rail project on Barbur Boulevard, but we would like the Naito and Bridgehead projects to be improved as well. Congestion on Naito parkway is very bad. It's also difficult for people to find our campus; if you are approaching NUNM while northbound on Naito, there is one opportunity to turn off and enter the campus, but</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>it is easy to miss and the intersection there can be somewhat hazardous because oncoming traffic from Naito is entering a three-way stop intersection without stopping. Meanwhile, if you are traveling southbound on Naito, there's no way to enter campus.</p> <p>GPS directions to our campus frequently send people to this location, which is not ideal for parking.</p> <p>Leaving campus to take US-26 West often feels hazardous because GPS directions will instruct drivers to make a left turn at this intersection, which is very difficult, especially in rush hour traffic.</p> <p>So, while we support the light rail project on Barbur boulevard, any improvements to the flow of traffic on or around Naito parkway would be a really big improvement for the people who must visit our campus every day.</p> <p>Thanks again for taking our feedback into consideration!</p>	
I179	Fowler, Justin	<p>I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM.</p> <p>I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
I180	Fox, Gerald	<p>Access to OHSU</p> <p>There seems to be a major flaw in the entire project in that it fails to address the "last mile" problem at the two largest potential trip sources, OHSU and the Sylvania Campus. To avoid tunnels? Most of Seattle's LRT is in tunnel. Why are we so skittish about short tunnels here?</p> <p>The solution proposed for OHSU confronts hospital staff and patients with a long, obstacle course, maybe in the rain (or does it have a roof ?), and is totally inappropriate to serve the biggest trip generator in the region. Not everyone can easily walk that far to a hospital. I can't.</p> <p>The obvious solution was to tunnel under the hill, as at the zoo, but this was discarded after the project generated a "kill piece" that ineptly and inaccurately emphasized tunnel problems, and avoided solutions. and bullying OHSU by demanding they pay for access ?? What about the public interest.</p> <p>However an alternative using an "inclined elevator" from the Barbur Station would have sufficed, had it been proposed. Inclined elevators, (funiculars) are common, and would give direct service from the Barbur Station to OHSU. An historic example is Angel's Flight in LA, and there are others in California, and Pittsburgh and other eastern cities. But no, our athletic planners decided the patients could walk. Imagine if the Airport Line had terminated east of the parking structure, as the Port once proposed. Failure to serve OHSU adequately is a huge black mark against the project.</p> <p>And if the Naito alignment is chosen, access to OHSU gets much worse. Another possible problem with the Naito alignment is building the switches out of Lincoln Street on a grade. May require regrading the entire street. The SW LRT should not be stuck with solving the Ross Island Bridge Access problem.</p> <p>Clinton to I-5</p> <p>If the LRT can't serve OHSU or PCC properly, why on earth put a kink in the line in the Tigard Triangle for marginal ridership gain, slowing down the whole operation. Slowing the LRT may actually lose ridership when the whole corridor is considered. Please unkink the LRT, and use a direct route, such as Alternative C3</p> <p>Park and Rides.</p> <p>I live near Lewis and Clark, 4,000 feet from a bus route. And I'm too old to bike everywhere. So I drive, but would like to use LRT. But I hate parking in neighborhoods for lack on P &amp; R. Portland is somewhat elitist about not providing P &amp; Rs. So potential transit riders can't use the system. But why not privatize P &amp; Rs. Then private funds could build them, and users would have to pay whatever the market (or policy) decides.</p> <p>So,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) There need to be a more appropriate access to OHSU.</li> <li>2) Naito is a bad idea compared to Tigard</li> <li>3) Don't do the Tigard Triangle Kink</li> <li>4) There needs to be some P &amp; R closer in, so drivers can access the LRT, even if it's not free.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment. And please fix these flaws so I can support the funding measure in 2020 or whenever'</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 15 regarding your support for a tunneled route connecting to OHSU.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 9 regarding the Marquam Hill Connection.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p> <p>In your comment, you also expressed a preference for the Clinton to I-5 alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as part of Alternative C3 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes, and Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS regarding traffic analysis related to park and rides.</p> <p>Private park and rides would require a new fee structure that is high enough for private developers to offset the capital cost investment of building a park and ride. TriMet's existing park and ride facilities allow parking for up to 24 hours, at no charge to the user. According to TriMet's 2005 policy, the agency encourages exploring the use of parking charges as a tool for allocating resources in an equitable manner that is consistent with fare policy and service development policy, though paid parking at park and rides is not assumed in the Final EIS. In addition, neighborhood parking management plans would need to be developed in parallel with a private parking development in order to reduce the amount of "hide and ride" parking that would occur in adjacent neighborhoods to avoid paying for parking.</p>
I181	Franco, Janet	<p>Need to preserve Terwilliger and Barbur intersection. NW corner has a number of shops needed by the neighborhood, and A-Boy provides a service not found for miles. Seems as though off Barbur would be less intrusive, but access could be more difficult.</p> <p>Barbur Foods is a unique grocer at Capitol and Barbur. Also important to preserve.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed concerns related to impacts from a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		Thank you for the great tonight.	Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and business impacts.
I182	Frazier, William	I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur..	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I183	Freewheel, Clicky	The stations have far too much parking. Have a few park-and-rides, yes, but there is no need for half the stations to have 300-900 spaces! This will ensure a suburban development pattern around the new rapid transit line - the goal should be to densify the surrounding area, not use it for car storage. This is a huge missed opportunity to create walkable communities surrounding the new rail stations.  The Tigard TC station should directly connect to the WES station, not be three blocks away.  Bike improvements are meager at best. There need to be separated paths, not buffered bike lanes with plastic posts.	Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to the redevelopment of park and ride lots.  In your comment, you expressed support for a station directly adjacent to the Tigard Transit Center in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as part of Alternatives C3, C4 and C6 in the Draft EIS, and opposition to a Hall Station, which was studied as Refinement 6 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.  Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support of greater separation for bicycle facilities.
I184	French, Miles	Rating 5  I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I185	Freud, Hazrdus	This will be great and take cars off the congested 217.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I186	Fromdahl, Larry W	Your proposal for a new SW MAX line causing Village Inn to close or re-locate, if possible, is very disappointing.  I have patronized Village Inn frequently over the last 10 years while living in Metro Portland area, primarily Tigard. I was forced to move back to Salem OR about 1 year ago because rent is out-of-control in this area. I am retired and enjoy driving to Village Inn for breakfast/lunch and sometimes dinner when I am attending a function. It is an outstanding 3rd generation restaurant that takes pride in providing outstanding service to their customers. The restaurant is well managed, provides a nice selection of great food and specials and reasonably priced. It is conveniently located from I-5 freeway too. Village Inn is a much better restaurant than any I have found in Salem OR.  Don't take away a restaurant with great service and great food. So many restaurants today are fast food not nearly as healthy and good for you. Please find a different route for the MAX line to serve in this area. I'm confident other routes exist due to having this meeting tonight. BE RESPONSIBLE AND DO IT.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
I187	Fromme, Arne	Two items: 1) Please plan to put up a Sound Wall along SW Pasadena/Pomona from SW 55 to SW 61 if the bike land/walking corridor is added. 2) Suggest you plan the stations to easily add auto ticket scan machines and for both the start and end of a trip. Think BART and DC Metro. When Portland decides to adapt that (over the honor system), retrofitting these stations will be easier.	To learn more about noise impacts and mitigations, see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of this Final EIS.  TriMet and partnering transit providers launched the Hop Fastpass contactless payment system in 2017. Light rail riders are now required to tap a card reader with a valid Hop card or smartphone before boarding a train. The Southwest Corridor stations would be constructed to include these card readers.
I188	Frost, Cindy	My name is Cindy Frost. I'm a Tualatin resident. I've lived here for about seven or eight years. Prior to that I lived in southwest Portland and southwest Multnomah for about 17 years. I'm familiar with the west side. First, I would like to say I am very much in favor of light rail and public transportation and I'm adamantly opposed to having you move The Village Inn. This is a restaurant that's been in business for 41 years. It's a family-owned business. We don't have a lot of those left. And also is a great meeting area. I am a Mary Kay sales director. I also teach at OHSU. Totally separate. But because of that I drive a lot and I drive from the Hill down. One of the reasons I think that intersection -- I think it's deplorable that anybody would want to build anything else there. It's already a nightmare. If you don't believe me, try to drive it especially around rush hour. You can't even turn because everybody is competing to try and get on the freeway from here over to the left lane or here. And, I mean, I can't imagine that they would want to put anything else there. They certainly haven't studied that and certainly haven't studied it around rush hour.  Currently when I work at the Hill if I leave at 4:00, it takes me -- or the med school, it takes me an hour and a-half to get to Tualatin. So like I said, I'm favorable, but we have a family owned business that's already been moved once and the thought of moving it again and putting a transit in there I find absolutely absurd. Also, as a Mary Kay sales director, we have a lot of meetings there. We meet there monthly. We have other Mary Kay meetings that meet there weekly and have met there for a long time and have kind of a separate area and it is a unique place to be able to meet without paying a meeting room fee and that's open to the public and available.  I would like to say that where the west is right now that comes into Tualatin by the empty Hagen's I would propose would be a better option. I mean, there is always going to be transit issues but there's a large space, there's a large area, there's a lot more parking. I	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.  Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for WES Commuter Rail improvements instead of light rail.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		mean, taking The Village Inn aside, that is enough space for long range planning in that parking lot to put a light rail in. I mean, I'm not a planner but that's pretty – pretty obvious, people. So I don't think there's any way that they can build that. There's no room for growth. And that's one of the issues we're having is we don't have the room for growth.  Another option is expanding west so it has a little more capability. A lot more people would ride that to Beaverton and back if it was available more often. We have the track. We have the train. And it's very limited for commuters so I'm not sure why that is so limited and why we haven't visited that. So, again, I am very, very adamant about not moving The Village Inn.	
I189	Frost, Julie	Rating 5  I love taking the MAX and was bummed when I moved too far away from the line, but closer to downtown Portland, to make it feasible to take it. I will absolutely use to go to Bridgeport and downtown.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I190	Fu, Mary	I am a recent graduate of the National University of Natural Medicine in Southwest Portland. In my time at NUNM, the traffic has been the most dangerous and unpredictable part of my day-to-day. As a bike commuter, it was difficult to cross the road where cars exit the Ross Island bridge. They cannot see and/or don't have time to slow down for pedestrians who are waiting right on the other side. The traffic flow is dangerous and access to the campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. When Trimet changed the bus line #9 to down by Tillikum, it took away one of the few transit options that I had. Please consider the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM as you finalize your plans for this project. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor. Thank you!	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I191	G, E	Please help improve walkability in and around Capitol Hill Road!! This is essential to accessing transit on the recommended (and preferable) route on SW Barbur Blvd (between Fred Meyer and the Transit Center across from Barbur World Foods.	Please see Master Response 7 regarding station access improvements.
I192	Gansner, Elliott	I live and am a property owner in the Lair Hill neighborhood. I am excited about this project in general and strongly support increased large-scale public transportation options for the Portland metro area. With that said, my location makes me strongly biased towards the A2-BH or A1 with the Ross Island Bridgehead reconfiguration route options for this project. While the light rail will solve a major need for a large area in SW Portland, the bridgehead reconfiguration will solve a major issue for our small neighborhood of Lair Hill. The current bridgehead configuration is inappropriate on many levels and strongly negatively affects the livability and safety of our neighborhood. Obviously, the bridgeheads current configuration with east bound traffic entering the bridge via SW Kelly, turns our neighborhood streets into a parking lot filled with idling cars twice a day. However, the situation is made even worse by the location of the exit of the Gibbs St. footbridge over I5. After reading through much of the documentation for this project, I never saw that issue mentioned. I frequently bike and walk over that footbridge and the intersection of SW Gibbs and SW Kelly is incredibly dangerous. Traffic exiting from SW Ross Island Way are often going well over 40 mph, come around a blind corner and are confronted by a great deal of foot and bike traffic entering and exiting the footbridge. That intersection currently doesn't even have a stop sign. Given OHSU's continued expansion, the likelihood of a new light rail station on Gibbs St, the SW Kelly and SW Gibbs intersection will see ever more foot and bike traffic coming off the bridge. The current exit and on-ramps must be eliminated to make the connection between the OHSU lower campus and the new Gibbs St station safe for pedestrians and bikers. So the bridgehead must be reconfigured both for the sake of neighborhood residents but also for all the commuters, workers, and students moving from the South Waterfront OHSU campus to the new light rail stations and up to the Marquam campus as well.  I fear that if the bridgehead reconfiguration is not included in the larger light rail project that it will fall by the wayside. Many of my neighbors have mentioned to me that there has been discussion of reconfiguring the bridgehead for decades. Let's not let this obvious problem go unsolved for another decade.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I193	Garbett, James	We are absolutely not in favor of the proposed plan as we feel it is going to severely affect the living quality in our neighborhood. Please advise.	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
I194	Garcia, Adriana	I think it's a great idea, I believe that's what you guys are looking for, I think it's very needed, there's not a lot of bus options heading over here, I think it would be nice to have some options like that.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I195	Garcia, Todd	Here's some feedback on the Light Rail DEIS and the SW Corridor Plan in general. I'm not very familiar with transportation planning; so I apologize if I get some of the terms or phrasing wrong.  I've been reading and learning for the last couple months about Light Rail, the SW Corridor Plan, and the SW Service Enhancement Plan. I found the DEIS to be full of information and easy to consume. It helped me to understand the Light Rail vision. The bad news is that it didn't make a case for Light Rail that resonated with me or my family. There wasn't enough hard data and details in it. Here's what I mean:  * Practical value - If Light Rail is a good idea, I would expect to easily find data on the value to average families as well as personal testimonials from communities that have already made this investment and are reaping the rewards. Nothing suggests future success quite like past success! However, when I looked online, all I found were a lot of underinformed citizens (like me), low TriMet ridership in my city, and online articles describing small cities across the country who are opposing similar Light Rail plans as "boondoggles".	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.  Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for roadway or bridge improvements instead of light rail.  Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support for improved sidewalks. Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of the Final EIS provides a summary of the roadway, bridge and sidewalk improvements that the Preferred Alternative would provide.  To learn more about the transportation modeling used to project ridership, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.  Your comment regarding a public version of "Lyft Line" has been shared with project partners.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>So, I gave up on finding past success stories and opened a spreadsheet. I did some quick analysis on my family's annual transportation costs and durations for the routes that we frequent. Turns out that none of the current TriMet bus routes nor any of the light rail routes in the DEIS would ever save us any money. We still have to keep our cars and pay for them. If gasoline prices go high enough then we might save a little money on some trips. But any cost savings are offset by the increase in door to door travel time. With getting to/from the a TriMet starting point and the time needed to get on and/or make transfers, we never see a reduction in our door to door time. Unless it saves us time, money or both, there's just no value in it for us. Many of our friends and neighbors feel the same way</p> <p>* Legacy - Some conversations mentioned that implementing the SW Corridor Plan is a wonderful legacy to future generations. This notion has some attractiveness to it. But, when I consider the younger generation, I get more excited about "on demand" (aka demand-response?) public transportation. I'd like to see a major investment in a public version of "Lyft Line" but with vans that hold 8-10 or more people. Door to door (or very close) service with low cost. That makes sense to me. That has value. It also brings up a question. If we don't build the SW Corridor Plan at all, can we use the \$2.8B on road repairs, bridges, sidewalks, etc.? I like that legacy a lot.</p> <p>* Protect employment/economic zones - One of the arguments for Light Rail that I encountered was that we need to protect our city's investment in our current economic zones. The plans/options in the DEIS seem to address this. That's good. I think it all depends on committed repeat ridership. Here's a case where specific data/details in the DEIS would be very helpful. The DEIS mentions capacity, but I think it needs to make a case for year over year repeat ridership patterns along each proposed route and through each city. That would be very helpful.</p> <p>Thanks for reading this and thanks for all that you do! Even if we can't support this project, we really appreciate all of your efforts!</p>	
I196	Garey, Kelly	<p>I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
I197	Garofalo, Luciano	<p>I am a 4th-year student at NUNM in South Portland, studying to be a naturopathic doctor and integrative medicine researcher. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. Most importantly, it is difficult to access for our patients, many of whom are physically disabled or can't travel independently.</p> <p>The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
I198	Gasparovic, Vicky	<p>Rating 1</p> <p>Destroys SW Barbur Blvd for rush hour commuters by creating more traffic congestion at sensitive times, and it reduces the existing lanes. Brings nothing to the table that existing bus routes cannot do better with bus express lanes added. Destroys the only main alternative to I-5 for commuting between Portland and Tigard. Impacts and will destroy neighborhoods needlessly...might as well throw grenades at homes. Does nothing to relieve congestion on Marquam bridge or to straighten out Terwilliger curves. Still need bus service to reach OHSU, PCC, Washington Square, and downtown Tigard. Unnecessary giant bridges in the Tigard Triangle and land purchases rather than staying on publically owned streets that won't require giant bridges.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for improvements to the I-5 Terwilliger curve or Marquam Bridge instead of light rail.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative reduces the scale of the proposed structure over I-5 compared to the light rail alternatives studied in the Draft EIS.</p>
I199	Gates, William	<p>I do not support Refinement 2 of the SW Corridor Light Rail proposal for two personal and community reasons. The intersection known as Crossroads (Barbur Blvd, Taylor's Ferry, Capital Highway, I-5 off/on ramps) is a quagmire of congestion and confusion already. We live within two blocks of Crossroads. Sending light rail along Taylors Ferry will only complicate an already dangerous intersection. I am a bike rider and walker and pedestrian safety will only be further compromised in this already dangerous area. We need more safe pedestrian access, not less.</p> <p>I am not opposed to light rail. My preference would be to keep MAX on Barbur Blvd through the Crossroads intersection all the way to Tigard. Thank you.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS, and opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center, which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p>
I200	Gerard, Craig	<p>First, I'm supportive of efforts to lessen traffic and increase public transportation.</p> <p>I have three comments on the plan:</p> <p>First, I encourage all possible efforts to minimize the need to tearing down housing or make the rail travel too close to residential properties.</p> <p>Second, I'm concerned this will affect traffic on Barbur Blvd when it is finished, specifically the ability (or lack there of) to make left hand turns from Barbur into shopping centers. Cars should still be able to make lefthand turns even if no traffic light is present.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for public transportation.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis, including information about turning movements.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed concerns about construction traffic impacts related to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>Third, since this will create considerable congestion at Taylors Ferry during construction, I would also advocate inclusion of a benefit for that particular neighborhood. Specifically, the widening of the road at Taylors Ferry and Capitol Hwy. That intersection is already backed up for blocks on a typical weekday during rush hour. If additional lanes can be created as part of this project, the neighbors affected by the construction will see a benefit beyond the light rail, which may help ease their burden.</p>	<p>EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p>
I201	German, Brett	<p>This is fine with me as long as you get road widening and SIDEWALKS on SW Lesser Rd from Haines Street to PCC Sylvania and Barbur Blvd. Thank you.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle mobility and station access improvements.</p>
I202	Gerould, Ilan	<p>Rating 1 Two of the biggest areas for ridership (OHSU and PCC Sylvania) are dodged and what we've been presented with is a line that would increase overall ridership by 8% of doing nothing, and creating connection challenges with both OHSU and PCC, while missing also missing the urban villages of Multnomah Village and Hillsdale. This project now has too many missed opportunities for the amount of money that is to be spent on it. From other light rail lines in the region, we know the problems that at-grade rail lines bring (mainly drivers crashing into trains or driving on tracks) yet we still want to spent billions of dollars on a design that doesn't address those problems , avoids major destinations, and will still be slower than driving? Scrap this and start over please.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 12 regarding your support for improved connections to PCC-Sylvania and OHSU. It is TriMet's preference to grade separate all light rail crossings. However, this is not always feasible due to budget constraints. Overhead catenary poles are still required on structures, utility relocations are still required everywhere there is a bridge column, and traffic signals will need to be adjusted with because of changed sight distances created by a structure. Typically, elevated guideway is significantly more expensive than guideway that runs at-grade. Where at-grade crossings are proposed, TriMet ensures they are designed and built to the most current safety standards. Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p>
I203	Gibbon, John T	<p>I write this comment to provide my personal and very conditional support for the IRP presented by staff. I am also presenting my semiprofessional opinions regarding the practical adequacy of the DEIS provided for this project. That opinion is based on, what is admittedly now dated training in environmental law, is, that while the DEIS probably dots all the correct transportation DEIS Is and crosses all required Ts, it should not be much relied on by decision makers in making the IRP. In my opinion, as written it cannot support conclusions either that the project can be effectively built or operated or as proposed, that it avoids significant environmental impacts to the communities of the Southwest Corridor through which it passes. Because I am not particularly conversant with transportation DEISs I cannot criticize the work as nonresponsive to the criteria that it must meet. Having received my environmental education in the earliest days of the Environmental Impact Statement's history I can only say that, taking the long view, it is unfortunately that appears from this work that such documents, that once offered the promise of improving and broadening the "cost benefit" analysis of public projects, appear to have because an additional hand maiden to whatever particular project they analyze. In the case of the SW Corridor this results in an extensive document addressing a number of transportation related issues that in the end operates on the assumption that more or less ignore any evaluation of the physical limitations of the route to discuss how the project can be blended into the growth and change "planned" for the area. This unfortunately occurs without realistically appraising how the any of the proposed alternatives will do anything but exacerbate the deficiencies found in Portland's and Washington County's due to their MS4 management programs. Besides a lack of analysis related to storm water impacts, which in the case of the Barbur-Capitol Highway / I-5 Crossroads results in the recommendation of an initial route that almost certainly will offset its costs savings with storm water and transportation mitigation costs , the DEIS fails to address in any meaningful way how the combination of elevation and weather events will impact the safe operation of the system. An honest analysis of Refinement 2 should not only note that while Woods Creek's natural channel originates near SW Taylors Ferry Road and Capitol Highway, in the area to be directly impacted by the proposed elevated crossing, but also that the streams water flow actually is sourced .3 of a mile to the southwest near the SW Barbur-SW Luradel intersection. It should noted that this area is then actually this is natural summit that must be addressed in operations through the Crossroads to 53rd Avenue. This is significant because it means in that approximately .4 of mile distance nearly 100 feet of elevation will need to be dealt with. This in area certainly often exposed to significant winds and not unusually significant snow or icing events. This lack of rigorous analysis concerning what will obviously the most demanding section of this project and, if built, I suspect of the entire MAX system leads to me one reluctant conclusion I have to recommend to the SW Corridor decision makers a recommendation that I, fairly well attuned to the history of trying to bring light rail to the SW Corridor and the current politics of the project, am incredibly reluctant to make, MOS. I make this recommendation only because, having evaluated the Crossroads challenges from several perspectives, I believe that the ultimate cost of resolving that problem in any responsible manner is most likely to be so expensive that reaching beyond downtown Tigard at this time is so likely to produce a LRT extension that is so threadbare on it's opening day as to not be credible with either the region's voting public or national decision makers. Thank you for your consideration of this testimony.</p>	<p>Both the Draft EIS and Final EIS evaluate environmental impacts of the Project, and are compliant with the National Environmental Policy Act. Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis. Please see Section 4.10, Water Resources, of this Final EIS regarding your concerns about stormwater impacts. TriMet has existing policies and procedures for inclement weather, including plowing, sanding and deicing. The elevations in the Southwest Corridor are not significantly different than elevations elsewhere on the MAX system. In your comment, you expressed concerns about impacts to Woods Creek related to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B. In your comment, you also expressed a preference for a minimum operable segment (referred to as terminus options in this Final EIS) instead of the Preferred Alternative. Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS to learn more about the terminus options studied in the Final EIS.</p>
I204	Giguere, Olivia	<p>I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I205	Gonzalez, Nozomi	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I206	Goodale, Anne	My husband & I vehemently oppose this plan, especially routes C1 & C3. The traffic problems are already bad on Bonita Road during commuting hours, and they would be horrific if you set up park & rides on to Bonita, especially if you ran the track along I-5. A lot of great businesses near Bonita & Bangy Road would be seriously impacted with routes C1 & C3 to make room for the track & the park & ride. In addition, all 3 alternatives (C1, C2 & C3) would create traffic gridlock in Bridgeport Village -- an area which has been beautifully developed during the past 10 years. Again, too many businesses would be negatively impacted. The park & ride areas which currently exist is already filled to capacity because of the widening of I-5. The back-ups on I-5 exits to get to the proposed new Light Rail park & ride area would be horrendous. The current express bus from Bridgeport Village to downtown Portland is great. We also are concerned about the impact on the crime rate in our neighborhood. TriMet has not done a good enough job of protecting light rail riders in the Portland area and preventing non-paying riders from riding the Max lines. If you build this light rail, our property values will drop significantly due to increased congestion & crime problems. We will be forced to sell our home and move to a safer, quieter neighborhood. PLEASE DO NOT PROCEED WITH THIS VERY EXPENSIVE PROJECT! Thank you.	In your comment, you expressed specific concerns about the I-5 alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Alternatives C1 and C3 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.  Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and locations.  Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.  Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime and fare enforcement.  Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.
I207	Goodman, Rachel	I am concerned that promised improvements to Sw Capitol Highway/ Barbur Blvd crosswalks are being shelved in favor of the lightrail project. Another concern is the businesses which will be displaced I suggest at least doing he crosswalk improvements first as it is a safety issue. I am in favor of public transportation and certainly use it myself but am concerned about priorities.	Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle improvements included in the Project.  Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.
I208	Gordon, Jane	I would like to know why you are not planning to use/link existing rail tracks, with likely improvements required, in several places including Main St. in Tigard, another that runs near Bridgeport Village (roughly parallel to Sequoia Pkwy) and another through Lake Oswego between Hwy 43 and the river that run all the way to the south waterfront and then link to the streetcar?  It seems that even with improvements and additions, it would be more cost effective and MUCH LESS disruptive than using Barbur Blvd. The tracks I mentioned are on flat terrain, have been around for ages and not subject to landslides (like Barbur Blvd.) or major sequelae from catastrophic events like earthquakes.  I would appreciate a response via email.	Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for using existing rail tracks instead of SW Barbur Boulevard.
I209	Gordon, Jane	1. I think additional bus service is a more flexible solution [buses can be of many sizes, fuels, routes]. Bus service can be modified at will for emergencies, weather, population, routes, etc. Light Rail is limited, expensive, proving to be dangerous and often hard to get to (which will be more of an issue with the SW terrain and people being expected to get off the hills down to a rail route). 2. If you are really going to do light rail, put it along the highway for its entire route. Leave the roadways for alternatives - be it car (with or without a driver!), cycle or pedestrians. It will also be safer for the other non-rail travelers.	Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail.  Please see Master Response 15 regarding your support for an extended I-5 alignment.
I210	Goulet, Sherry	Rating 1  Far too many property acquisitions . Add cost of another \$1,000,000,000 with decades of legal fees. Impacts are too big for homes and businesses for all the designs shown. STAY NEXT TO I-5, and STAY OFF Barbur/Pacific Hwy. Savings will allow light rail to extend to Wilsonville or further. Alternatively stay next to existing railroad lines from Portland to Lake Oswego to Bridgeport. Even more money will be saved that can be used to extend the light rail past Wilsonville and well towards Salem. Provide big Park and Ride somewhere near Bridgeport or Tualatin. Overall savings might allow light rail to extend to Salem--the connection that is really needed for the SW Corridor.	Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.  In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.  Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the alignment to Wilsonville and Salem.  An alignment following the existing rail line along SW Macadam Avenue to Lake Oswego and then west to Bridgeport Village was not considered for the Project, because such an alignment would not meet the Purpose and Need of the Project. That alignment would also fail to support existing land use and transportation plans, including the <i>Southwest Corridor Land Use Vision</i> , the <i>Southwest Corridor Plan</i> , and the <i>Barbur Concept Plan</i> . Additionally, the <i>HCT System Plan</i> identifies the connection between Lake Oswego and Bridgeport/Tigard as meriting further analysis as part of a separate corridor study plan, and the corridor is outside of the identified Southwest Corridor. Separately, a rail connection between downtown Portland and Lake Oswego along SW Macadam Avenue has been previously studied as the Lake Oswego to Portland Transit Project. That project published a Draft EIS in November 2010; however, that project was suspended at the request of Lake Oswego. More information about the process by which the Preferred Alternative was identified can be found in Appendix I, Preferred Alternative Selection and Project Refinements, of this Final EIS.  Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and locations.
I211	Grand, Jeremy	Access to PCC from 68th is not horrible, but 53rd is a better walk.  Should serve both Tigard and Bridgeport. It would be great to include Tualatin too. Loop?	Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS, particularly Section 2.2.4, Preferred Alternative: Segment B, for a description of the connections to PCC-Sylvania.  The Preferred Alternative as studied in the Final EIS includes stations in the Tigard Triangle, downtown Tigard and Bridgeport Village.  Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the alignment farther into Tualatin.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I212	Grey, Eric	I work and study at NUNM in South Portland - I have been attending NUNM in some way since 2004. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, even with recent changes, especially for bicyclists and pedestrian and anyone with mobility difficulties of any kind. SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM - thank god! I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor, this seems like a great plan that will likely save lives in the long run.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I213	Griffin, Christopher	I am NOT in favor of the light rail going down the middle of Barbur. There are so few arterials left for auto traffic, and this would take one away. Yes, I know the "experts" say this will not affect auto traffic, but look at all other "superior" efforts on the part of metro and the city-- the result has consistently been a degradation of efficient use of pavement for automobiles. I say, SAVE THE ARTERIALS WE HAVE LEFT. No light rail in the middle of Barbur, please.	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.
I214	Grinnell, Alan	Whatever solution you settle on, please include a method to remove the traffic in our neighborhood at the west end of the Ross Island Bridge.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I215	Grinnell, Alan	Whatever the final plan, it should include car traffic changes at the west approach to the Ross Island Bridge, to eliminate congestion on neighborhood streets trying to get to the bridge.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I216	Gross, Ezra	Rating 5 No Comment	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I217	Grover, Mikailah	My name is Mikailah Grover and I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor. Thank you for your time,	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I218	Guild, George	While I applaud community effort to move us into the future with advanced and modern methods of transportation, I likewise do not want to lose recognized pillars of our community. I specifically do not want to lose the Village Inn restaurant in Bridgeport. Every effort should be employed to ensure the proposed transportation improvements do not adversely affect the Village Inn restaurant.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
I219	H, Jenna	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I220	Hadley, Bonnie	The two biggest problems with light rail are its inflexibility and price. There are much more economical, sensible ways to enhance service through this area, like buses. If there is a problem on the route a bus normally takes, it simply detours. Also, buses use existing multi-purpose infrastructure. Any light rail project is simply make-work for Metro, which desperately needs to be right-sized. NO LIGHT RAIL FOR THE SOUTHWEST CORRIDOR.	Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail.
I221	Hajdu-Paulen, Allison	Rating 5 Tigard triangle shops, downtown Tigard transport connections, and Bridgeport Village shops are all highly utilized areas.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I222	Hajdu-Paulen, Allison	I am very excited about the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project! So many times I would like to go into Portland by public transportation (to avoid traffic and parking issues) but it takes a long time on the bus and the MAX lines involved quite a drive to Sunset Station. Thank you for connecting Tigard! It would also be helpful to have the WES train run at all times of the day to connect Tigard to the west side.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. TriMet acknowledges your suggestion to expand the WES schedule to run at all times of the day.
I223	Halbert, Jenna	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur..	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I224	Hall, Aaron	I completely agree with the proposal to keep the the northern end of the alignment on Barbur versus putting it on Naito. The Gibbs Station absolutely needs to be as close to the base of Marquam Hill as possible for the many 1000's of riders who will be accessing jobs and services there on a daily basis. That connection must be as efficient and ADA accessible as possible given the sheer quantity	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>of people with disabilities who will need to use this station. Also, with accessibility in mind, it seems that Connection #2 is really the only one of the 4 options presented that would be acceptable for the disabled community. The other three options are convoluted and would be incredibly difficult for many people to navigate.</p> <p>Another major issue... when the new line branches off of Lincoln at 4th Ave and crosses I-405, it would be a huge mistake to have an at-grade crossing of Sheridan and Caruthers. Those intersections especially, along with the entire area around Duniway Park where Broadway, Terwilliger and Barbur converge, are major bottlenecks where cars frequently are backed up for blocks several times a day. It is one of the worst choke points in the city with traffic flooding between I-405, the Ross Island Bridge, Downtown, Pill Hill and Barbur. Blocking Caruthers and Sheridan a dozen times an hour, especially during peak hours, would make an already terrible situation exponentially worse. When the SW line crosses I-405, it only needs to remain on that overpass for roughly another 300+ feet until it clears both of those streets. Then it can come back down to grade before it reaches Hooker.</p>	<p>and concern about an at-grade crossing of SW Sheridan Street and SW Caruthers Street. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 9 regarding the Marquam Hill Connection.</p>
I225	Halstead, Erik	<p>The Southwest Corridor DEIS continues to perpetuate the continued bias of light rail by Metro and other regional "leaders", ignoring many facts and environmental impacts and overlooking other impacts, in an effort to push a pre-conceived light rail agenda.</p> <p>While Metro claims it is attempting to increase transit access and provide alternatives to driving, page S-2 is the most telling admission by Metro that this project is not designed to increase options - it is purely designed to cut bus service, forcing residents, and especially lower income residents, to drive on already congested local streets. "Bus routing changes: elimination or modification of bus routes to improve coverage and service levels and avoid duplicating light rail service (service hours reallocated throughout the corridor)" The DEIS has zero plan on how bus service will be reallocated (if so), and we have 30 years of experience with light rail construction in our region that proves, unquestionably and undoubtedly, that light rail has negative impacts on transit usage, especially with local, intra-community trips such as residence-to-shopping, residence-to-education, and other trips that are well established but do not follow Metro's sole "corridor" nor involve downtown Portland. Metro is depending on 4,200 brand new parking spaces to drive ridership, which at full capacity means at least 8,400 new vehicle trips throughout the corridor, many of which are replacing current transit-and-pedestrian trips.</p> <p>Further on page S-2 it is clear the goal isn't improving transit - it's specifically to build light rail:</p> <p>"The purpose of the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project is to directly connect Tualatin, downtown Tigard, southwest Portland, and the region's central city with light rail, high quality transit and appropriate community investments in a congested corridor to improve mobility and create the conditions that will allow communities in the corridor to achieve their land use vision. Specifically, the project aims to, within the Southwest Corridor: * provide light rail transit service that is cost-effective to build"</p> <p>Metro should not be in the business of acting as an agent for the light rail construction industry; rather it should be focused purely and simply on the needs of the taxpaying citizens and businesses throughout our region, providing the best service at the lowest cost. Nowhere, is Metro able to ascertain that light rail is the only, the best, or the most cost-effective option. Instead, we will be stuck paying for a project for 30 years, at a cost many times higher than some of the options Metro has refused to study (specifically, Bus Rapid Transit), at an operating cost that is so expensive, that we will be forced to cut transit elsewhere. Again, we have decades of experience that prove this, and just in the last ten years we have seen numerous rail-only investments in our region fail to pay off - we have absolutely zero transit growth despite a red hot population growth, and all-time traffic congestion. Numerous other cities have admitted that focusing on light rail investments is not achieving any goals for improving the environment, pollution, congestion, land use, housing affordability - simply put, it is ineffective. Is Metro, its employees, and its contractors, going to accept the responsibility should Southwest Corridor fail to meet any of its goals - will Metro's Councilors and employees be financially responsible for repairing the damage, when traffic congestion in Tigard explodes as a result of the loss of bus service, and the change in travel patterns so that former bus riders can drive to a park-and-ride?</p> <p>Metro's attempt to justify light rail as the only option is also flawed:</p> <p>"A light rail transit project in the Southwest Corridor is needed for the following reasons:</p> <p>* Transit service to important destinations in the corridor is limited, and unmet demand for transit is increasing due to growth."</p> <p>How does light rail expand the options? Simple - it doesn't. It actually eliminates nearly all bus service in the corridor and surrounding areas. Sherwood as an example will lose the 94 bus, leaving it with just the 93 bus once every half hour, and no rush hour service. Tualatin will lose its 96 bus with no transit access connecting it to Portland. King City will lose service. River Terrace, Murrayhill and South Beaverton remain well underserved; and will continue to be underserved despite Southwest Corridor.</p> <p>"* Limited street connectivity and gaps in pedestrian and bicycle facilities create barriers and unsafe conditions for transit access and active transportation."</p> <p>This is no justification for light rail; Metro has itself to blame for failing to provide transportation funding in our corridor for pedestrian, cycling and other safety improvements in the corridor that have nothing to do with light rail. Southwest Portland and Tigard are woefully underserved with good pedestrian access, and the Southwest Corridor doesn't fix it - it creates 4,200 parking spaces entrenching our auto dependency rather than provides neighborhood bus service with sidewalks and safe bus stops, to where residents don't even need a car.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period, including notifications to affected addresses.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project, as well as your concern that other modes besides light rail were not considered for this Project and your preference for bus rapid transit improvements instead of light rail.</p> <p>To learn more about the transportation modeling used to project ridership, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and locations, and Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS regarding traffic analysis related to park and rides.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle mobility and station access improvements.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to affordable housing.</p>

Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>"* Travel is slow and unreliable on congested roadways."</p> <p>Again this is no justification for light rail. We can see that our existing light rail network is itself slow and unreliable; nor has improved traffic congestion on those roadways. Despite 30 years of investment, Portlanders overwhelmingly choose the single-occupant motor vehicle as the travel mode of choice - over 80% of trips taken are by car.</p> <p>"* There are both a limited supply and a limited range of housing options in the Southwest Corridor that have good access to multimodal transportation networks. In addition, jobs and services are not located near residences."</p> <p>The Southwest Corridor not only does not provide housing options; it will actually make housing more scarce and less affordable. Tigard will lose over 100 apartment units in the Tigard Triangle with no replacement housing. Dozens of homes will be demolished. Again, as we have 30 years of experience, the housing that is built along a MAX line is universally not considered affordable housing, either to low income or to middle-class populations. This will only push these populations further away, requiring them to drive as a result of bus service cutbacks preventing a transit option.</p> <p>"* Regional and local plans call for high capacity transit in the corridor to meet local and regional land use goals."</p> <p>There was once a time regional and local plans called for a major freeway network in our region. Just because light rail existed in a 1980s-era plan does not mean we are legally or morally obligated to continue down a failed path.</p> <p>"* State, regional and local environmental and sustainability goals require transportation investments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. "</p> <p>Nothing in these goals states we must build light rail. Instead, we should be focused on how to reduce emissions, and we know with experience light rail has not accomplished this. Cities like Seattle and Vancouver, BC, which have heavily invested in bus service, are seeing reductions in air pollution and auto share trips taken; cities that have followed Portland's lead by disinvesting in bus service are seeing increased traffic and decreased transit use.</p> <p>On Page S-4, Metro is required to study alternatives:</p> <p>"S.3 Alternatives Considered This Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project Draft EIS considers a No-Build Alternative and several light rail alternatives. "</p> <p>Plainly, no realistic alternatives, such as enhancing bus service, Bus Rapid Transit (including "BRT-Lite" and fully built Bus Rapid Transit with busways) have been studied. This in and of itself flaws the entire DEIS, as there are no true alternatives being considered other than "light rail or bust". This violates the spirit and principle of even completing an Environmental Impact Statement.</p> <p>Until the public is given a true opportunity to study alternatives, this DEIS must be rejected, and light rail planning needs to cease. We the citizens deserve to know that our government is working for us - not light rail companies and developers. We want a transit system that works for us, and when we are being told our bus line is being reduced or cut in favor of a far-flung parking garage - that is not transit working for us. It is increasing traffic congestion and pollution in my neighborhood. Metro has a legal duty and obligation to serve each and every citizen fairly, equally, equitably, and honestly - and Metro has shown that it is clearly in the business of cutting bus service out of some perverse rail fetish, rather than serving the public.</p>	
I226	Hamilton, Joan	<p>I have been a long-time transit user and SW Corridor Concept Plan/Light Rail project supporter. I can see the value that light rail could provide to Barbur Boulevard because I've seen the development on North Interstate Avenue. Light Rail has improved North Portland neighborhoods' livability. I appreciate the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project for the development and movement that could happen on Barbur Boulevard in the future. Land on Barbur has been underused for decades. It is time to rebuild that old highway for future needs.</p> <p>I attended a Hillsdale Neighborhood Association meeting and saw how the project team has improved the proposed alignment on Barbur Boulevard by listening to previous comments. I support proposals for the alignment along the Barbur Woods, the proposed connectors to OHSU, a shared transitway for both buses and light rail, and new park and rides near freeway ramps. I attended a workshop on equitable developments and am pleased that the Equitable Development Strategy is included in the plan. We need sufficient low income and moderate housing for Barbur and its connected streets. (A young relative of mine who works for Intel was able to rent an apartment off Barbur for about \$700/month). Please focus on effective strategies such as land purchases to avoid total gentrification. Please hurry this project along -- some of us have been waiting for this light rail project for a long time! Thank you.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>In your comment, you support for the alignment in the Barbur Woods portion of Segment A (Inner Portland). Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 9 regarding the Marquam Hill Connection.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS for more details about the shared transitway and park and ride sizes and locations.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 18 regarding the Southwest Corridor Equitable Development Strategy (SWEDS) and your concerns about gentrification.</p>
I227	Hamilton, Marlene	<p>It seem absurd to build the line on Barbur when the Terwilliger curves need urgent fixing. Constant scary accidents and slowdowns ever day. Why not kill two birds with one stone? I have no doubt the cost of a line along Barbur will continue to grow as property owners demand adequate compensation. I will probably move if Barbur is chosen.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for improvements to the I-5 Terwilliger curve instead of light rail.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed concerns related to a center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I228	Hamlow, Jen	I am in support of bring light rail to the south/southwest side. We need something that moves outside of regular traffic, however, where possible. I'm not sure that reducing lanes for cars will help alleviate a lot - there's already too much congestion with the existing number of vehicles in the limited space. If you could add mass transit options, without also reducing lanes, the congestion of traffic would likely drop (or I'd hope). I'd certainly opt for riding the train if it by-passed car traffic. If it's going to be another street car situation, where it's faster to walk than take the street car, while ALSO adding more vehicle congestion, it's a waste of money.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard. To learn more about transit travel time and reliability, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.
I229	Handel, Dan	I support light rail transit for the region, it is a vital component of the regional transportation system. I look forward to seeing the land along the route used for transit-oriented development that is mixed-use and mixed-income.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for light rail. Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to affordable housing.
I230	Hangland-Skill, Mick	Rating 3 I think the route generally looks good. I'm concerned about the alignment on Barbur and the impact on existing traffic. Barbur is a great alternative route to I5 and shouldn't be tampered with unless improvements are made. I also think the traffic problems on Barbur should be addressed with the construction of the light rail line. That would include intersections at 217, I5/99W, Multnomah Blvd, Terwilliger Blvd, and the Ross Island Bridge exit. You can't have a successful project without addressing the critical issues with the existing route first.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.
I231	Hansen, Susan	Rating 1 this route only adds to the congestion in the 'crossroads area'.....an area which is already congested.....there is NO improvements to the intersection, just additional traffic with a 26 foot high light rail structure going thru a nature park. What is going to happen when IN ADDITION tolling is added to I5 ?? THIS NEIGHBORHOOD WILL ONLY BE ONE BIG CONGESTED PARKING LOT.....THANKS ALOT PORTLAND	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis. Tolls are not a committed project and therefore not considered as a project alternative. Any tolling program would incorporate its own traffic analysis, including the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project, as a committed project.
I232	Harding, Kathy	please allow more time to answer questions on the light rail project.	Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period, including the amount of time provided for the public to provide comment on the Draft EIS. Although the Draft EIS comment period ended on July 30, 2018, project partners have continued to conduct outreach and collect feedback on the Project during its advancement.
I233	Harding, Robert	How about making room at transit centers for privately run shuttle services to load and offload passengers to and from points of interest like Multnomah Village???	Separate from the Final EIS, the Project is developing a mobility hub framework to guide implementation of a variety of tools for patrons to access transit stations including rideshare, bicycle share, bicycle parking, shuttles, scooters, private car drop-offs and other options. Drop-off zones will be provided at select stations where conditions demonstrate a need. The Bridgeport, Hall, 68th, 53rd, Barbur Transit Center (TC), and 30th Stations are examples of stations likely to include drop-off zones.
I234	Harding, Robert and Kathy	First, and most importantly, your public comment period should be extended to receive more public comment. Why? Because the Capitol Highway intersection with Barbur Blvd. has been a thorn in the side of nearby residents for years - at least since 1983 when we began residence there together. Traffic backs up along Capitol Hwy in both directions. The freeway entrances and SW Taylors Ferry are all involved and exacerbate the congestion and lane changing difficulties in an already over-congested and very inconvenient intersection for which there are no alternate routes, making it unavoidable for local traffic. Second, it would be best to build a rail line overhead, above the metro transit center to facilitate connections with bus service. At this location, provide space for private shuttle passenger service to and from Multnomah Village and taxi service elsewhere. Finally, though obviously substantial thought has gone into the project already, more thought and input is necessary regarding about the suggestions in the second point above, all in light of the difficulties and input referenced in the first point above. So to reiterate, please extend and give more notice for public comment.	Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period, including the amount of time provided for the public to provide comment on the Draft EIS. Although the Draft EIS comment period ended on July 30, 2018, project partners have continued to conduct outreach and collect feedback on the Project. In your comment, you expressed a preference for an overhead light rail alignment at the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was not studied in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B. Separate from the Final EIS, the Project is developing a mobility hub framework to guide implementation of a variety of tools for patrons to access transit stations including rideshare, bicycle share, bicycle parking, shuttles, scooters, private car drop-offs and other options. Drop-off zones will be provided at select stations where conditions demonstrate a need. The Bridgeport, Hall, 68th, 53rd, Barbur Transit Center (TC), and 30th Stations are examples of stations likely to include drop-off zones.
I235	Hare, Anissa	I am so happy that we are expanding public transportation. The bus system has worked but it simply isn't as convenient as a max line. I've long thought we should have a max line on Barbur and didn't even know this program was being implemented until someone posted on NextDoor. THANK YOU. As a young professional who was unable to get a parking pass, I was taking two busses and a max to get to work. This will make so many commutes a million times easier.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I236	Harms, Dietrich	My family is in support of the SW corridor plan. Having light rail serve Barbur blvd, 99W, to downtown Tigard.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I237	Harrel, Wayne	I live a few blocks from the Barbur Transit Station and am excited about the new southwest MAX line. However, I think it should STOP at downtown Tigard and that the existing WES line should be modified to serve Bridgeport Village and points further south.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. In your comment, you expressed a preference for the Project to terminate at downtown Tigard in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), with WES service modified to serve destinations farther south. Termination of the transit line at

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		It seems a terrible waste to painstakingly create a parallel line for several miles through developed neighborhoods, when the WES line already flows through the general area. Instead, please upgrade the existing WES line to MAX standards and blend the two runs together. A short trunk line or shuttle from WES to Bridgeport Village is a far simpler and more affordable solution than a dedicated line from downtown Tigard that dead-ends in the Village.  Hopefully, I'm not the first to suggest this. I appreciate the invitation for feedback and look forward to the final solution.	downtown Tigard was studied as only as part of a minimum operable segment in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding the selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C and Master Response 10 regarding your preference for WES Commuter Rail improvements instead of light rail.
I238	Hart, Alicia	I'm looking forward to the max line. I work in tualatin and having access to transportation that goes to work without a 2 hour delay like the current bus system will greatly improve my ability to reduce my contributions to air quality problems. As we grow our city we need to continue to focus on infrastructure that will serve us for decades to come.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I239	Harter, Evan	Love the most recently proposed train route; also excited to see revamped roads, sidewalks, and bike lanes. Currently commuting from where I live takes an hour and 15 minutes if going by bus (with one transfer.) Driving is more feasible and only takes 15-20 minutes, but would love to take a moderately brief(no traffic/stress free) 30 minute train ride.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I240	Hawkins, Natlie	Rating 5 Increase metropolitan expansion!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I241	Helmsworth, Chris	I am very much in favor of this plan. I envision the day when I will not be able to drive. Tge time to put in transportation like this was ten years ago. So I guess doing it now is the best possible alternative. I have seen how people who live along the other max lines I have come to depend on it. It cannot be buikt soon enough in my mind.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I242	Hennessy, Shaun	I think a MAX down the SW corridor is a good idea, and will help to relieve congestion from Barbur Blvd.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I243	Hensel, Maripat	I have followed this project since the outset and early on I attended Metro meetings about the SW Corridor whenever possible. I want Metro and all of the jurisdictions to examine this project holistically.  For background, I am still one of the supporters for bus rapid transit (BRT) service, such as what my hometown Pittsburgh PA will pursue. The hills in the Pittsburgh area are very similar to those in SW Portland and so are the number of bridges. However, with that option off the table my light rail preference for the alignment is to head along Barbur for the entire route - even at the 7 intersections area at the Crossroads (Barbur to Capitol/ with I-5 ramp).  I know we are still in the planning stage, however, I think we need to have some public gauge and clarity on the timing and ways funds for this large project will be secured. I understand some jurisdictions and/or counties will fund expanding Hwy 217 with project funds and others will focus on light rail per se. This information makes the project much more complex for the public to review.  My concerns at this point are with the funding for this project - no matter what alignment you select. Moving from the Eastside of Portland to the hills of SW Portland includes significant topographic and seismic hurdles.  When we include SW Portland transportation needs that have been promised for years from the City with the new needs for this project including possible bridge upgrades to meet Federal and/or State requirements, we should clearly establish early information about overall funding requirements. Residents, businesses and jurisdictions are getting weary.  When we finally find an option that satisfies neighborhoods, businesses and Cities, we may not be able to finance what a majority of residents are interested in supporting. Please don't get us behind one option and then change it so significantly that trust is lost.  * I have not seen any studies that integrate housing and what alignment changes may do for real estate development. * I have not seen any studies about how this project would play out if we move toward tolls on I-5 and I believe that is something that also needs to be examined. * I'd like to see some review of plans for autonomous vehicles - or, at least ways to plan out accordingly for this option which will be front and center by the time this project is finished in 2027 or 2028. Within Multnomah County, our taxes have increased, our water is more and more expensive, the recent PPS Bond Measure did not raise enough funds, so schools will need more and we know the Multnomah County Library also needs to expand and wants to raise funds. Tax payers can only take on so much of this additional transportation burden.  I realize the SW Corridor project includes multiple jurisdictions, however, I do not have a good way of knowing at this time if my contribution commitment will be the same or different from the contributions other counties will need to put into the project.  Even though I may be able to pay for this project, my children do not have the same funds available for a surge in taxes to ensure this project gets adequate funding. They do not live along the proposed light rail route to gain value from light rail from Portland Center to Bridgeport Village without a transfer to another mode of transportation. (For those off 99W -- where the traffic is unpredictable at best, even when you are on the bus this is a tough package to buy into.)  When work in Portland often requires movement from one place to another during the day, an independent vehicle needs to be a choice that is modeled for a certain part of the population with considerations for seasonal adjustments. The 18-50 age group is the demographic that will use the service that is built at the completion of the project. I hope their needs and voices are being sought out and that your data scientists and models take younger residents into consideration.	Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus rapid transit improvements instead of light rail.  In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.  To learn more about how the Project would be funded, see Section 5.3, Cost and Funding Evaluation, of this Final EIS. Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to housing and development at park and ride lots. Tolls are not a committed project and therefore are not considered as a project alternative. Any tolling program would incorporate its own traffic analysis, which would include the Project as a committed project.  The effects of widespread adoption of autonomous vehicle technology are not reasonably foreseeable and are not analyzed as part of the Project's traffic analysis. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.  Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		Some type of forecasting should be shown before the alignment final decisions are made for the various alternatives, especially if you are going to get onto the ballot in 2020 for the election year vote.	
I244	Herms, Dana	I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists, bus riders and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I245	Hickey, Elinor	I'm really looking forward to a SW transit line that is more than just the buses! I live on the east side and don't own a car, and love the access I have to the Orange line and to the bike lanes.  Of the alternatives, I vote:  A1 B1 - keeping the access off the I-5 makes it easier for people not in cars to access C4	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.  In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.  In your comment, you expressed support for the Clinton-Railroad alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Alternative C4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.
I246	Higgins, Stephen	I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur..	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I247	Hill, Rachel	Is there a time to comment on questions/suggestions for mitigating noise etc? We live off of the corridor and if the MAX will be using I-5 or Barbur for the alignment, our entire street (which parallels) would like to talk about a sound wall.	Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of this Final EIS, regarding concerns about noise and vibration.
I248	Hill, Rachel	We live on the Terwilliger Curves (on Custer just below Barbur). This street receives a lot of I-5 noise because of the curves. If the light rail project is running up that alignment, we would like to propose that a sound barrier (a low one) be used to help mitigate the sound of both the light rail and the highway from a street that receives a lot of traffic noise as it is.  I also work in Salem and take the bus from Wilsonville. The amount of people in cars (single occupant cars at that) coming from Wilsonville and inward in the morning and the reverse in the evening is staggering. Why is the light rail not extending out to closer to the edge of the UGB?  I also think that making better transit connections to the transit companies that serve Salem is important. Our State government is there and a great deal of people commute from Portland to Salem. It would be great for their to be better linkages to Cherriots or even create a line that goes to Salem. Thank you.	Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of this Final EIS, regarding concerns about noise and vibration.  Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the alignment to Wilsonville or Salem.
I249	Hinamon, Dori	I just wanted to let you know that I think this idea is brilliant.  I believe it will make a huge difference for people who would rather get home faster than the drivers on I-5 .  I think having large Park and Ride areas at each major stop would help a lot for people that live far from the Max or a bus line or just don't to deal with riding a bus.  I would hope that this Max line would be named The Purple Line, to finish off the rainbow of the current Max Line colors.  Thank you,	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and locations.  Trains on the existing MAX Green Line will continue through Portland to serve the Southwest Corridor. To avoid confusion for current riders, it is TriMet's practice to postpone referring to a new line by its color until about a year before the new service begins, around the start of the public process to discuss potential bus service changes that will complement the new MAX service.
I250	Ho, Jh	Rating 1 This will not change anything. People will still get to where their going by driving. People do not want crime train.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.  Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime.
I251	Hobson, Jason	Rating 5 No comment	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I252	Hogan, Adam	By the time Portland's Transportation department wants to start this newest max line, it will be out dated due to self-driving cars. But of course the main reason this is done is due to unions forcing more trimet lines that the majority of people don't want. That is why this is never put to a vote, it is always voted down. I want to be on the record saying it is a stupid and selfish idea. I understand why Washington didn't want the infectious disease of trimet coming into their state and refused the ultimatum of having it on the Columbian Crossing bridge. It is cheaper to give everyone Ubers (If you divide 1.2 billion by 70 million rides = \$17 per ride) for the cost of what is spent on keeping trimet going. It sucks and anyone who supports it sucks. Thanks for wasting more tax payers money.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I253	Holdahl, Terry	<p>Well, good evening. Again, my name is Terry Holdahl, H-O-L-D-A-H-L. I'd like to preface my remarks with the fact that I'm a -- I'm a very good, very big proponent of mass transit. I think that as our region and our local areas are growing, we need to do something better than just driving a car back and forth, and of course the light rail is a huge component of that.</p> <p>However, it needs to be -- needs to be used in a way that is -- is less invasive to -- to specifically small businesses that they really don't have the power to -- to stop something like this. This is a huge undertaking, of course. Just as a personal note, I work for a business in the area and we utilize The Village Inn quite extensively as a meeting location. It is -- it is a community center in a sense. There's nothing else like it close to work where my offices are. The parking is always available unlike, you know, areas around there where you are going to have to pretty much fight somebody off to take a parking space. The Village Inn is -- is a perfect location. And as a matter of fact, when we have meetings there</p> <p>I rarely have to -- have to tell my guests where it is. It's usually, oh, so it's Village Inn again? Yeah, it's The Village Inn. So, again, I think that there are some alternatives that, you know, that can work well into this. I kind of wonder where the west fits into all of this. I mean, that's been working pretty well as far as I can tell. And is there any opportunity to expand the west that would not be as invasive to the other -- other locations within -- within that Bridgeport area? Is the sole purpose of this to serve the Bridgeport location? I certainly would hope not. Certainly not to the detriment of other businesses within the area. I know it is a destination and it is kind of a central spot for the -- for the mid valley but, you know, there's got to be a better way for this. The Village Inn, you know, it's been there for -- for well over 30 years, a third generation company. You know, we've utilized this, as well. I understand -- I know for a fact, I was there when -- when Bridgeport Village actually moved The Village Inn to the current location because, you know, it didn't fit into their -- their model at the time. I would hope that Tri-Met would actually consider that, as well. How many times does a business need to be moved and still be able to survive? And I don't believe that this particular move would allow it to survive. I thank you for allowing me to comment.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.</p>
I254	Holland, Ann	<p>I work at NUNM Health Center Lair Hill in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our clinic is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. I bike to work, and really have trouble getting across the street safely. I was also a student at the NUNM campus for six years, and I struggled to get to and from the bus safely. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comment.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
I255	Hopkins, Craig	<p>My name is Craig Hopkins. I live in Tigard and I've lived in Tigard for sometime, and have had the pleasure of interacting with the city government in terms of citizen advisory activities.</p> <p>I'm a small business owner. I run a service business that covers the metro area. We have roughly a dozen and a half employees that work out of our business, and they come from all parts of the region. The biggest encumbrance to the efficient function of our business is traffic congestion. There are other encumbrances but in terms of the efficiency of movement, in order to do what we do well, is affected significantly by traffic congestion.</p> <p>None of our employees have consistently used public transportation. A few have tried; it doesn't work for them, try as they might to make it work. Public transportation, in my opinion as a small business owner with a service business that needs to use conventional transportation with service vehicles, looks upon light rail as a system that will not do anything to help alleviate or mitigate or have a positive effect on traffic congestion. Growth will come. People will bring their vehicles. And what we need to do with the money that's available to improve transportation is to improve the systems that work, and that's roads. Thank you.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for roadway improvements instead of light rail.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p>
I256	Hughes, Dave	<p>Rating 1</p> <p>Stop making current traffic worse. I would support the "waste" if the plan eliminated grade crossings and did not cause more gridlock. I can put up with construction inconveniences. If the route is improved with a shuttle service, why can't a shuttle(bus) be the whole solution?</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>It is TriMet's preference to grade separate all light rail crossings. However, this is not always feasible due to budget constraints. Overhead catenary poles are still required on structures, utility relocations are still required everywhere there is a bridge column, and traffic signals will need to be adjusted with because of changed sight distances created by a structure. Typically, elevated guideway is significantly more expensive than guideway that runs at-grade. Where at-grade crossings are proposed, TriMet ensures they are designed and built to the most current safety standards.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail.</p>
I257	Hughes, Tami	<p>I am concerned about the light rail being built through downtown Tigard. I am worried that the light rail will take away from the feeling Tigard is striving for with the downtown area. I feel that Tigard residents enjoy the small street experience (although additional restaurants and activities will increase the appeal). Having Max taking up so much space throughout downtown will take away from the charm of the downtown. If Max travels through the Tigard Triangle, I believe that many commuters will use the system to travel to work. I don't feel like there are many who will from the downtown area as parking is limited.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed concerns regarding a light rail alignment through downtown Tigard in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as part of Alternatives C1, C2, C3, C4 and C5 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p> <p>To learn more about ridership projections for specific stations, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I258	Humann, Alyssa	Walking and biking in South Portland is not just aggravating, but impossible. Even going to a nearby park requires a drive in the car. I vote for whatever solution helps alleviate the complete disconnection of this neighborhood. Whether that means the light rail goes down Naito or not, there's need to be a complete overhaul of that parkway and and it's connection to the Ross Island Bridge.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I259	Humann, Dalton	Summary: I support the A2-BH alternative for the reasons of reconnecting the Lair Hill-Corbett (aka: South Portland) neighborhood. This project will have a massive impact for all the affected cities and neighborhoods within. My focus on this project is in the newly designated "South Portland" neighborhood. This transit project will be a defining element in Portland's sixth sextant that is currently inadequate and inaccessible to bicyclists and pedestrians. My hope is that this project will act as a zipper to a historic neighborhood that's been neglected for decades since the Parkway and Ross Island Bridge ramps carved through it. The A2-BH alternative will provide the necessary connection for the neighborhood to prosper while the additional cost will be justified in the new development opportunities made available.  Thank everyone for their fantastic effort in making this process a success.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I260	Humphrey-Keever, Debra	Concerned about the impact on our view of Mt Hood with the I-5 overcrossing via Taylors Ferry. Would like to have more information on the height of the crossing that is proposed.  Also concerned about the appearance of the crossing proposed, as it cuts right thru a neighborhood. Want to make sure the crossing can blend into the neighborhood and not destroy the feel for the families that live there.	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
I261	Humphrey-Keever, Mary Ann	I-5's Taylor's Ferry cross-over will affect property values as well as property view of Mt. Hood (property is 9920 SW 48th Ave, southern border is ours and state fence line. Plus noise and visual sources.	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
I262	Hutchinson, Leslie	Please go all you can to save this building by John Storrs. It could work well in many places for many uses and I strongly urge you to explore all avenues to see that it is repurposed.	Please see Master Response 9 regarding the Marquam Hill Connection and the Congregation Ahavath Achim Synagogue.
I263	Hutchinson, Leslie	No	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.
I264	Hyndman, Vicki	Rating 2  If you cut Barbur Blvd down to one driving lane in each direction, you've taken away the only alternative to I5. Just this morning, I5 was backed up from Haine St north to downtown and drivers were using Barbur as an alternative. If that alternative is minimized, you will create gridlock on all routes. I think the line should run along I5, where there is room already.	Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard.  In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
I265	Ierulli, Joseph	<i>This comment was submitted as a PDF with text overlaid on maps and photographs. Please see Appendix J3, Original Copies of Draft EIS Comments, of this Final EIS for the complete, original comment. Below are the headings of each page in the comment:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Public Comments with Proposal</li> <li>· Problem: South Portland is a 'Traffic Sieve'</li> <li>· The Worst Part</li> <li>· The Water Avenue 'On-Off Ramp'</li> <li>· Proposal: Wall Off Water at Barbur</li> <li>· Proposal: Wall Off Water at Barbur</li> <li>· Direct Traffic Flow Away From Residential</li> <li>· Thomas, Lowell, Water, Abernathy and Lane</li> </ul>	Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.  The Project would not close the intersection of SW Water Avenue and SW Barbur Boulevard; instead the intersection would be reconfigured in the Preferred Alternative to a more perpendicular intersection to discourage high-speed turns from SW Barbur Boulevard.
I266	Itscorrupt, Disolvemetro	Stop diverting funds for projects that have proven to have failed. Completing the interstate project from the 1960's and fixing bottlenecks is more important. The housing crises is metros fault also. Let's dissolve metro! The most corrupt organization on the west coast	Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for highway investments instead of light rail.
I267	Ivory, Ed	Rating 1  I do support the light rail. It's critical to keep Portland from becoming a transit nightmare. However I do not support the penny "wise" pound foolish refinement 2. Please do not put your heads under the sand. Take a deeper look at the Capitol Highway overpass and how abysmally unsafe it is. Please conduct the all of the intersection studies and then look at the aggregate data.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
I268	Jacobs, Gloria	I am in full support of the light rail project. I have a growing concern, however, with the crossing on Bonita Rd and the placement of transit centers there. Already, between the freight trains and the WES, Bonita regularly gets backed up because the traffic flow has to stop to allow for the trains to pass. Furthermore, the freight trains frequently stop and block both SW Hall Blvd and Bonita, which disrupts auto, bike, and foot traffic. Adding light rail to the mix will make it even worse. Furthermore, the noise of whistles blowing plus the rumbling of the trains is quite disruptive. If there were any possibility of making the Bonita crossing (the freight, WES, and light rail) above grade, it would make rail a positive factor in this neighborhood rather than the negative one it has become.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.  Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of this Final EIS, regarding concerns about noise and vibration.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I269	Jeffreys, Tiffanie	<p>So I'm Tiffanie. I'm from Tualatin, and I just wrote down some concerns. I would appreciate having less difficulty to find answers to our questions, it be easily accessible and understood by the entire community. I'm aware this may be difficult but it would be much appreciated by the community, whether they are referred to one specific website or printed packets made accessible to us during community events, or by the mail, it would be appreciated.</p> <p>I'm also concerned about the Trimet police and environmental impact that will be occurring during this massive project; the animals, air, water and other pollutants and disruptions.</p> <p>I'm asking for more consideration of the community in these ways, and if we can be more involved in the discussions of these concerns. Thank you.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period, including public meetings and outreach to different communities. Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about transit police.</p> <p>Both the Draft and Final EISs document the environmental impacts of the Project, as well as mitigations to avoid or reduce the effects of these impacts.</p>
I270	Jenkins, Joseph	<p>-Plan should include replacing the trestles on Barbur. They are not seismically retrofitted and pose a significant risk to public safety in the event of an earthquake. Need room for bikes as well.</p> <p>-There is no room to bring light rail on Taylor's Ferry and it would significantly impact adjacent properties. This whole intersection configuration is already bottle-necked and overcapacity.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for replacement of the trestle bridges on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as part of Alternatives A1, A2-BH and A2-LA in the Draft EIS, and opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative, Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support of bicycle improvements included in the Project.</p>
I271	Jerónimo, Minerva	<p>My name is Minerva Jerónimo. I am here to support the MAX line, as long as a law attesting that there will not be an increase in rent is passed. By rent increase, I mean increases both in government and private properties.</p> <p>I moved to King City about a year ago. To go home and run my errands I have to cross Tigard. I've not been there for almost a year and I've already received a letter with a rent increase of \$50.00.</p> <p>It is a private property, and they say that Oregon law approves the rent increase. I approve the MAX line, as long as the rent does not increase.</p> <p>Thank you very much.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to affordable housing preservation and gentrification.</p>
I272	Johnson, Jay	<p>I vote in favor of improvement / project in Naito Parkway as I commute far and noticed how unsafe pedestrian and bicycling feels</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for the SW Naito Parkway alignment in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternatives A2-BH and A2-LA in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle improvements included in the Project.</p>
I273	Johnson, Joe	<p>I would like the SW route to go on Barbur instead of Naito, then along Barbur instead of I-5. I am concerned about the reduced bus frequency in the SW corridor. If moved to I-5, the route will 1) limit access along Barbur once bus routes are reduced, and 2) will cause more traffic on Barbur to access these amenities for local residents, like grocery stores and doctor visits. In planning for the future, the route really ought to be a branch route to adequately capture the growth of Tigard. I really wish this branch route terminated in the downtown Tigard core, not just around Hall - if you are already building this SW corridor, just extend it a few more blocks into Tigard. Currently you are not actually serving downtown Tigard as claimed, and this will come back to bite you when Tigard voters realize. If this downtown station is truly not feasible, the branch route should at the very least cross Hall to get as close as possible. Thank you for including access/service to OHSU and PCC along this route. Overall, I am very excited about this route and want to thank you for the hard work you are putting into this project and the way in which you are engaging the community.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p> <p>In your comment, you also expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project.</p> <p>In your comment, you also expressed a preference for the branched alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Alternatives C5 and C6 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p>
I274	Johnson, Lindsey	<p>I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
I275	Johnson, M	<p>I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for a light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I276	Jones, Lara	<p>I live in Lair Hill, and while turning Naito Parkway into a surface street appeals, I agree with the preliminary decision to route the new MAX line up Barbur Blvd for the following two reasons: #1 Better access to the V.A. and hospital. The grade b/w Naito and Barbur is considerable...I think it fairer to go with the (slightly) faster ...and less steep route. #2 More of the houses/structures along Naito are of historic significance, and in the National Registry (our home included). The foundation on our house is already challenged by rainfall; I shudder to think what major construction might do to further those problems.</p> <p>***I have tried to notify as many invested parties as possible...there is a MAJOR flood/waterfall issue that occurs during heavy rains on SW Pennoyer St. PLEASE, if it is not flagged in the system [Tri-Met came out to look and told me it absolutely would be] -- PLEASE contact me! Our porch foundation has eroded, and we decided to not go through litigation. In making changes to the neighborhood, this issue is one that absolutely effects Naito as well, when water flows over the barrier between Pennoyer and Naito as well!</p> <p>Also, something need be done about the Ross Is Bridgehead + 3 hr. weekday rush hour backup on the West side.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative includes reconstruction in the area around SW Pennoyer Street and SW Naito Parkway, potentially including retaining walls. In this area, stormwater would be collected in a stormwater pond and then moved off-site.</p>
I277	Jones, Milton	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I support the addition of light rail to our transportation options in SW Portland. The project should not, however, compromise the capacity of Barbur Boulevard/Highway 99 to serve motor vehicle traffic.</li> <li>2. Care should also be taken to ensure that nearby residential neighborhoods do not become "park and ride" parking lots for SWC commuters.</li> <li>3. Do not adversely impact Barbur Foods. It is a Portland institution of great value. It is probably the most diverse gathering place in the city.</li> </ol>	<p>Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard.</p> <p>Regarding potential spillover parking into residential neighborhoods, TriMet will work with local jurisdictions after project opening to assess parking impacts and implement parking management policies as required.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p>
I278	Jones, Milton	<p>Five preliminary comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Ridership south of the Tigard Transit Center looks pretty skinny. Ridership here needs to be brought up or you should closely question the value of this segment.</li> <li>2) You would get greater ridership from the southern reaches if you eliminate the closer in transit parking. Commuters from the south tend to drive in as far as they can and then take transit.</li> <li>3) At first glance, it looks like following Barbur/Highway 99 as far as you can (B-1 all the way) best accomplishes the goals of the project.</li> <li>4) The "crossroads" area is already a mess and you may make it much worse. It looks like the B-1 option may be best here. But this area is admittedly complex. Don't screw it up more than it is!</li> <li>5) If you can find an excuse to fix the daily traffic jam at 405/Broadway/Hwy 26 please do it. Commuter traffic from all directions ties this area up and it gets worse by the week. (Why there is no enforcement against blocking the intersection here is beyond my comprehension.)</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for considering these comments.</p>	<p>To learn more about ridership at specific stations, see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and locations.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a desire for solutions related to traffic near the Ross Island Bridgehead in Segment A (Inner Portland). Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A and Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p>
I279	Jones, Milton	<p>I do not see how the proposed initial route modification to avoid the Newbury and Vermont bridges can be accomplished without causing significant traffic backups on Barbur/Hwy 99 given the frequency of rush-hour rail service and the blockage of traffic that is evidently required for diverting it to the modified detour route.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for replacement of the trestle bridges on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as part of Alternatives A1, A2-BH and A2-LA in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
I280	Jorling, David	<p>This route should be designed so as to permit future expansion of a branch line from the current route as it passes Kruse Way/217. The branch should travel east on Kruse, which would be through the largest commercial area outside of downtown portland. The route would proceed to Boones Ferry Road and go south from there all the way to Bridgeport. I was disappointed that the City of Lake Oswego essentially gave up its seat at the table for this project. The development underway along Kruse Way and Boones Ferry will significantly worsen traffic congestion in the area, with all of its negative consequences.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 15 regarding your support for an extended I-5 alignment which would have brought the light rail along I-5 and past Kruse Way.</p>
I281	Joshu, William	<p>Ridership on MAX is down despite Portland Metro population up. Residents of the area are not asking for this. I would recommend using this money for road repairs, which are needed more than a MAX line that is not a priority. Also, there needs to be public information on yearly cost to taxpayers regarding manintence, compensation (salary plus benefits) to drivers.</p>	<p>To learn more about the transportation modeling used to project ridership, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>The estimated annual operations and maintenance costs for the Preferred Alternative and terminus options are provided in Section 5.3, Cost and Funding Evaluation, of the FEIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for roadway improvements instead of light rail.</p>
I282	Joyce, Patrick	<p>Very nice work, Metro. I like the thoughtfulness of the design and the process. We are excited about the positive changes this project will bring to Barbur and the communities it will serve.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p>
I283	Juric, Iva	<p>I do not approve Refinement 2- I am completely against it! Im concerned about the amount the noise and vibration impact in my house, loss of sunlight and the effects on the vegetation and animals living in the Woods Memorial park. I bought my house because of the proximity to the park, the tranquility of the trees and the quiet of the area and I DO NOT wish this to be disturbed.</p> <p>Im concerned that my property will loose in value because of the vicinity or the railroad.</p> <p>the proposed location of the Taylors Ferry alignment is at the headwaters of Woods Creek. Im concerned about the storm water issues that as is the city is unwilling to address, adding more infrastructure will additionally affect the storm water issues and quality of drinking water</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		I absolutely reject the Refinement 2!	
I284	Just, Jessica	<p>I support the SW Corridor Max line. I live on 55th and Taylors Ferry Rd. and commute to 12245 SW Myslony St, Tualatin, OR. I currently do most of my commuting by car, but would much rather commute by public transport and would consider using my bicycle for part of the commute. Currently, my work commute is not practical by public transport and I'm hopeful that the proposed SW Corridor line will change that.</p> <p>Some things to make my commute practical (assuming there's a SW Corridor line):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 - Better pedestrian and/or bicycle lanes down Taylors Ferry Rd from 80th to Capitol Highway - currently Taylors Ferry is unfriendly to to bikes and pedestrians, but it is impractical to use an alternate route out of the neighborhood</li> <li>2 - a pedestrian bridge over I-5 to connect Crestwood neighborhood with proposed 53rd and Barbur Blvd. Max station.</li> <li>3 - better transit opportunities to connect Bridgeport Max terminus to Tualatin and Sherwood via Herman Rd or Tualatin-Sherwood Rd.</li> </ol> <p>Thanks for all the work on the project!</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle mobility and station access improvements.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project.</p>
I285	Kaiser, Alex	<p>Rating 3</p> <p>I think it's key to get closer to the PCC Sylvania campus.</p>	Please see Master Response 12 regarding your support for a tunneled route through the PCC-Sylvania area.
I286	Kale, Mike	<p>Rating 5</p> <p>Please build light rail! Build for 2050, not 1950.</p>	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I287	Kalstrom, Sally	I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur..	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I288	Keating, Mike	The southwest corridor will be too expensive to build and also to maintain. It is so expensive to build that the numbers show that my granddaughter will be paying for a lot of it. This project is completely unnecessary. Here in Portland we are already having a hard time paying the city taxes including a toll on the major highways that the city wants to install; now with a new multi billion tax we, the working family, are going to have a ruff go of it.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.
I289	Kelch, Carlton	I work at the National University of Natural Medicine (NUNM) in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to and from our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor. Thank you.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I290	Kelley, Sarah	Hi! Love the project, but don't want to lose The Village Inn at Bridgeport. Please consider a different route.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
I291	Kepple, Kara	<p>Rating 5</p> <p>The bus system is pretty good here but it takes a really long time to get from Sherwood to Marquam Hill and the surrounding areas. A MAX line would help reduce the time spent commuting not only for current bus riders but also for commuters in their cars. This could greatly increase ridership.</p>	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I292	Keroes, Joshua	<p>Boy, oh boy, was I excited to hear that we'd be getting MAX just a few blocks from my house. "Sure, I'm definitely in favor of that!" Then I went through the DEIS plans, attended meetings, and went through the plans in more depth.</p> <p>It's not worth it. Holy Bajeesus, is it not worth it.</p> <p>In particular, design Refinement 2 is the worst. THE WORST! It would run right over Woods Creek, a protected nature preserve, add noise, and depending on how it's engineered, slow down competing traffic (the details were light in the DEIS). Many of my neighbors would be forced to move, too. Businesses in the Southwest Crossroads intersection would be negatively affected too. No thank you. No thank you, a whole lot!</p> <p>Maybe this MAX line will make sense some day, but there are more pressing concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. First, improve Southwest Crossroads intersection. It's already a bottleneck. Fix it first or it will just cost to fix it later.</li> <li>2. Improve pedestrian and bike safety. There are few safe roads leading to the proposed transit station location, especially for bikes. If we expect these riders to use transit, we have to make it safe for them to do so. This ties in with Vision Zero.</li> <li>3. Add more express busses, at least as a temporary measure. They're far cheaper, can be put on the road tomorrow, can go more places, and don't negatively affect current traffic patterns.</li> </ol>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for improvements to the Crossroads intersection instead of light rail.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support for improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 15 regarding your support for an extended I-5 alignment.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of this Final EIS, regarding concerns about noise and vibration.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>NO on Refinement 2. NO to this MAX line. YES on Busses.</p> <p>PS If this bond does do through, then I'm in favor of sending MAX down I-5 all the way. I worked above the 7th Ave MAX station for years. Trains squeak, and I wouldn't want that for any neighbor. This route would adversely affect residents, businesses, and street traffic the least. In particular, it will be the quietest solution, because the walls of the I-5 channel already direct noise up to the sky instead of out through the neighborhoods. Every other plan would be louder. Every other plan would slow down traffic on the side streets, too.</p>	
I293	Killingsworth, Serge	<p>Good evening. My name is Serge Killingsworth. I'm a member of the Southwest Corridor Citizen's Advisory Committee and a member of the City of Tigard Pedestrian and Bicycle Subcommittee of the Transportation Advisory Committee. I support the IRP and I would like to draw attention to some benefits this project provides to the citizens of Tigard, who might not even use the light rail. First, the IRP stipulates a bridge across Highway 217, that is to include a pedestrian and bicycle path. This bridge will allow cyclists to avoid the difficult and dangerous crossing on Pacific Highway. Motorists, too, will be benefited by not having to interact with cyclists where Pacific Highway bike lanes cross the 217 onramps. Second, the extension of Ash Avenue across the railroad tracks of downtown Tigard will provide a better alternative to Hall Boulevard or Main Street for cyclists to get across the tracks, as well as provide additional passage for motorists. Third, the IRP stipulates an extension of 75th Avenue across Dartmouth, providing cyclists and pedestrians a safe option for crossing Dartmouth.</p> <p>So these three projects are generally overshadowed by the big picture of the light rail, but these kinds of things are very important to our pedestrians and cyclists and motorists as well. Thank you.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle mobility and station access improvements.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include an extension of SW Ash Avenue across the railroad tracks in downtown Tigard.</p> <p>Although the Initial Route Proposal studied in the Draft EIS did not include an extension of SW 75th Avenue across SW Dartmouth Street, both the Draft EIS and Final EIS include an improved crossing at SW Dartmouth Street at SW 70th Avenue.</p>
I294	Kim, Gabrielle	<p>I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
I295	Kimmelshue, Megan	<p>I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
I296	Kisor, Michael	<p>I have concerns about Design Refinement 2, as proposed. Firstly, the lack of pedestrian and bicycle facilities, which otherwise would have been addressed by the B1 alignment. Design Refinement 2 also impacts a number of businesses and residences, and encroaches on a wetlands area.</p> <p>I support a modification to Design Refinement 2, proposed by Dean Smith of Ashcreek, which will preserve the overall objectives of the original design refinement, but with fewer negative impacts to the neighborhood. It should also have a lower cost as fewer properties and businesses need to be acquired/displaced.</p> <p>The modification includes these four elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative parallel route bypassing Taylors Ferry (see map below)</li> <li>2. Pedestrian and bicycle multi-modal path included on the aerial guideway structure over the freeway</li> <li>3. Pedestrian and bicycle multi-modal path from Taylors Ferry &amp; 48th to the aerial guideway</li> <li>4. Traffic signal at Taylors Ferry &amp; Capitol Highway, synchronized with the traffic signal at Barbur &amp; Capitol</li> </ol> <p>Should the alternate route of element #1 above not prove viable, or is otherwise not selected, elements 2 through 4 above should still be incorporated.</p> <p>Regardless of what option is chosen, a rapid flashing beacon for the I-5 offramp should be considered. Currently, that area represents a hazard to pedestrians and bicyclists.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 3 regarding your preference a new "Dean Smith refinement" near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was not studied in the Draft EIS, and opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center, which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Your request for a rapid flashing beacon for the I-5 off-ramp at SW Taylors Ferry Road has been shared with ODOT.</p>
I297	Kleinbach, Darl	<p>My home is approximately 12 feet from Barbur. I was just about to remodel my bathroom but light rail on Barbur will impact the value of my home so greatly I can't afford to I invest any more.</p> <p>I have a hard time understanding how light rail can be a greater priority than fixing the west approach to Ross Island Bridge. Evidently your staff hasn't noticed Naito, Corbett and Kelly Streets between 2:30 and 6:00 EVERY DAY.</p>	<p>Studies of the relationship between light rail investments and property values have tended to show either positive correlation or no significant impact. In other words, properties near light rail or streetcars tend to increase in value at either the same rate as, or somewhat faster than, other local properties without transit service.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I298	Klieber, Bill	In the past I lived in a metro area where mass transit was the preferred means for commuters to travel to work. One of the important advantages of the public transit was the ability of the trains and buses to have express service. Having only 2 tracks, one for each direction, makes that option nearly if totally impossible. The third rack also makes maintenance less disruptive.  If the option is to have literail with no express service, or bus service with express service the choice is use bus service. Please consider this information when making your decisions. Thank you.	The Project design includes dedicated trackway to provide consistent, faster travel time over transit service operating in traffic, and increased capacity. Each station skipped would save about 30 seconds in overall travel time, but would reduce service provided to each skipped station. The addition of a third track either at certain stations or throughout the route would significantly increase property acquisitions and neighborhood impacts without benefits to the adjacent neighborhood. Serving only the four highest ridership stations on the alignment would provide marginal travel time savings for some riders while reducing service to the remaining nine stations and significantly increasing capital costs. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative studied in the Final EIS is predicted to improve travel times over existing express service buses in the corridor. To learn more about transit travel time and reliability, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.  Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for express bus service instead of light rail.
I299	Knapp, Kelly	I just do not want to see car/auto/shuttle down my residential street.	Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS, particularly Section 2.2.4, Preferred Alternative: Segment B, for a description of the connections to PCC-Sylvania.
I300	Knier, Aimee	Please extend the max to tigar! Bringing it down Barbur will revitalize that street, slow traffic, and decrease the number of cars going through neighborhoods that don't live or work there! The only way we are going to survive the economic challenges of the future as a society is to invest in public services like good public transportation, public wifi and cheap utilities. Let's at least start with increasing our public transportation.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I301	Kormendy, Amy	Can't wait for it to be a reality. Not looking forward to the disruption of construction but the future vision is beautiful. Thank you!!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I302	Kosbau, Wayne	The Max line would best serve the neighborhood by staying on Barbur Blvd. It would be more accessible to families and elders. The two bridges on Barbur Blvd. (Newberry and Vermont) should be rebuilt, as they do are not fire and earthquake resistant structures as they stand now and do not have good bicycle and pedestrian access and safety. I suggest removing the flyover viaduct at SW Capitol and Barbur (Slavin) and make that intersection with a signalized stop to allow traffic to go up to Hillsdale and come down from Hillsdale to join Barbur Blvd. This will also moderate the speeding that we experience on Barbur along the "Woods" to the curve.  Please do not eliminate the bus line number 12, as it is a reliable local line that stops in the neighborhoods along Barbur Blvd. People from above and below Barbur take this line, and the proposed MAX stop is too far away.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in the Barbur Woods portion of Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied under Alternatives A1, A2-BH and A2-LA in the Draft EIS, as opposed to a separate structure to the east of SW Barbur Boulevard, which was studied as Refinement 1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.  Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS, specifically Section 3.3, Short-Term Transportation Impacts, to learn more about impacts to the SW Capitol Highway flyover. A signalized option was studied at one point, but it was removed from consideration because of its anticipated traffic impacts.  Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project.
I303	Kraft, Amanda	I am concerned about the disruption of local businesses (mainly Village Inn at Bridgeport and Barbur World Foods). These places are more than businesses they are meeting places for locals. Also, without Barbur Foods my access to healthy food selections is more limited (Fred Meyer & Safeway are too far to walk to).  I agree we need contiguous sidewalks along Barbur...along with planning design specifications to reduce the number of driveways; there needs to be more easements to access the existing building from major intersections (with crosswalks).  I have read the studies so far and was disappointed the steering committee didn't make more of an effort to diversify the respondents. I ride the bus several days a week from the Barbur Transit Station and never heard or saw media about the plan. I also live on Barbur Blvd and was never mailed information to comment. Lastly, I work in commercial real estate and have many clients with businesses along the route, they too were never contacted for comment on the proposed route and were surprised when I shared the plans.  I understand there would be additional funding sources if the route was on a street where bike and pedestrian issues could be addressed but I am very worried that so many homes and businesses would be affected. Additionally, in terms of responsible use of public funds goes I can't rationalize crossing an aquifer and wetlands to meet up with the existing Tigard TC. It would be far cheaper and environmentally sound to move the old, under-used transit center to the I-5 adjacent route and re-route the busses and PCC shuttle to the new transit center.	Please see Master Response 17 regarding property acquisitions and business displacements. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant. Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian improvements included in the Project. Your comment regarding a reduction in the number of driveways on SW Barbur Boulevard has been shared with the City of Portland. Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period, including notifications to affected addresses. Please see Master Response 15 regarding your support for an extended I-5 alignment.
I304	Krager, Carol	Hello, my name is Carol Craiger and I'm a Tigard resident and taxpayer in support of the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project. I looked at the initial route proposal. We've got some adjustments that are making it easier on small businesses. I think there's give and take whenever you put in big infrastructure like this and I think that there are some resources and help to -- to help with relocation. I've lived in the metro area most of my life and as a taxpayer I have helped pay for all of the other light rail lines. I hope now that the region will support our southwest corridor, which is the most logical next branch on this line.  One thing I wanted the planners to be concerned and aware of is that Tigard and Tualatin aren't really built on grid systems like Portland. It may be harder for people to get on a bus from neighborhood to neighborhood or subdivision to subdivision. Just be aware of that and please plan adequate parking. A lot of people would use this but they may drive their car to get on it. I've heard complaints about taxes. I know that transportation projects that are huge almost always subsidize, and I'm here to say this is -- this is what I want my tax money to go towards. We're looking at, you know, 70,000 more people. Think of the traffic now. Some of you might have been a little late tonight because of traffic. What is it going to be like, you know, by 2035? Whether we want that to	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and locations.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>happen or not, it's coming and we better get ahead of it. We better be prepared. And, then you know, on a personal note, probably by the time this is built I'll be retired. I won't be taking it to work. I'll be taking it to appointments, games, cultural events, hopefully visit my daughters and my future grandchildren if they can still afford to live in this area. And I look forward to that. What I don't look forward to would be explaining to them that, yeah, we knew this was coming. We knew that 70,000 people were moving to our area and we let this opportunity go by. I just -- to me, it's -- you know, if you don't wish to ride it or support it, that's your choice. You can sit in traffic and gridlock, but I think it's selfish and shortsighted to take the choice away from other people. We need options.</p>	
I305	Krager, Carol and Warren	<p>My name is Carol Krager and I am a Tigard resident and taxpayer here to speak in support of the SW Corridor Light Rail Project and the initial route proposal with modifications I have lived in the Metro region for most of my life. As a taxpayer I helped pay for the other light rail lines and associated improvements and now I hope that the regional voters will support the next logical branch- the SW Corridor line. Tigard is not built on a tight grid system like Portland. There can be a lot of space between arterials or between subdivisions. Be aware that many residents will need to drive to a Max line stop to use it an plan adequate parking lots.</p> <p>Transportation projects like this are almost always subsidized. They are big, expensive projects but they benefit many. This is where I want my tax money to go. I am in favor of efforts to provide an equitable housing strategy as part of this project. We are expecting 70,000 additional people in the SW Corridor by the year 2035! Whether we want this to happen or not it's going to, so we'd better be prepared. If people don't like the gridlock on our roads now, just imagine the additional demand on our transportation systems by 2035.</p> <p>If and when this is built I will probably be retired. I look forward to taking light rail to appointments, games, shopping, and visiting my children and future grandchildren (if they are able to afford housing in our area). What I would not look forward to is explaining to them that WE KNEW the population would grow, yet in 2018 WE FAILED to move forward on a light rail line in the SW Corridor. To those that do not wish to support or ride light rail, you do not have to get out of your cars. You can choose to sit in gridlock on 99W or 1-5. But please do not take that choice away from everyone else. That is just short-sighted and selfish.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and locations.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 18 regarding the Southwest Corridor Equitable Development Strategy (SWEDS).</p>
I306	Kranzler, Brooke	<p>We are absolutely not in favor of the proposed plan as we feel it is going to severely affect the living quality in our neighborhood. Please advise.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p>
I307	Krnak, Vitek	<p>Rating 5</p> <p>Love any extensions that removes obstacles and makes it easy for everyone to enjoy. Europe and Asia is 100 years ahead of us. About time to catch up.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p>
I308	Kunert, Charles	<p>I work at the National University of Natural Medicine in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
I309	Kung, Chung-Huey Nina	<p>Hi, good evening. My name is Chung-Huey Nina Kung. I'm here tonight as a Tigard resident and a member of the Tigard Chinese-American community to ask for an effective, efficient and affordable public transit system. Our current Tigard public transit system is ineffective, inefficient, nor affordable for us as working commuters, students, parents with young children, and seniors with disabilities. We badly need to access the city of Portland and our surrounding cities on a daily basis beyond only traditional commuter hours.</p> <p>Because the current job market and college regular class hours are not only 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. for working adults, but evenings, nights and weekends. Since parking in downtown Portland for our jobs, schools, and community activities cost \$2 per hour on top of the cost of driving, we cannot afford to drive there on a daily basis. It's simply not possible and there's not enough street parking spaces in those hours for us to access easily and efficiently. And so please support us in making -- in giving us or creating or however you will do it to make -- to help us have a working effective, efficient, and affordable public transit system so we can function with our full capacities as Tigard residents and a citizen in the city. That is what we have paid for with our tax dollars and is guaranteed by our civil rights, written in our constitution.</p> <p>And that's what that we elected the officials to do and represent our best interests for. And so I am here to emphasize that and remind you all to please, you know, lend the support and do the job. Thank you.</p> <p>I have more to add. Thank you. I would -- I am voting for the Ash option, since that's one of the things being considered, one of the options being considered. If we come to using the light rail as the solution, that would give the minimum impact to the residents living on Ash Avenue, and their rights are important to acknowledge, their needs, you know, and survival are important to acknowledge and emphasize. And also I want to say that I am very disappointed with the fact that the meeting fliers announcing this meeting was not available until this fourth meeting, but not for the last three meetings, the last three community meetings. And also the flier -- the Chinese fliers were not given to me, a resident who later became a community organizer for our Chinese-American community, due to the fact that I didn't receive -- the electronic copy wasn't given to me until two weeks before this meeting on a weekend, on a Friday, from the City of Tigard Community Engagement Coordinator, Lauren Scott. That we asked for those fliers six weeks in advance and it was not forthcoming. It was delayed again and again. And the reason given was there was a budget got cut, the bond measure,</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed support for the Ash-Railroad alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as part of Alternatives C1, C2 and C5 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period, including notifications to affected addresses and community outreach.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		the levy -- the levy for the bond measure did not pass. However, I did get news that \$25,000 was given to United Oregon to make sure that this happened, the flier was done, and then the community outreach was done, so I was already given. So I don't understand why we still have the problem since that is separate from the levy, and, you know, that's down the road. Okay. So -- and then when I received the electronic copy of this flier, it was full of errors, and it was not in the writing system that was commonly used for overseas Chinese-Americans. It was written in the not equitable, and inclusive, simplified Chinese version instead of the traditional Chinese writing. So when I received it as an organizer at the last minute, and we couldn't send it back -- there's not enough time to send it back to Lauren Scott and then to have her send it back to the translation company to redo it and have it out in time, losing another two weeks. For that reason, I did it overnight myself and not charging a penny for it in order to get it out to my community members. It should not have been that way, and I am not -- I feel we were not being served. It was not equitable and it was not inclusive for these reasons. Okay. Therefore, I want to express these concerns and our met needs so that they would be worked on, and hopefully in the future, we will be included and served as equal citizens of the community and as stakeholders of these community projects that we pay for as taxpayers. There was also errors in translation that needed to be fixed. It also left out the phrasing "Please come and attend the community meeting so that you can influence the final decision -- the decisionmakers to reach a decision that includes your best interest." That part was left out in the flier in the translation.	
I310	Kung, Chung-Huey Nina	I've concluded that Alternative C2 with Refinement 5 & Refinement 6, that is, Ash to Railroad, with Elmhurst and Tigard TC Station East of Hall, is my final choice ease forward this comment for me to the SW Corridor Light Steering Committee and its related Advisory Committee. I have limited Internet access at home, due to no wifi, and am not available to go to an outside wifi source for it, due to caring for an elderly parent with multiple disabilities.  Thank you very much!	In your comment, you expressed support for the Ash to Railroad alignment, including Elmhurst and a Tigard Transit Center Station East of Hall in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which were studied as Refinement 5 and Refinement 6 in the Draft EIS. The Ash to Railroad alignment was studied as Alternative C2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.
I311	Kunzler, Joe A	Two quick thoughts:  1) Are you guys going to have Trimet be able to run light rail operations independent of the ongoing issues with the Steel Bridge that is regularly triggering e-mail alerts into my inbox? If no, then why go with light rail?  2) Why should Trimet expand its light rail when Trimet has a driver assault epidemic, ongoing issues with having even one week free of MAX Light Rail interruptions and when Trimet clearly needs another Tilikum Crossing to replace the Steel Bridge?  There you go. As a supporter of public transit, I'll be impressed if you answer these questions for the record.	A new operations and maintenance facility (rail yard) in Tigard will give TriMet much more flexibility when there are issues with the Steel Bridge. Once the Project is complete, the new maintenance facility will be able to maintain MAX Orange Line trains, which can only be maintained at Ruby Junction (on the east side of the river) currently.  Separate from the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project, Metro and TriMet are conducting the MAX Tunnel Study, which analyzes replacement of the Steel Bridge light rail connection between downtown Portland and the Rose Quarter Transit Center with a tunnel.  Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for public transportation.
I312	Ladd, Laura	I'd like to know how you're going to put a train line on a road that barely has room for all the traffic it already has? I live off of Barbur Blvd and depending on the time of day, it can take nearly 20 minutes to get from the KFC to the Burger King on 99. Will you be expanding Barbur, making the road wider for the train, because there is no center lane in some parts of the road. I think it would be a good thing, but causing more traffic problems is certainly not the way to go.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.
I313	Ladd, Laura	Sounds good to me. I like Bridgeport and it would be fun taking a train there; won't have to worry about parking. I appreciate your response.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I314	Lamb, Nicole	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I315	Landis, Charles	Love the plan!  The sooner the better.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I316	Landsverk, Jaime	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I317	Lane, Thomas	..j	NEPA requires FTA, Metro and TriMet to respond to substantive comments related to the content of the Draft EIS. FTA, Metro and TriMet acknowledge receiving nonsubstantive comments such as this one; decision makers also received these comments before identifying the Preferred Alternative, as explained in the introduction of Appendix J1, Overview of Draft EIS Comments and Responses, of this Final EIS.
I318	Lanigan, Ryan	I think the line would be a fantastic addition to the trimet network. Being able to get to work via light rail from Portland proper would be a big plus.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I319	LaPorte, David	I live in northeast Portland and work in Tigard on Greenburg Rd. My commute involves putting my bike on the number 12 bus, riding it to Tigard, then biking the last two miles to my office. I support this light rail project and the DEIS because it describes easing everyone's commutes in the southwest corridor. My fellow number 12 riders are all in support of this making their commute faster, smoother and less dependent on congestion conditions. My only critique of the DEIS are of its descriptions of improving active transportation infrastructure such as bike lines. In the suburban parts of the southwest corridor (segments B and C), cycling infrastructure is severely lacking. The bike lines that do exist are on high speed arterial roads that are not safe nor inviting for cyclists, especially beginner and family bikers. The station access improvements depicted in figures A-31 and A-32 will be a great improvements for people biking to and from stations, but more needs to be done to make biking to stations in segments B and C friendly and accessible for all. Designating cycling routes to stations in a similar manner to Portland's neighborhood greenways would be an effective way to do so. Increasing connectivity for cyclists and pedestrians on low traffic volume residential streets would make it much more inviting and comfortable for people to actively transport themselves to and from light rail stations.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle mobility and station access improvements.
I320	Laporte, David	Good evening, Steering Committee. Thanks for the opportunity to speak and thank you for your patience. I hope nobody is getting tired yet. My name is David LaPorte and I live in northeast Portland and I work in Tigard. And put yourself in my shoes, my commute every day is putting my bike on the No. 12, riding the No. 12 for 45 minutes to Tigard, and then biking the last two miles to my office on Greenburg Road. And I can tell you that my fellow No. 12 commuters and I are very excited for this project. They couldn't be here because they had to catch the bus home. But I'm definitely giving this five stars, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is great. I'm really excited.  I did want to point out some things about the bike part of it. You mentioned talking about improving bike access to the stations. I think that's really important, especially out on this end in Tigard. I don't know how many of you bike regularly in Tigard, but most of the bike routes are on pretty fast roads, and the bike lanes have a lot of debris and glass. Even getting here was a little dicey on a bike two miles from my office. And so improving the infrastructure to stations is a great idea, but I would also advocate that you do some of the things like the City of Portland does with their neighborhood greenways, to try to make it easier for bikes to be on lower-traffic, residential streets instead of just a bike lane on a busy street. Because it's a lot less daunting, especially to people who don't bike in traffic often, if they can bike to a station on a residential street with traffic-calming measures than if they have to get on a busy road with bike lanes. So thanks a lot for your time.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. Please see Master Response 7 regarding bicycle improvements included in the Project.
I321	Lara, Jennyfer	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I322	Leatham, Eric	Rating 5 Would make more sense to go to Sherwood instead of Bridgeport but love the rest of it. Looking forward to being able to get downtown and go to soccer games without driving.	Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the alignment to Sherwood. Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I323	Leatherman, Ken	We live on the only non-negotiable portion of the route where Barbour intersects with Corbett. While I am sure that historically, our property has surrendered part of our lot to the initial expansion of Barbour, we are supportive of the improvement of Portland's public transportation issues.  However, I have problems with this recommendation. First, the DEIS identifies the project's purpose to meet the need for those travelling into downtown Portland, citing the inadequate routes available now. What it doesn't identify is the current backup on Barbour and it's cause, nor will it relieve that. Barbour's traffic is primarily driven by the back up of people to get across the Ross Island bridge. Every afternoon cars will hop off I-5 and go on Corbett up to Hamilton or take Corbett to access this bridge, this proposal will do nothing to alleviate that, in fact it could increase congestion on this route.  Second, the route shows no alternative from downtown to take the train line and have it track with I-5 from Naito all the way to Bridgeport. I am not sure why this is not an alternative for the whole route? I have seen where this has been mentioned in other feedback that this could be the lowest potential impact of all solutions?  Last, in the draft DEIS there was no mention of why the route onto Barbour at the Corbett St impact point is the only option? The homes that back up to Barbour there are all over 100 years old and to take even 10 ft of property leaves the lots with little or no space between them and the traffic revision and the subsequent increased noise and traffic, both pedestrian and vehicular. I am assuming that if there is a substantial expansion on Barbour (which there is no indication of how much property is needed) Tri Met will move to pursue eminent domain on this block of historical Portland Homes?  I believe that if there was 2.6 billion spent on how to improve I-5 traffic through the downtown area as well as a public transportation alternative through the Ross Island area the impacted individuals trying to get to downtown Portland would experience a much smoother and less congested commute to downtown now and in the future.  I appreciate the opportunity to try to save our historical neighborhood.  Thank you.	In your comment, you expressed concerns related to the existing configuration of the Ross Island Bridge and its related traffic patterns in Segment A (Inner Portland). Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration.  Please see Master Response 15 regarding your support for an extended I-5 alignment. Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions. Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of this Final EIS, regarding concerns about noise and vibration. Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for I-5 and Ross Island Bridge area roadway improvements instead of light rail.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I324	Leatherman, Ken	Rating 2 No option for the Barbour route where it intersects with Corbett Homes	The Draft and Final EISs both include only one route option in the portion of Segment A where the alignment is adjacent to a row of residential properties abutting both SW Barbur Boulevard and SW Corbett Avenue. These residential properties are impacted by the Preferred Alternative, primarily to accommodate a relocated and widened sidewalk adjacent to SW Barbur Boulevard. Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.
I325	Leavitt, Naomi	Rating 4 I'm excited about the potential max line. I feel like buses that don't run so frequently (43, 45, my closest buses which are each about a mile away) need to be enhanced or run more frequently before a new project starts.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements.
I326	Lee, Joon Hee	I work at NUNM in South Portland and live close to the school. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I327	Lee, Melissa	Rating 5 This extends to people living closer to i5. This will help relieve congestion on 217 and i5 as right now, as a tualatin resident i would have to drive clear into beaverton or clackamas to catch max and at that point it just makes more sense to drive downtown.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS for more information on the traffic analysis and proposed mitigations.
I328	Lee, Melissa	I could not support this plan more. I know people are going to grumble about displaced businesses (apparently people LOVE the village inn), and residents, but we are a growing metropolitan area with a need to ease congestion and improve quality of life overall. I really hope this plans move forward and I am willing to help gather support.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I329	Leggroan, Russell	Why not do a WES / MAX hybrid (Gold Loop line). Also, run a PSU - Barbur Blvd - Tigard streetcar. Extending MAX South on 217 to I-5/Bridgeport, then to 205 North (Extending the Orange line down McLoughlin to Oregon City to intersect with the new line. Then connect the new line to the Green line at Clackamas Towne Center. Do it now rather than wait until it is a lot more expensive and call it "improved infrastructure"!	Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for a MAX line connecting outer suburbs instead of the Project.
I330	Leonetti, Richard	Four things stand out: 1. Major disturbance of businesses--buy outs, relocations etc. 2. Major disturbance to road transportation during construction 3. A large portion parallels the I-5 freeway 4. Very large cost to build Which suggests the following: 1. Less money would likely be spent by adding lanes to I-5 and adding busses and stops therein. The advantage would be many more people's transportation would be improved--the auto drivers as well as the transit riders. Left over funds could be further used on road transportation used by significantly more people. 2. A lot less land removed for transportation use and more land left for public living (housing, shops & business') 3. An order of magnitude less disruption to business' and jobs. 4. Speeded up commute times since busses would permit both locals and express commuters. 5. Less disturbance to living: freeway changes would take less time than train build out and be ready earlier.	Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions. To learn more about mitigation for short-term transportation impacts, please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS. Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail. Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for additional lanes on I-5 instead of light rail.
I331	Leonetti, Richard	The Southwest Corridor Project assumes: 1. that a light rail line will be built, 2. that it will impact highway I-5 in the short run, and I-5's right-of-way in the long term, 3. that \$2 billion or more dollars will be spent. It is less clear who is in overall charge since Metro has not assumed control of TriMet, the Highway Department facing a major change to it's most important roadway seem uninvolved and the Governor and Legislature seems to accept no responsibility for the billions of dollars about to be spent. So I write this letter to anyone looking for a response as to who is in charge and the answer to simple common sense questions not found in the plan: What total cost--local, state, federal--is expected to move, how many additional people, how fast?	Metro and TriMet together are the project sponsors for the Project, in partnership with the Federal Transit Administration, Federal Highway Administration, and local partners, including ODOT. Metro and TriMet have worked extensively in coordination with project partners on development of the Project, including in analyzing impacts and identifying mitigations related to the I-5 corridor. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis. To learn more about project costs and the Project's funding plan, please see Section 5.3, Cost and Funding Evaluation. Please see Master Response 11 regarding investments in roadway improvements instead of light rail.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>And, if a comparable amount of money--less or more--is spent on an additional lanes on I-5, how many people--less or more--would be moved in automobiles and busses? Just a rough comparison of an extra lane each way on I-5 compared to a train, mostly on I-5, in total number of people moved and at what cost?</p>	
I332	Leslie, Marcia	<p>First, I would like to thank all of you for all the work you have put into the Southwest Corridor Plan over the past seven-plus years, and acknowledge the multiple tens of thousands of hours the partners and staff have spent researching and refining the options, and creating the DEIS. Thank you, also, for removing the tunnels and tram options from consideration as access to PCC along SW 53rd.</p> <p>For reasons that will be explained, I believe the final LPA should be as follows:</p> <p>A1 with Design Refinement 1 B1 with Design Refinement 4, PCC Shuttle along Capitol/49 C2 with Design Refinement 5 and 6</p> <p><b>A1 with DR-1</b> A1 is described as replacing the Newberry and Vermont trestle bridges and Capitol Hwy. overpass. DR-1 mitigates the need to replace either the trestles or overpass.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. While DR-1 is described as being "less disruptive" to existing transportation options it will, in reality, add two or more signals with gates to a stretch of Barbur Blvd. that has had no signals between Hamilton and Miles for nearly (at least) 50 years. Thus it will disrupt and cause delays in vehicle traffic with the crossing off and back onto Barbur of every train and/or bus on this stretch of road (shared transitway). This may serve as "traffic calming" to reduce vehicle speeds on Barbur (often well in excess of the posted 45 MPH), which could be a good thing.</li> <li>2. Care needs to be taken with signaling to avoid vehicle backups at Hamilton, Miles and Terwilliger that may result while accommodating the crossing trains/buses.</li> <li>3. Also of concern is adequate multi-modal bike/pedestrian improvements. Plans haven't been clear for these. Southbound improvements should be kept on the west side of Barbur, with northbound on the east side of Barbur and the east side of the "aerial guideway" (aka bridge) where they can transit safely without having to cross traffic (except at Capitol Hwy.).</li> <li>4. One last concern is whether the removal of vegetation between Barbur and I-5 will negatively impact retaining walls and tie-backs along I-5, and destabilize the slopes.</li> </ol> <p>I'll leave comments on the Marquam Hill Connection Options to those who are more knowledgeable and affected by them.</p> <p><b>DR-2</b> The Taylors Ferry (TF) 1-5 Overcrossing is a classic example of avoiding the necessary. The crossroads of Barbur/Capitol Hwy. and Taylors Ferry have needed to be rebuilt for 30-plus years. People who have studied the "Crossroads" said ODOT ran out of money in 1959 and was never able to build it properly. With the significantly increased volume of traffic at this intersection, seismic upgrades are needed along with additional traffic safety measures. By reconstructing the crossroads as part of the light rail project, ALL forms of transit will benefit. Putting it off won't make it any cheaper.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is claimed that rebuilding the Crossroads is too expensive. More than building one or more bridges over 1-5 as part of DR-2, plus noise walls and vibration mitigation, plus property acquisition along TF? While it is much better than the aerial guideway planned for over the south part of the intersection in B2, neither is a desirable option. Additional sources of funding will be described under "SW 53rd."</li> <li>2. On pg. 1-3, "2012-2013: The Elements of Great Places" it states "The Southwest Corridor Partners agreed that the foundation of the SWCP would be the SWC Land Use Vision, .. ." In October of 2012 HCT on 1-5 was removed from further consideration because "1-5 options could not support the SWC Land Use Vision." While the HCT being considered was HOV, HOT or BRT on added or converted 1-5 lanes, the Land Use statement still applies to "along 1-5" HCT.</li> </ol> <p>Why then do three of the "B" options in Segment 3, including B2 of the IRP, have segments running along 1-5 for varying distances instead of center-running the entire length of Barbur to SW 60<sup>th</sup>, where the potential for land use development could occur? In addition, Metro has consistently said the cost of getting riders from 1-5 grade up to Barbur grade was too great. With stations planned for 1-5 grade, is it now affordable to move them up to street level? Or could/should that money be applied to reconstruct the Crossroads?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. As part of DR-2 It is proposed to add a signal at the TF/Capitol Hwy. intersection. While this would be a great improvement over the current 4-way stop signs, it would need to be synchronized with the signal one block away at Capitol and Barbur, and the signal one block beyond that at Capitol and Huber – in order to avoid serious backlogs greater than those currently experienced. In addition, the signal at Barbur has needed a timing adjustment for many years - it doesn't stay yellow long enough to get more than half way through the intersection before turning red (when entering on green). Additional "storage lanes" will just compound the problem and the cost. Plans are already under way to restrict northbound left turns onto the 1-5 on-ramp. How do those differ from plans to "minimize impacts" in DR-2?</li> </ol> <p>In addition to avoiding a problem that needs fixing, it violates the Land Use Vision by running along 1-5 to 53rd and beyond, requires costly "aerial guideways" (bridges), noise and vibration mitigation, cost of getting riders up to street level from 1-5, and it doesn't address much-needed bike/ped improvements.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as to the east of SW Barbur Boulevard in the Woods area of Segment A, which was studied as Refinement 1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle mobility and station access improvements.</p> <p>Removal of vegetation, erosion and slope stability are addressed in Section 4.8, Geology, Soils and Hydrogeology, of the Final EIS.</p> <p>In your comment, you also expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS, and support for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B, support for the Barbur Undercrossing spanning Segment B and Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), and opposition to the I-5 Undercrossing spanning Segment B and Segment C, which were studied as Alternative B1, Refinement 4 and Refinement 3, respectively, in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS, particularly Section 2.2.4, Preferred Alternative: Segment B, for a description of the connections to PCC-Sylvania.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime.</p> <p>Although a pedestrian bridge over SW Barbur Boulevard at SW 53rd Avenue was studied in the Draft EIS, that design is not further studied in the Final EIS. Instead, to provide a safe route, signal and pedestrian crossing improvements are proposed for at that intersection and included in the Final EIS analysis.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed support for the Ash to Railroad alignment, including Elmhurst and a Tigard Transit Center Station East of Hall in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which were studied as Refinement 5 and Refinement 6 in the Draft EIS. The Ash to Railroad alignment was studied as Alternative C2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and residential displacements, and Master Response 18 regarding your concerns about affordable housing.</p>

Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p><b>DR-3&gt;</b> About all that can be said about this is that it is as bad an idea as tunnels and trams. Why is a new and costly frontage road needed? Access to commercial and residential property is just fine from Barbur Blvd. SW 60 and Lesser are a main access route to PCC Sylvania. Removing 60th and directing traffic to 53rd won't help access to PCC. If you force people to choose 60th or 53<sup>rd</sup>, they will choose 49th! Then there's the matter of a costly tunnel under 1-5 rather than a costly bridge over it, not to mention modifying the off-ramp. The idea is to IMPROVE traffic, not totally disrupt it at a huge cost. This needs to be dropped from further consideration.</p> <p><b>B1 with DR-4&gt;</b> Many of the reasons for rebuilding the Crossroads and going center-running along Barbur have already been given. B1 will also decrease transit time and decrease business displacements. The addition of DR-4 will greatly enhance the transition over 1-5 into the Tigard Triangle. SA 16, SA 18, SA 21 and SA 22 will enhance bike/ped transit in this area of the SWC. SA 23, while needed, will be a major challenge to construct due to the narrowness of both Lesser and Haines, and the severely steep grade/drop-offs on the west side of Lesser. At one place in all the paperwork and reports it said the cost of B1 would be \$10 million more than B2. At another place it said \$40 million more. Regardless of which is more accurate, the funding could easily come from savings by not building DR-2, the SW 53<sup>rd</sup> pedestrian bridge over Barbur and Pomona, and the P &amp; R at 53rd. So the potential funding is there.</p> <p><b>SW 53rd, PCC-Sylvania&gt;</b> In a 2016 4-pg. Report "Barbur Blvd. light rail + SW 53rd Ave. walk/bike connection to campus" it states 53rd "provides the shortest access to Barbur [.5 miles] and is used informally as a route for bike/ped access to PCC Sylvania . . ." "It doesn't say that only 20-30 people per day now use 53rd for access, if that. This "shortest route" statement is also made in the 8/25/15 report "Connecting HCT Transit to PCC Sylvania: Implications for SW 53rd ". It also describes 53rd as a "semi-rural, quiet street."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In April 2011 PCC, PBOT, SWNI, West Portland Park NA and TriMet toured the area around PCC to discuss alternative access modes to campus. SW 60th/Lesser was also found to be .5 miles to the campus, the same as 53rd. Metro has often projected access to PCC at 1,000 or more people per day along 53<sup>rd</sup>. In the 3/11/16 "Direct and Indirect Connection Options to PCC-Sylvania" on pg. 25 it gives an estimate of 3,240 weekday on and offs at Sylvania in 2035. That is a distinct possibility if the Capitol/49<sup>th</sup> shuttle option is chosen, but not 53rd. Capitol/49th is used to that kind of traffic. It is a 5 lane throughway to Lake Oswego to the south, and already has sidewalks and bike lanes along much of its length.</li> <li>2. The Far Southwest Neighborhood doesn't want 3,000-plus people walking, biking or riding shuttles along their "semi-rural, quiet street" every day. Would any of you want 3,000 people parading past your home at all hours of the day? Or even the 1,000 Metro projected?</li> <li>3. From the beginning Metro has been obsessed with providing "Direct Access to PCC Sylvania" by way of SW 53<sup>rd</sup>. It didn't matter the extent to which it would disrupt the neighborhood and it's residents. It didn't matter when they were told access to the campus was not allowed at 53<sup>rd</sup>. From the time PCC Sylvania was built and the first Master Plan for the college was developed and approved by the City of Portland, by agreement with the Far Southwest Neighborhood Association vehicle access to the campus has been permitted ONLY by way of 49th on the east, and Lesser Rd. on the west. Access has been permitted to the campus along SW 51<sup>st</sup>, 53rd and 55th for pedestrians and cyclists only. In 1992 PCC developed "Condition K" of the Master Plan which included a 10-year plan to control the number of cars using the campus, and required annual reports on how they were doing to meet their goal. It took 12 years to achieve their 10-year plan. Whether it is still being met or not is unknown.</li> <li>4. On pg. 2-10 of the DEIS under "PCC Sylvania Shuttle" it references a "shuttle ramp accessing campus". Under the original and all subsequent Master Plans for PCC, this would not be allowed by way of SW 53rd. Shuttle access by way of the already wide street and entrance at 49th would not be a problem.</li> <li>5. The 2015-6 reports referenced above also said 1) initial concepts for bike/ped improvements had been developed and would be refined during environmental review; and 2) described a TriMet shuttle to campus between Barbur TC and the Tigard Triangle along Capitol/49<sup>th</sup>, timed to coincide with LR train arrivals to minimize wait times and provide a faster connection to/from the west and south of campus than the 53rd connection, that it would only run when campus was in session, and would be the least expensive improved transit connection to build and operate.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) In June 2012 PBOT already had a "Southwest Portland NEIGHBORHOOD GREENWAY SAFETY PROJECT" which would include all the street improvements planned for 53rd under the SWCP. These plans were put on hold pending the outcome of the SWCP. Chances are the "refinement" planned during environmental review have already been done and are available to implement on 53rd and other streets mapped out in the project, saving design costs.</li> <li>2) The proposed shuttle was said to cost about \$1.6 million to operate annually, with about \$10 million in capital costs to buy new buses and make improvements on campus. Rather than buying new buses run by TriMet, existing PCC shuttles could be used and their blue "brand" would ID them as a campus shuttle vs general rider bus. PCC already pays operating costs for their shuttles, but may still need campus improvements. Total capital costs should be significantly less than the \$10 million projected. Just as OHSU is expected to provide some of the capital costs for access to their campus, providing the shuttles and their operating costs could be PCC's way to share in the cost of accessing the Sylvania campus.</li> </ol> </li> <li>6. On pg.B4-17.1 under "Transit and Crime", it says "light rail does not increase crime around stations." It went on to say that "crime statistics for areas around stations reflect those of the neighborhoods in which they are located, ... "For 40 years the majority, though not all, of the crime reported in Far Southwest has occurred on the PCC Sylvania campus. Fortunately even that is low. Yet concern has been expressed by some residents that criminal activity may follow the line from PCC along 53rd to the station on Barbur, with a P</li> </ol>	

Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>&amp; R subject to car prowls, and no amount of reassurance can dissuade them. Given recent reports of violence at east side stations and P &amp; R, and along Burnside, maybe it should be motivation to start a neighborhood Crime Watch. Turn the perceived threat into positive action.</p> <p>7. In Table 4.4-3 it states "No new barriers would be created within neighborhoods, because the alignment would run within or parallel to existing major roadways along the boundaries between neighborhoods." This is only true if Capitol/49th is chosen as the shuttle option for PCC. 53rd is not a major roadway, 49th is. 53rd is not a boundary between neighborhoods, 49th is and runs between FSW and West Portland Park (WPP). Unless 53rd is developed only as a Greenway, it will be a barrier between the east and west halves of FSW.</p> <p><b>C2 with DR-5 and 6&gt;</b> For many months both the Steering Committee and CAC heard testimony from business owners along Beveland of their concern for the impact C2 would have. DR-5 along Elmhurst alleviates that impact while providing a beneficial "urban renewal" to Elmhurst. Similar concerns were expressed by property owners of residential affordable housing along Ash who were concerned not just for their property but for their tenants who would be displaced. DR-6 provided the needed adjustment to the alignment to avoid the property and not displace the tenants. It is hoped a similar solution can be found for the Village Inn at Bridgeport.</p> <p><b>In summary:</b> What we would <u>really</u> like to see, what would make many if not most of the residents of the Far Southwest Neighborhood the happiest (especially those along SW 53rd) - to have SW 53rd completely removed from consideration for any kind of "direct access" to PCC Sylvania by any type of shuttles or people movers. Yes - improve the street as a "Greenway" for the benefit of cyclists and pedestrians, but end access at the fence at the edge of campus. Use Capitol and 49th from the TC with PCC shuttles to the campus and Tigard Triangle for direct, faster and cheaper access than along 53<sup>rd</sup>. Do away with plans for a pedestrian bridge over not just Barbur but Pomona as well. Have signal-controlled pedestrian crossings and sidewalks on the west side of 53rd to avoid the downhill traffic from Pomona. Apply the pedestrian bridge money to rebuilding the Crossroads.</p> <p>In addition, we don't want or need a 950-space park-and-ride at the end of our "semi-rural, quiet street." We don't need that many cars coming into our neighborhood on a daily basis, and it won't be PCC people parking - it will be commuters from McMinnville, Newberg and Sherwood that are accessing LRT. I know because I commuted from McMinnville for seven years and would have loved LRT access. Use that entire space to meet the SWC Land Use Vision and find someone who will build multi-use commercial and affordable housing structures that will be close enough to PCC so they won't have to build housing on campus, but can further develop their educational system. Multi-use development at 53rd was part of the Barbur Concept Plan, and would be a more productive use of the land than a P &amp; R. Then apply the money earmarked for the P &amp; R to rebuilding the Crossroads, along with the other funds designated previously. Expand the P &amp; R at the TC and 68<sup>th</sup>. Change the one at Bonita from surface to multi-story. Those changes should provide enough spaces for transit riders.</p> <p>For several years Metro has said the SWCP is only effective if they can go all the way to Bridgeport Village, because by doing so they will get the volume of riders to make the route successful. Having to cut the route short at the MOS in Tigard, due to a lack of funding, would be like what happened to the Crossroads in 1959 - and it still isn't fixed. Don't let direct access to PCC Sylvania along 53rd and the related and costly developments at Barbur and 53<sup>rd</sup>, be the financial straw that breaks the SWCP. There are other, faster and cheaper ways to provide direct access to PCC that could still allow the project to go all the way to Bridgeport.</p> <p>Thank you for considering these comments and suggestions.</p>	
I333	Levine, Jonathan	<p>First: the importance of the decisions about potential routes for light rail is in no way matched by the quality of the maps available for informing those decisions. Please -- please! -- make one good clear separate larger-scale map for each of the routes. Then make one good clear larger-scale map that shows all the routes side-by-side for comparison. Don't tell neighborhood residents that the beach is pretty, have the courage to show us the grains of sand and let us decide for ourselves.</p> <p>Second, I always assumed that light rail would come to SW Portland someday. I also assumed it would follow the path least intrusive to neighborhoods -- i.e., along the freeway or between the freeway and Barbur whenever possible, or along Barbur if a less intrusive route were not possible. But it appears that some of the plans call for rail running along much smaller roads. NO!! For many years I lived in Japan, a place with the world's best public transport system, and it is hard for me to imagine why a light rail system would ever need to run along a tertiary road such as Taylor's Ferry. Somebody needs to go to Kumamoto and see how light rail can be done right.</p> <p>Third, whatever route the train takes, the intersection that includes or is influenced by: Barbur Boulevard; Taylor's Ferry; Capitol Highway; the I-5 South onramp; the Freeway itself; the Capitol Highway offramp; Huber Street; and the I-5 North onramp needs to be considered as one interactive ecosystem and completely re-designed. The money spent "fixing" it some years ago was wasted. About the only sensible fixes involve at least one short tunnel or bridge. I would be happy to discuss 15 years of observations from driving through the area with a transportation engineer in situ. My comments are too extensive to type here. But considering how many people from neighborhoods far to the west of that intersection currently pass through every day, and how many more will pass through with the advent of light rail, that ecosystem needs to be given very serious thought and even more serious money.</p>	<p>The Draft EIS included maps showing color-coded alternatives for each segment on the same maps, along with detailed descriptions, in Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered. Separate maps for each of the alignment alternatives and station access improvements were provided in Appendix A, Detailed Maps and Descriptions of Light Rail Alternatives, and for each of the Design Refinements in Appendix E, Potential Design Refinements and Options, in the Draft EIS. In the Final EIS, these maps are provided in Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, and Appendix A, Detailed Maps and Descriptions of the Alternatives. In addition, please reference TriMet's Conceptual Design Report for the Project to see detailed conceptual designs for each station location (see <a href="https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm">https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm</a>).</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed an opposition to putting light rail on roads such as SW Taylors Ferry Road in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B, including information related to the Crossroads intersection.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and locations.</p>

Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>Fourth, the placement -- and size -- of commuter parking lots for the light rail stations needs to be laid out in much more detail. See comments about larger-scale route maps above, and ditto them here. If several thousand commuters are going to park in my neighborhood daily, I'd sure like input as to exactly where.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>	
I334	Lewellan, Art	<p>I support MAX but NOT this line, NOT on Barbur. INstead, BRT would be better, and an extension of the Red Line from Beaverton to Tigard, Tualatin and Wilsonville is IMO undeniably more logical. The Impact on Barbur is WAY too much, development potential too little, the cost too high. Barbur is already a good bus route, better and faster than average.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus rapid transit improvements instead of light rail.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for an extension of the MAX Red Line from Beaverton to Tigard, Tualatin and Wilsonville instead of the Project.</p>
I335	Ley, Kari Jo	<p>I attempted to send an email to Oregonmetro but it didn't go through. Can you forward for me please? Hello. I've only lived in Tualatin for a few years but I've come to love Village Inn. I visit frequently. While I am in support of advancing public transportation, any kind of relocating of businesses impacts that business - usually not in favor for that business. I believe there are alternatives to removal of Village Inn. Being that the intersections surrounding Bridgeport Village are extremely busy, no matter the time of day, adding more transit seems to only aggravate the problem. Perhaps relocating the Tualatin Park and Ride would be a better alternative? Perhaps moving it to the east side of I-5 could ease the congestion on the west side and at the same time still provide a need? In the Tualatin Life news, the current mayoral candidates both bring up important issues. As for Village Inn, not only would it be costly to relocate (I would question if Metro will foot the bill 100%), but the employees that work there could potentially be out of work for an unspecified amount of time. People are reluctant to change and to move Village Inn would impact the lives of customers. It wouldn't be the same and the restaurant would suffer. Have studies been done on similar situations? Not all change is good or necessary. Paul Morrison suggested that elevating the tracks in several locations could help alleviate some of the congestion problems in the Tigard/Tualatin area. I am in support of these suggestions. Not only would it help traffic flow on Lower Boones Ferry and Tualatin/Sherwood Road but it could keep traffic flowing on I-5 and 217 better. Not everyone takes public transportation and not everyone works in Portland. I live three miles from my work and sometimes it can take up to 1/2 hour to get home. Easing the congestion with some of the proposed alternatives to just bulldozing through needs to be explored. Thank you for allowing me to comment on this issue.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.</p> <p>It is TriMet's preference to grade separate all light rail crossings. However, this is not always feasible due to budget constraints. Overhead catenary poles are still required on structures, utility relocations are still required everywhere there is a bridge column, and traffic signals will need to be adjusted because of changed sight distances created by a structure. Typically, elevated guideway is significantly more expensive than guideway that runs at-grade. Where at-grade crossings are proposed, TriMet ensures they are designed and built to the most current safety standards.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p>
I336	Liden, Keith	<p>Please find my comments regarding the SW corridor DEIS. Like most folks, I don't have time to thoroughly review the 23-volume set, and I focused on active transportation to support transit in Portland (Segments A and B). I support the project, but the active transportation element is largely deficient (especially relative to the extensive traffic analysis) and needs lots of work.</p> <p>WHAT I LIKE</p> <p>I favor the project. While my comments below are primarily critical of elements of the planning work done to date, I support this project, and believe that better transit and a true reduction in our level of auto-dependency is critical to the regions' future.</p> <p>WHAT I DON'T LIKE</p> <p>The plan is not visionary. I understand there's a huge, mind-numbing amount of data collection and analysis that's required, and also being visionary at the same time is difficult. However, other than the introduction of LRT, the transportation status quo is assumed with autos remaining as the overwhelming mode choice. Although acknowledged and receiving some cursory evaluation (a refreshing change from past planning efforts like this), active transportation still is not taken seriously. Of the 23 DEIS volumes on-line (reports and appendices), 12 contain reams of traffic data and detailed analysis. Apparently, we're planning for a growing auto-dependent future with the addition of some transit and a few pedestrian/bike improvements. For the cost of this project, we should expect something that will be more transformative as stated so eloquently in our regional, city, county, and neighborhood transportation planning goals. This should be about beginning to change the way people get around and gradually becoming less auto-dependent. Unfortunately, the focus of this DEIS analysis strongly suggests the opposite - gotta keep those motorists happy!</p> <p>Unbalanced transportation analysis. Related to the above comment, active transportation is not given adequate consideration. For example, the analysis has detailed evaluations of intersection performance for cars and the precise number of on-street parking spaces affected by each alternative, but the potential fate of the buffered bike lanes on Barbur between Naito and Sheridan (the only good bike segment on all of Barbur) is not revealed. Bike improvements on other portions of Barbur are also not described. Dangerous, or at least intimidating, intersections and network gaps are not evaluated for current or future pedestrian/bicyclist safety or performance. Attachment B Transportation Impacts Results Report analyzes roadway segments in a very general way for pedestrian/bike level of service, but it fails to evaluate how intersections will work (or not) for folks who are not driving.</p> <p>Active transportation - inaccurate portrayal of existing conditions. Although the information presented in Attachment B Transportation Impacts Results Report is generally accurate, the existing conditions presented for pedestrians and cyclists tends to gloss over serious deficiencies in the existing system. In particular, difficult intersections, short but nasty gaps, and substandard facilities are not identified. Rather, they are shown simply as existing and in no need of improvement. Just because nobody's been killed yet isn't a good determinant of facility quality or performance. Examples of inaccurate or misleading information can be found in Figure 3.2-1 Segment A:</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle improvements included in the Project.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS regarding analysis of active transportation impacts.</p> <p>Regarding your comments on the SW Barbur Boulevard trestle bridges (Vermont and Newbury structures), FTA has determined that these bridges are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, because they are early examples of multi-component bridge designs that were used to save costs during the Great Depression. However, their historical significance does not preclude their removal or replacement for the Project. The Preferred Alternative would replace both bridges, which would result in adverse effects under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and would require mitigation. For more information, see the <i>Cultural Resource Survey for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project, Multnomah and Washington Counties, Oregon</i>, which is provided as Attachment C to this Final EIS.</p>

Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>* SW Terwilliger lacks a SB bike lane between Chestnut and 7th.</p> <p>* Dangerous intersections and bike lane terminations are not noted, such as 6th at Jackson, 4th at Lincoln, NB Barbur at Naito, SB Barbur at Capitol Hwy., and Bertha at Barbur.</p> <p>* Inadequate facilities, which don't meet current standards, are shown as being adequate existing facilities that are not in need of further improvement. Examples include Capitol Hwy. between Terwilliger and Barbur (Sorry, but a 3' bike lane WB and sharrow EB on an arterial don't cut it!) and 1st (no NB bike lane).</p> <p>Active transportation - vague and inadequate improvement package. The SW Corridor generally features lower densities and limited land use mix, which is marginally supportive of a significant transit investment like this. There will certainly be some redevelopment in response to LRT, but attracting riders from a greater than normal distance (¼ to ½-mile) will be critical to the success of this LRT line. However, only a very modest smorgasbord of pedestrian and bicycle improvement projects are contemplated. While they are likely to be appreciated by people currently walking and cycling, they will do nothing to entice motorists to get out of their cars and walk or bike to transit.</p> <p><b>GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p>Be visionary. This project needs to be much more focused on the transportation outcomes we repeatedly say we want in the RTP and our local comprehensive plans and TSPs. To be sure, curbing our auto addiction is a challenging and multi-faceted problem. But we can start by not devoting a lion's share of the planning effort to simply ensure that motorists are fully accommodated. Truly providing transportation choices takes lots of work and funding, but if it can't be an outcome of this enormous transit investment, when will it?</p> <p>Re-balance the transportation analysis. The EIS needs to consider active transportation at a similar level of detail as has been given to auto travel, safety, and performance.</p> <p>Active transportation - correct the existing conditions information. The pedestrian and bicycle background information presented in Attachment B Transportation Impacts Results Report needs to be revised to: 1) be accurate, 2) not show substandard improvements as existing facilities, and 3) identify difficult/dangerous gaps and intersections.</p> <p>Active transportation - provide 1st class improvements. First, the EIS needs to clearly describe the proposed active transportation improvements - especially for Barbur and the important routes that connect to transit and/or cross Barbur/I-5. In addition to clarity, improvements need to be robust, not half-baked proposals like "uphill" bike lanes and "downhill" sharrow. We need facilities that would be safe and comfortable to use at all times in both directions during bad weather and lighting conditions, not just on a sunny Sunday afternoon. Perhaps most important, these facility proposals violate the notion of equity and providing facilities to be used by all ages and abilities (and "interested but concerned" cyclists). If we are to have any hope of reaching our goals for active transportation mode share, we need to put our money where our mouth is.</p> <p>Bike park &amp; ride. The project needs to seriously consider how to improve bike access to the transit stations. Simply accommodating motorist access to transit isn't enough. Because of the low densities in the SW Corridor, we must develop a specific plan to extend transit's active transportation reach beyond a ¼ to ½-mile. Perhaps something similar to the bicycle valet at the base of the OHSU Tram could be emulated in targeted stations. Facilities at the stations would need to be coupled with significant bike route improvements to access them. Metro, TriMet, and the cities should evaluate the most promising stations and routes. This would include linking areas of concentrated activity (e.g., PCC, Hillsdale, Multnomah Village) with 1st class bike facilities on routes with limited topography (e.g., Barbur, Capitol Hwy., Multnomah Blvd., Bertha, Terwilliger, Capitol Hill Road, 30th/Hume/31st) to selected stations.</p> <p><b>SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS</b></p> <p>Alternatives for Segments A and B</p> <p>Alternative A1</p> <p>* Barbur bike lanes - potential impact. Barbur from Naito to Broadway is the only segment with very good bike facilities, but the impact on this existing facility is not discussed. These bike lanes must not be compromised.</p> <p>* Barbur to 4th bike transition. More analysis is needed regarding the Barbur bike lane transition between Sheridan and Lincoln to 4th.</p> <p>Alternatives A1/A2</p> <p>* Gibbs Bridge and South Waterfront. There needs to be more emphasis on providing better pedestrian and bike connections to the Gibbs Bridge and South Waterfront.</p> <p>* Corbett and John's Landing access. Hamilton station should include improved pedestrian/bike connections down to Corbett and John's Landing area.</p> <p>* Vermont/Newberry structures should be reconstructed. These bridges are not of sufficient historical value to save - they're just glorified RR trestles. The Sellwood was historic, and we're all glad that it's gone.</p>	

Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>* 1st-rate multi-modal facilities along Barbur. Even with reconstruction of bridges, there are numerous safety issues all along the route, which are not proposed for improvement. In order to establish a real multi-modal corridor, Barbur pedestrian and bicycle facilities need to be 1st class and not a continuation of the incomplete patchwork we have now.</p> <p>* No half-baked bike improvement projects. In several instances the bike improvements consist of an "uphill" bike lane and "shared in street" facilities (aka. sharrows) in the "downhill" direction. This is not a desirable method for providing inviting options to driving. We need quality facilities in both directions. Although these routes all have a predominant uphill and downhill direction, they are often undulating with sections of up and down in both directions. Examples include Capitol Hill Rd. (SA09) and Dolph (SA12). Finally, "shared in roadway" always sounds so friendly and workable, but in reality, this approach is often a bad deal for cyclists - especially on damp December ride on a busier street during the PM peak.</p> <p>Alternatives B1 - B4</p> <p>* Provide a Barbur crossing at Miles. An improved pedestrian/bike crossing should be included at Miles because it offers a valuable I-5 crossing to/from Corbett.</p> <p>* Provide a better Hillsdale - Custer Station connection. There should be a robust and complete pedestrian/bike connection between Hillsdale and the Custer station.</p> <p>* Fill ALL active transportation gaps on Barbur. Bike lane and sidewalk gaps on Barbur between 26th and Custer need to be addressed. Too many are not acknowledged or glossed over.</p> <p>* Extend 26th improvements north to 30th. The proposed pedestrian/bike improvements on 26th need to be extended under I-5/Barbur and north to 30th to connect with the route to Multnomah Village.</p> <p>* Fix the Crossroads. This project must address the abysmal bike and pedestrian crossing conditions at the Capitol Hwy/Barbur (Crossroads) intersection. We've kicked this can down the road for long enough!</p> <p>* Don't remove Multnomah Blvd. Alternative B4 calls for removal of Multnomah Blvd. north of 17th with no apparent bike improvement of the parallel portion of Barbur, which doesn't have bike lanes or sidewalks. This portion of Multnomah currently provides an excellent alternative to traveling NB on Barbur to Burlingame.</p> <p>* Place less reliance on auto park &amp; ride to access transit. Barbur Transit Station is proposed to have 725-825 parking spaces (a 500 +/- increase from today?) along with 950 at Barbur/53rd. With most of these cars arriving and leaving during the AM and PM peaks, how will adverse traffic impacts be avoided? The project must focus more on transit access without getting into a car. Bike &amp; ride facilities should be added to complement traditional auto park &amp; rides.</p> <p>* Provide a Huber - Capitol Hwy. connection. Plans for reconstruction of the Barbur Transit Station in Alternatives B1-4 must include creation of a pedestrian/bike link between Huber and Capitol Hwy. This should be designed to minimize auto conflicts, especially when crossing Barbur. It should also be viewed as a way to have foot/bike traffic support the proposed commercial uses on the southern portion of the station.</p> <p>* I-5 crossing at Tigard. Proper pedestrian/bike facilities are necessary on Barbur as it crosses I-5 at the Portland/Tigard boundary. Currently, it's huge barrier.</p> <p>Potential Design Refinements and Options (Appendix E)</p> <p>Design Refinement 1: Barbur Woods East-Side Running</p> <p>* No bike/pedestrian improvement on Barbur is TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE. Active transportation improvements not being proposed for the Woods Section is a total deal breaker for me. I'm astonished such an irresponsible idea is even being considered. NO WAY!</p> <p>* Potentially place a multi-use pathway on the LRT bridge. An option would be to include a multi-use facility on the LRT bridge. This would separate pedestrians/cyclists from high speed traffic and eliminate the vehicle/bike conflict at Barbur and Capitol Hwy.</p> <p>* Include NB vehicle lanes on the LRT Bridge. Historic or not, the Newbury and Vermont bridges aren't going to last forever. To soften future construction impacts, consider the following: 1) include NB vehicle lanes on the LRT bridge, and 2) convert the current NB lanes into a multi-use facility. In the future, the region can decide if it wants to replace the viaducts or not. If yes, you would have the LRT bridge as a detour option.</p> <p>Design Refinement 2: Taylors Ferry I-5 Overcrossing</p> <p>* No bike/pedestrian improvement for the Crossroads is TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE. Same as my comments above, because the analysis is totally auto-centric and leaves the pedestrians and cyclists in the dust. Come on, you can do better than this!</p> <p>* No apparent analysis of pedestrian and bicycle impacts. The affect of this alternative apparently has not considered pedestrian and bicycling impacts.</p> <p>Design Refinements 3&amp;5: I-5 Undercrossing/Overcrossing</p> <p>* Another inadequate active transportation analysis. More of the same. No apparent concern for active transportation impacts.</p> <p>From an active transportation perspective, the alternatives and refinements demonstrate to me that the "D" in DEIS stands not for "Draft" but for "Disappointing".</p>	
I337	Liden, Keith	Rating 2	Please see Master Response 7 regarding active transportation improvements as part of the Project. Impacts related to active transportation are discussed in Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigations, of the Final EIS.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		Extremely poor proposed accommodation of active transportation. 23 volumes of the DEIS on-line and 12 are all about cars.	
I338	Lipscomb, Joe	Eryn hello there, hope you had a great weekend. I have been giving this issue a great deal of thought lately with all that is happening here. I would "suggest" the team look at stopping the present line at Tigard then taking the time to really plan what is going to happen in Tualatin and where the line will run next. The present plan is to stop at Bridgeport which in of its self presents a large amount of problems. Tualatin is no where ready to decide what sort of transit and housing system it wants. And this present plan does not really help this part of the region and will spend monies best used elsewhere over the next 10 years. Problems are Tualatin has no internal circulator bus system being planned or even discussed and the ending at Bridgeport will really not have any impact of car usage to our major employment area. Six year ago I was part of a study team funded by CTAA out of Washington DC to look at our employment transit problems and I believe that data, although out of date now, is still accurate. TriMet must look at this totally unserviced area as far as bus and regional employment needsahre before we should located and end-line at Bridgeport. There are other option I do nothing have ever been considered. The cost of this line to Tigard alone today will be expensive and we need to at least get that far with the monies we may receive. But to make a mistake and go beyond until you know where the "TRUE TUALATIN" stop should be is a waste of any possible funding until you know how local service needs are connected to it and to where it may extend in the future. The transit destination needs study is available the Tualatin Chamber if you have not already seen it. In the meantime we can still provide adequate regional bus service into downtown Portland by using the existing #96 bus run-in a full schedule of 7 days a week until we really know what wee need to do. Service form here is important to the east ( VA Medical Clinic and Airport ) to the south ( employment) and to Newburg ( employment ) and this does not even address the big missing system a local circulator bus system within the city. If you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me. Some times experience (been there done that can be helpful),	Please see Master Response 16 regarding your interest in a future Tualatin station. Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project.
I339	Little, Anaheed	I {study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur..	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I340	Loeffl, Jamie	I understand the need for public transit but I don't see the worth of displacing 1200 employees just so people can get to Bridgeport. That is a lot of livelihoods lost especially when there is no plan to help them or rebuild the businesses and homes.	Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.
I341	Long, Casey	Rating 1 In Beaverton light rail is almost unnoticed. The SW Corridor light rail route will be "in your face" This is not a route that makes sense. It should follow I-5 and stay away from disrupting streets, homes, and neighborhoods. It should relieve traffic congestion on Barbur Blvd and I-5, not increase it.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.
I342	Long, Jim	I have been the chair of the local Community Participation Organization serving east Tigard, Durham, and the old town of "Metzger" in Washington County for years. The following is my initial testimony. Both residents and business owners have told me they were not notified of refinement #4 of the SW Corridor Light Rail Train plan. If not, this is not "good government". Please be receptive to more comments. Why not? More than a couple of us attending the CAC meeting tonight strongly disagree with the statement by METRO CAC facilitator Eryn Kehe at 8:07pm PDT when she said: "It's not a fact that people have not been notified." Not all landowners and business owners were notified in a timely fashion. She doesn't know. There were a lot more residents that were no notified. Not all homeowners and landowners were notified. Other business owners and residents effected by the early options Seems like extending the comment period would only have good benefits. OOooops! Looks like I've run out of time to comment. Thanks.	Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period, including the amount of time provided for receiving public comments on the Draft EIS.
I343	Long, Jim	Good evening. Good evening, everybody. I'm a CEO leader here for East Tigard, Metzger and Durham, and just last night Eryn came again to talk to us about the proposal's – latest refinement on proposal. She come last year and what's new is there's this new proposal, this refinement, I guess it's number four. And we don't really think we've had enough time to look at it. Many people I've talked to haven't really -- didn't get notification properly and we need more time. So I've been a Tri-Met rider for 45 years. In the late '80s I was a big advocate for bikes on buses. We've been successful with bikes on buses, bikes on trains. I'm really -- you know, feel good about that. I'm a supporter of community engagement and public involvement. But what I want to see or I guess what I want to say is I oppose the current timeline. We would like to get an extension, at least 90 days because there's people who haven't heard about it and this latest refinement just came out six weeks ago and we would like some more time to look at it. I don't think that	Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period, including notifications to affected addresses. To learn more about impacts to wildlife and wetlands, please see Chapter 4.9, Ecosystems, of this Final EIS. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		would do any harm. Obviously the more -- the more people provide input, the better the input will be. So the notification has been late and there's residents and businesses that haven't been notified. I will have written comments to submit by Monday but I'm concerned personally about the wildlife and the wetlands. It seems like the tunnel under Barbur needs some work, exploration and maybe perhaps even some further traffic study. So I will leave my comments at that but my request is for more time. I think that this latest refinement has new things a lot of people haven't seen. They haven't seen the diagrams and people would be interested in seeing that and providing input. Thank you.	
I344	Love, Alan	<p>Dear Metro, people who don't drive have been told for years now that improvements to bike facilities on Barbur are coming; just be patient for the SW Corridor plan. The recent proposal for the SW Corridor Plan is out, and after a decade of talk, and likely at least a decade more of construction, absolutely NOTHING is being done to address one of the most dangerous sections of Barbur, the "Woods" section including the Vermont and Newbury bridges. People on bike are forced to merge into auto traffic going 50mph on an already too narrow traffic lane with zero accommodations aside from some signs and lights that are routinely ignored. Rebuild the bridges? Too expensive. Add an eight foot path to the Trimet facilities? Too expensive. Nearly 3 BILLION (with a B) dollars, and a simple additional bit of width to a planned bridge is "too expensive" even though it would only add a small fraction to the cost of a small fraction of the total package. What's the worth of a human life?</p> <p>If Metro can't find a small amount more to add to the proposed Trimet bridge at the "Woods" section, then the only course of action that Metro can take would be to REQUIRE ODOT to move forward with Option 3 of the Barbur Road Safety Audit submitted a couple of years ago. This turn a single Southbound lane on Barbur in this section into a Right turn only lane onto Capital Hwy, and signalize the crossing as it turns, allowing a lane diet over the bridges with dedicated space for people on bikes. As a bonus, this project could potentially be finished next year, rather than waiting another decade.</p> <p>Please Metro, if you are going to say 2.5+ Billion dollars isn't enough to eliminate a terrifying section of deadly road, at least have the courage to push ODOT to make a change. This isn't about convenience. If you doubt anything I say, please come along on my daily commute with me and see how this section of road feels.</p> <p>Thanks,</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support of bicycle improvements included in the Project.</p> <p>Specific to your concerns regarding the Vermont and Newbury bridges, please see Master Response 3.</p>
I345	Love, Pamela	<p>Thanks for keeping the fight going to bring mass Transit to Sherwood. I commute 5 days a week into the Pearl District. My weekend commute I drive because there's no where to park in Beaverton Transit center and the Wes does not run and I'm not interested in sitting on the bus in traffic for hours to and from work. Thank you thank you!!</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p>
I346	Lovorn, Karstan	<p>I've been an advocate for this project for ages. But what happened to the biking infrastructure?!? I thought one of the main benefits of all this new construction was a significant improvement for bicycle transportation. At this price tag, we should be seeing a bicycle superhighway connecting Bridgeport to downtown in addition to the rail and bus transit. This is incredibly short-sighted planning. For the price of a rounding error on this project, we could have a separated, bicycle highway to help set the tone for a future, connected Portland. What's shown here is what we see for repaving projects in Portland. To coin a phrase: Sad.</p> <p>I'm incredibly disappointed. Without the promised bicycle improvements, I don't see the point of supporting this project. Please rethink this.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support of bicycle improvements included in the Project.</p>
I347	Luelling, Brett	<p>I fully support this plan and my only critique is the timeline; a 2027 opening is a long way off and we have immediate needs to alleviate traffic on Barbur and increase the safety for cyclists and pedestrians. As an active user of the Trimet, I look forward to being able to use light rail for going to work, and my daughters school, since we won't be caught in single occupancy car commuters.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Your comments regarding a desire to improve traffic and safety on SW Barbur Boulevard before the Project is in place have been shared with project partners.</p>
I348	Luelling, Brett	<p>Rating 5</p> <p>Barbur ends up with spill over traffic off I5 and this could help alleviate the current strain on the roadway. I also live right off of Barbur and would love to see light rail go in; the current issue I have is that the buses get caught in single occupancy car traffic. I see this everyday going to work and getting my daughter from school.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p>
I349	Luna, Ashley	<p>I am opposed to a MAX line to Bridgeport. I used to live near PCC Sylvania when the idea was floated for a tunneled rail line to PCC from Barbur. This was eliminated due to it being excessively costly to install rail lines in hilly areas. I believe that metro funds would be better spent enhancing the already existing WES Commuter Rail and/or bus lines.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus or WES commuter rail improvements instead of light rail.</p>
I350	Lundell, Dana	<p>Please get this light rail done and do NOT succumb to any of the critics who are selfish individuals. That is a harsh statement, but honestly this just has to happen to make Portland connected here on the south/southwest corridor. There are a lot of really conservative people down here, and they hate things like this - but they are NOT the people who you should listen to seriously in a project like this. We need a MAX. It would make this city much more cosmopolitan and solve so much of the worst of its problems - the growing population, spread to this side of the city, and NO good routes! Thanks - and please, please, please MAKE this happen :) The future will thank you - the kids of this city who will be the beneficiaries of the many benefits.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p>
I351	Lyman, Daniel	<p>As nearly as I can tell the Refinement 4: Barbur Undercrossing would affect the entire front of my property at 11420 SW Pacific Highway. This seems like a very small possibility of a refinement and was mentioned as such in a Pre-Application Conference causing our property to drop out of sale. This feels like defamation in that the idea of the refinement doesn't have strong ground yet. This</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to Refinement 4, which would run along the south side of Pacific Highway (99W) in the southern portion of Segment B (Outer Portland) and the northern portion of Segment C (Tigard and</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>opens too many options and too many possibilities which affect too many properties. A far better refinement of the idea would have been better before spouting off.</p> <p>Let me be clear, do not proceed with Refinement 4.</p>	<p>Tualatin) and would add a station at SW 68th Avenue. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p>
I352	Lyman, Daniel	<p>Rating 1</p> <p>It's not clear enough what it will impact...</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p>
I353	Lyman, Kyle	<p>My name is Kyle Lyman and the proposed Maxline runs right through my back yard. I am disappointed hearing that my life long neighborhood could be destroyed by this new route. I have lived here my entire life and 15 years ago I purchased this property as an investment from my parents so I could save money and remodel the property. My son and I currently live in the property as I have been taking the last 7 months away from work pouring my time and money into the property. If you simply drive by you would be able to tell on the outside it stands out. If you tour the inside you will be blown away with what has been done. This property is going to be an income producing property as I have split the bottom level off for a business. My concerns are simple 1) how can I replace my life long investment and memories, 2) I got a mortgage at under 4% which I cannot replace today, 3) I couldn't get another mortgage right now since I have a 7 month gap in work and haven't made any money but rather just spent 160k on this property, 4) this property is set up to start making me commercial monthly income. My understanding is beveland was the best option but since the businesses raised their iron fist you moved the route to my street and on my property. I am absolutely disappointed and I hope this reaches the highest level of authority. Myself along with my Hermoso way neighbors are all feeling helpless and pushed over from the TriMet pressing their money making project right through our community. Please consider my point of view and understand why I'm upset. If this route wins by popularity please make sure you consider what all I have invested into this community and property. Please advise to my cell phone any concerns or questions. I will chat directly with you.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to the SW Elmhurst Street alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Refinement 5 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p>
I354	Lynch, Noah	<p>Rating 5</p> <p>So glad to see this route on Barbur as it will be a big boost for economic development and community place-making. Please incorporate as much public art as possible. Also glad there won't be any branched service.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Current FTA policy does not allow that money for transit projects be spent on art. However, TriMet continues to seek opportunities to incorporate art within existing restrictions.</p> <p>In your comment, you also expressed a preference against branched service in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as part of Alternatives C5 and C6 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p>
I355	Lyons, Chris	<p>I support Alignment B1 (Center Barbur) and reconstruction of the Crossroads intersection at I-5/SW Barbur/SW Capitol Highway. Anything short of fixing this terrible intersection will be a dereliction of duty to improving the livability of our neighborhood with the coming of lightrail. As an identified Town Center, this intersection must be fixed and doing so as part of the Southwest Corridor only makes sense. Refinement 2 along Taylors Ferry Road would only compound the problems already in existence at this intersection and should be rejected.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS, and preference for an alignment along SW Barbur Boulevard instead, which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p>
I356	M, Lonnie	<p>Good evening. Time is money, my Pop always used to tell me, and no one likes to waste money. I'm a Tigard resident and a property owner. I became involved with my city as a committee volunteer giving my precious time to various committees here. I'm a frequent transit user daily. Our household is a single-car household. So I still own a car. Transportation is an economic issue. It allows us to get to and from work, shopping, leisure, appointments, and others where we earn money and spend money. You know, economics. Growth is inevitable. We cannot escape it or its impact on our lives unless we, ourselves, move away from it, and we're running out of places to move. I sit here today to voice my support for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail project. I'm interested in effecting change through participation. I'm giving my time to serve us, the citizens and the City of Tigard, on the Tigard Transportation Advisory Committee, the Transit Subcommittee, and the Fanno Creek Trail Committee. And yes, I also serve the region with Metro on the Community Advisory Committee or CAC, for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail project for the last 16 months. That's because I believe in this project.</p> <p>There are pros and cons for reaching alignment and for the project as a whole. Because I'm on the committee, I'm not going to get specific on my opinion. Some I agree with. Some I don't agree with. The decision on alignments are going to be a consensus and not a one-person recommendation. In my effort to be part of the solution rather than part of a problem, I'm looking forward to the future for Tigard. I hope to be part of a legacy that shows future generations that we were forward-thinking and intentional in our actions and planning. So I ask if not this project now, when? If not this project at all, what is your solution? Thank you.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p>
I357	Macioce, Naomi	<p>Rating 5</p> <p>That is an area that is currently over-run by traffic, and is a high density shopping area. Many users would benefit from taking Trimet, and hopefully it would reduce some of the traffic and traffic pollution.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I358	Mandel, Marvin	Why not include a Sherwood destination? Sherwood is one of the fastest growing cities in the area and transit to there is really insufficient. When I lived in Sherwood, I could not use transit as it would take three hours to get to work and three hours to get back home.	Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the alignment to Sherwood.
I359	Marrin, Dan	Compile testimonials (good and bad) from previous homeowners on how lit-rail has impacted their properties.	The information requested in this comment is outside the scope of the EIS, which focuses on objectively identifying and addressing Project impacts.
I360	Marrin, Dan	Sound walls along I-5 please Would love to see plans for future street-car trunk lines to neighboring commercial centers Would like to see website of all possible resources (links) to studies of past affected properties	Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of this Final EIS, regarding your suggestion for sound walls. Please see Master Response 10 regarding your interest in other transit improvements, such as streetcar lines. The information requested in this comment regarding past affected properties is outside the scope of the EIS, which focuses on objectively identifying and addressing Project impacts.
I361	Marrin, Dan	Must consider Taylors Ferry upgrad to include bike lane and sidewalks between Capitol Hwy and SW 48th - currently a terrible walk route to BTC.	Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle mobility and station access improvements.
I362	Marsh, Audra	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor. My child is disabled and in a wheelchair and I cannot access this area with her wheelchair and safely walk between buildings and town.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I363	Marshal, Janet	Rating 5 I love riding light rail. Living in Tigard, I will use the SW Corridor transit often.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I364	Martinez, Manuel	I'm in agreement with the MAX line going from Portland to Tigard, but it should not get to downtown Tigard or remove houses. The city of Tigard is very beautiful and there is a lot of transportation in downtown. I live on 85th and Lodust. In that area it is very necessary to have more transportation during the weekend. My rent went up a lot, so we need more information about how the project will affect us.	Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and Master Response 18 regarding your concerns about rent increases and gentrification. In your comment, you expressed a preference for a route that avoids entering downtown Tigard in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Refinement 6 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.
I365	Martel, Sherrie	I'm an employee at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur. THANK YOU!	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I366	Martin, Agnes	The light rail route maps do not clearly show the interaction it will have with streets and the adverse impacts it will have on the surrounding street systems, businesses, and neighborhoods. Light rail should either closely follow I-5 or use the existing railroad line from Portland to Bridgeport and Tigard. It should not disrupt SW Barbur Blvd as proposed. It appears there are no plans to mitigate the immensely slower commute that light rail will cause vehicular traffic at or near the following areas: I-5 because traffic will be forced from SW Barbur Blvd onto I-5 due to traffic limiting effects of light rail and because there are only two main traffic routes between downtown Portland and the SW Portland Metro area SW Barbur Blvd because of interference with traffic sensitive intersections and less traffic volume capacity on SW Barbur Blvd as proposed SW 3rd Ave because light rail will add an unsynchronized cycle at a traffic sensitive intersection and reduce crucial traffic movement. SW Hamilton St because light rail will add an unsynchronized cycle at a traffic sensitive intersection and reduce crucial traffic movement SW Terwilliger Blvd because light rail will add an unsynchronized cycle at a traffic sensitive intersection and reduce crucial traffic movement SW Capitol Hwy Ave because light rail will add an unsynchronized cycle at a traffic sensitive intersection and reduce crucial traffic movement SW 72nd Avenue because light rail will add an unsynchronized cycle at a traffic sensitive intersection or street crossing and reduce crucial traffic movement	Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigations, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS regarding traffic impacts and mitigations. Other impacts to businesses and neighborhoods are described in Chapter 4, Environmental Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS. Please see Master Response 15 regarding your support for an extended I-5 alignment. Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail. Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for Marquam Bridge improvements and improvements to the I-5 Terwilliger curve instead of light rail.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>SW Hall because light rail will add an unsynchronized cycle at a traffic sensitive intersection or street crossing and reduce crucial traffic movement</p> <p>SW Hunziker because light rail will add an unsynchronized cycle at a traffic sensitive intersection or street crossing and reduce crucial traffic movement</p> <p>A single freeway lane has the potential to accommodate over 2,000 vehicles per hour and bus routes can be adjusted easily to meet demand between Tigard and downtown Portland. Light rail is static in its location, and will not reduce the number of vehicles that use SW Barbur Blvd or I-5 between Tigard and downtown Portland during morning rush hours by more than 3,000 vehicles per day. This means overall, that light rail as proposed will do little more than buses to reduce traffic in the area between Tigard and Portland, and it will significantly worsen the vehicle commute between Tigard and Portland unless street crossings and intersections are avoided entirely by light rail.</p> <p>The light rail route between Tigard and Portland will primarily serve the same customers buses already serve but will leave behind a traffic commute nightmare. Revealingly, the light rail plans rely upon BUSES to serve OHSU, PCC, and Washington Square so the new light rail really does nothing to make those areas more accessible.</p> <p>Light rail will adversely impact neighborhoods, destroy businesses, create congestion in critical traffic areas, and require the reduction of lanes or access to major commute routes. With buses, none of this occurs and if bus lanes are added in the critical traffic areas it will reduce commute time as well.</p> <p>As currently proposed, light rail will come at an immense cost to hundreds of thousands of people on a daily basis because light rail will not meet their needs. They will continue to use the resulting limited and congested road system caused by light rail.</p> <p>With \$2.5 billion, instead of light rail it could be possible to eliminate the cross-weaving on Marquam Bridge arising from drivers choosing between I-5 and I-84. Those that rely upon the Marquam Bridge are well acquainted with the cross-weave problem as it is the major source of the northbound I-5 backup. The \$2.5 billion might also allow the I-5 Terwilliger curve to be eliminated by drilling a short tunnel. Both of these projects will help reduce traffic congestion far more than the proposed light rail route along SW Barbur Blvd.</p>	
I367	Martin, Agnes	<p>Rating 1</p> <p>It requires too many bridges, too many street crossing, impacts traffic flow and increases traffic congestion. Too many homes and neighborhoods are impacted and destroyed. Not enough effort has been made to avoid businesses</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p>
I368	Martin, Steve	<p>Light rail should not reduce vehicular capacity of the streets as it is currently planned. Street crossings should either occur by overpass or underpass, and certainly should not reduce existing street capacity as the current plans will do. Unless light rail borders I-5 or existing rail lines, it will add enormous congestion to the streets rather than be a source of congestion relief.</p> <p>A rail line connection already exists between Bridgeport and Portland that is superior to the existing plan in almost every measure possible. It would travel along the existing rail line at the base of the OHSU Aerial Tram, follow the rail line along Macadam to Lake Oswego, and then along the existing rail line to Bridgeport where it can connect eventually to Beaverton, Wilsonville, or Sherwood. Right of way should be obtained along the existing rail line routes instead of destroying much of the existing major street system and causing untold damage to existing businesses either during construction or other means.</p> <p>This is the light rail route that makes sense, not one on Barbur Blvd that will cause untold traffic congestion on both I-5 and Barbur Blvd for all the SW Portland suburbs. Buses best serve Barbur Blvd and already do, especially with a center express lane.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard, and Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis generally.</p> <p>It is TriMet's preference to grade separate all light rail crossings. However, this is not always feasible due to budget constraints. Overhead catenary poles are still required on structures, utility relocations are still required everywhere there is a bridge column, and traffic signals will need to be adjusted due to changed sight distances created by a structure. Typically, elevated guideway is significantly more expensive than guideway that runs at-grade. Where at-grade crossings are proposed, TriMet ensures they are designed and built to the most current safety standards.</p> <p>An alignment following the existing rail line along SW Macadam to Lake Oswego and then west to Bridgeport was not considered for this project because such an alignment would not meet the purpose and need of the project. That alignment would also fail to support existing land use and transportation plans, including the Southwest Corridor Land Use Vision, the Southwest Corridor Plan, and the Barbur Concept Plan.</p> <p>Additionally, the HCT System Plan identifies the connection between Lake Oswego and Bridgeport/Tigard as meriting further analysis as part of a separate corridor study plan, and the corridor is outside of the identified Southwest Corridor. Separately, a rail connection between downtown Portland and Lake Oswego along SW Macadam has been previously studied as the Lake Oswego to Portland Transit Project. That project published a Draft EIS in November 2010; however, that project was suspended at the request of Lake Oswego.</p> <p>More information about the process by which the Preferred Alternative was identified can be found in Appendix I – Project Background and Alternatives Considered of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail.</p>
I369	Martin, Steve	<p>On July 30th, 2018, the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Community Advisory Committee was asked to make a decision on Design Refinement 5 in the Tigard Triangle. That decision was made based on partially correct impact information and a consensus report from businesses along Beveland. No other information was presented to the Committee and the Committee did not ask for further</p>	<p>Please see Appendix I, Preferred Alternative Selection and Project Refinements, of this Final EIS regarding the process for selection of the Preferred Alternative, including additional context on the Metro's Community Advisory Committee recommendation. At the July 30, 2018 Metro's Community Advisory Committee meeting, the Committee was presented</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>information to make the decision. It was not possible to correct the wrong and absent information that should have been used to form a reasonable decision because the comment period had closed.</p> <p>The Committee was presented a graphic that incorrectly portrayed the impact on the Hermoso and Elmhurst neighborhoods. Both Hermoso and Elmhurst are private and quiet neighborhoods and a light rail train passing potentially every 6 minutes (or 3 minutes both directions) will destroy the livability of both neighborhoods. The graphic did not show there is no comparable neighborhood on Beveland, and it did not show that only secluded homes surrounded by businesses exist along Beveland. The number of homes shown as directly impacted in the Hermoso and Elmhurst neighborhood was significantly incorrect by showing only one home as impacted in the Hermoso neighborhood when it will require at least 3 homes to be purchased in addition to partial property acquisition. The committee did not address the impact to the remaining neighborhood homes that will suffer irreparable damage after homes are removed and light rail runs adjacent to their backyard. A quiet and peaceful neighborhood will be destroyed.</p> <p><b>Why didn't the route shown as Design Refinement 5 to the Committee match the route shown in the DEIS Appendix E?</b> Shouldn't the route considered by the Committee match the route in Appendix E? The decision by the Committee was based on a route that was not part of the DEIS Appendix for property acquisition. The graphic presented did not address the impact on a parcel of land under development for years that is over 2 acres in size. The impact from light rail on commercial land will be severe. The graphic did not address the correct number of homes to be purchased in the Elmhurst neighborhood. The Committee did not address the impact to the remaining neighborhood homes as they did not with the Hermoso neighborhood homes. The Committee chose to support Design Refinement 5 without regard to the impact it would have on residential areas and without knowing the actual impacts on Beveland. The Committee showed a clear deference to offices over permanent damage to neighborhoods. This should not remain uncorrected.</p> <p>No consideration was given by the Committee to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. traffic impacts on 72nd avenue because the light rail crossing is too close to the Dartmouth/72nd intersection and the Beveland/72nd intersection.</li> <li>2. the random train crossings to eventually occur every 6 to 10 minutes (3 to 5 minutes if both directions counted) that can cause vehicles to back up and impact nearby intersections.</li> <li>3. the 725 feet of 6.8% track slope required by Design Refinement 5 versus 4.1% on Beveland.</li> <li>4. the location of a station that would be moved about 775 feet further from the thousands of employees, students, and hotel guests in the southern portion of the Triangle</li> <li>5. decreased ridership from moving the station away from the southern portion of the Triangle</li> <li>6. the slope of 72nd at the Elmhurst light rail crossing versus the flat intersection at the Beveland crossing of 72nd</li> <li>7. the severity of impact Beveland businesses would actually have</li> <li>8. the severity of impact the neighborhoods would have</li> <li>9. the fact that no opposition had been presented on behalf of the neighborhoods</li> <li>10. the significant amount of private property to be purchased because the existing public right of way is not being used on Beveland</li> <li>11. the fact that far more private property must be purchased for Design Refinement 5 than along Beveland</li> <li>12. the fact that there is only a small amount of property along Beveland that is actually needed adjacent to public right of way</li> <li>13. the type of impact is permanent in the neighborhoods but temporary for businesses along Beveland</li> <li>14. Noise and vibration impacts that are better kept in office areas not residential areas.</li> </ol> <p>Had the Committee been properly informed and armed with correct information, it would likely reject Design Refinement 5. This mistake in judgment by the Committee arose because of the short time given to consider Design Refinement 5. After over 2 years of consideration to the other alternatives, only 2 months was given to Design Refinement 5 and this led to showing the Committee a route that did not match Design Refinement 5 as shown in DEIS Appendix E. This is wrong and shows an indifference to all property owners and especially home owners.</p> <p>Light rail crossing 72nd avenue near SW Elmhurst has an elevation of about 245' according to City maps. Elevation of light rail crossing at Beveland is 225'. A 20' difference in elevation based on City mapping information.</p> <p>The north-south portion of Hermoso Way is at about 196' according to City maps. Light rail may have lower elevation near Walmart but should not interfere with its loading dock operations.</p> <p>The slope of the Design Refinement 5 route from 72nd to Hermoso near Walmart loading docks is at least 6.8%. The slope of Alternative C5 along Beveland is 4.1%. Design Refinement 5 has a steeper slope than Alternative C5 along Beveland.</p> <p>What is the rationale for choosing a route with a much steeper slope, that impacts more homes and destroys two neighborhoods, and requires much more private property to be purchased when public right of way is readily available with Alternative C5 or C6? What rationale is there to choose Design Refinement 5 when businesses along Alternative C5 and C6 on Beveland are mainly temporarily impacted during construction because light rail stays primarily on public right of way?</p>	<p>with an initial summary of public comments from the Draft EIS as well as information on comparative impacts between the alternatives in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin).</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to the SW Elmhurst Street alignment in Segment C, which was studied as Refinement 5 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>TriMet design criteria allow maximum slopes of up to 6.98%. However, as studied in the Final EIS, the Preferred Alternative does not include a slope in this area greater than 5.3%, which occurs for a short distance to the west of SW Atlanta Street.</p> <p>To learn more about ridership at specific stations, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>The slope at the light rail crossing of SW 72nd Avenue at SW Elmhurst Street is 3% and well within the typical slope of crossings on the system.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of this Final EIS, regarding concerns about noise and vibrations.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period, including the amount of time provided for public comment on the Draft EIS.</p> <p>As studied in the Final EIS, the Preferred Alternative will not interfere with Walmart's loading operations, as the alignment is elevated approximately 35 feet above that location. Coordination between TriMet and property owners will continue as design progresses.</p> <p>Please see Section 5.3, Cost and Funding Evaluation, of this Final EIS for more information related to your concerns regarding costs and funding of the Project.</p> <p>To learn more about transit travel time and reliability, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p> <p>In your comment, you also expressed a preference for light rail along an I-5 alignment in Segment C, which was studied as Alternatives C1 and C3 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p>

Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>Why consider any light rail route that causes so much damaging impact and cost when it does not cross Hall Blvd into the downtown core? Downtown Tigard will be served by WES and bus service can connect it with a more efficient light rail that should remain parallel to I-5. This would be similar in concept to the plan in Tualatin to rely on WES and bus service to serve its downtown area.</p> <p><i>(Note: additional markups are shared in the original version of this comment submission as overlays atop Figure E-6 from Appendix E, Potential Design Refinement Concepts and Options, of the Draft EIS. These markups can be seen in the original comment, which is provided in Appendix J3, Original Copies of Draft EIS Comments, of this Final EIS.)</i></p>	
I370	Martin, Steve	<p>This report has additional information and impacts regarding Design Refinement 5 to be added to Appendix E, page E-15 and E-23 and presented below.</p> <p>Based on the proposed neighborhood destruction as shown by the continued consideration of Design Refinement 5 and Design Refinement 6 Variation 1, the goal of minimizing impacts to homes and businesses is not met. It also fails to deliver on the fundamental goal of relieving traffic congestion because of traffic impacts at critical intersections arising from nearby train crossings and the resultant random traffic flow stoppage.</p> <p>The following is a summary of impacts with questions posed that primarily arise from Design Refinement 5:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Design Refinement 5 requires a steeper slope of at least 6.8% over a distance of 725 feet for the tracks. The slope of the tracks along Beveland with Alternative C5 or C6 will be 4.1% or less. <b>Given the smaller track slope on Beveland, wouldn't it be more reasonable to choose Beveland as the light rail route instead of Design Refinement 5?</b></li> <li>2. Design Refinement 5 reduces track length by 775 feet. The travel time saved is negligible. <b>Given the negligible change in travel time, wouldn't it be better to avoid the destruction of two neighborhoods?</b></li> <li>3. The access to Design Refinement 5 relies upon using a bridge to cross Dartmouth at 70th. The bridge is necessary due to elevation differences and the impact on the Dartmouth/68th intersection and I-5. Random traffic flow stops at 70th due to light rail trains could cause vehicles to back up onto I-5 because there is no synchronization between train and traffic signals. However, 70th is bounded tightly by buildings and a bridge would be incompatible with vehicular usage of 70th near Dartmouth. The resulting problem could necessitate reconsidering Alternative C3 or C4. <b>Given the problem at the Dartmouth/70th intersection, wouldn't it be reasonable to have a design prepared that shows how a bridge can be used to cross Dartmouth at 70th while vehicles also continue to use 70th?</b></li> <li>4. Design Refinement 5 effectively destroys the Hermoso neighborhood and Elmhurst neighborhood and could be avoided by using the existing public right of way along Beveland. The livability of both neighborhoods will be irreparably damaged. In contrast, Alternative C5 and C6 along Beveland uses primarily public right of way and there are no private or quiet neighborhoods to be destroyed. Most offices along Beveland will have only temporary impacts during construction and will lose only small pieces of property bordering the public right of way. Offices can be replaced, the destruction of neighborhood livability cannot. <b>Given the enormous impacts to two different neighborhoods, wouldn't it be more reasonable to use Beveland with mostly temporary impacts? If impacts on Beveland are considered large, given that light rail is primarily on public right of way, what basis was the impact considered to be permanent and large?</b></li> <li>5. Design Refinement 5 places construction noise next to a residential area and away from the office area along Beveland that is associated with Alternative C5 and C6. <b>Given that noise in a residential area is far more impactful than in an office area, wouldn't it be reasonable to keep the noise impacts within the office areas on Beveland?</b></li> <li>6. Design Refinement 5 results in a station located further north and further from thousands of employees, hotel guests, and students in the southern portion of the Triangle. <b>Given that there are thousands of potential riders in the south part of the Triangle, wouldn't it be reasonable to have a station on Beveland rather than further away from the potential riders?</b></li> <li>7. Extensive private property must be purchased with Design Refinement 5 because it does not rely upon public right of way as does Alternative C5 or C6 along Beveland. <b>Given the substantially increased private property that must be purchased, wouldn't it be reasonable to avoid such purchases and stay on public right of way?</b></li> <li>8. Design Refinement 5 impacts the Dartmouth/72nd intersection for the same reason the Hall Blvd crossing impacts the Hall Blvd/Pacific Hwy intersection. The light rail crossing at SW Elmhurst St is located too close to the intersection. Frequent random traffic flow stops on 72nd due to light rail trains will cause vehicles to back up into the Dartmouth/72nd intersection. This is the primary intersection in the Triangle. Alternative C5 and C6 along Beveland cross 72nd a distance that is double the distance of the Design Refinement 5 72nd crossing and Dartmouth/72nd intersection. Given the impacts on the Dartmouth/72nd intersection, wouldn't it be more reasonable to have the 72nd light rail crossing much further away at Beveland where it is less likely to have an impact?</li> <li>9. Design Refinement 5 will require tracks to cross 72nd where it has a slope. The Alternative C5 and C6 route crosses 72nd at Beveland where it is already a flat intersection without noticeable slope. <b>Given that Beveland crosses 72nd at a flat area, wouldn't it be more reasonable to have light rail cross 72nd where it is flat and not sloped?</b></li> <li>10. Design Refinement 5 may have unidentified difficulties with Walmart operations. Alternatives C5 and C6 should not interfere with Walmart operations. <b>Given the impact on the neighborhoods and associated panic, shouldn't this potential problem have been already explored?</b></li> </ol>	<p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to the SW Elmhurst Street alignment in Segment C, which was studied as Refinement 5 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>TriMet design criteria allow maximum slopes of up to 6.98%. However, as studied in the Final EIS, the Preferred Alternative does not include a slope in this area greater than 5.3%, which occurs for a short distance to the west of SW Atlanta Street.</p> <p>To learn more about transit travel time and reliability, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p> <p>Please reference TriMet's Conceptual Design Report for illustrations of the Project's potential improvements to SW 70<sup>th</sup> Avenue, including additional description and illustrations of the trackway on SW 70<sup>th</sup> Avenue (find the Conceptual Design Report at: <a href="https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm">https://trimet.org/swcorridor/design.htm</a>).</p> <p>To learn more about ridership at specific stations, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>The slope at the light rail crossing of SW 72nd Avenue at SW Elmhurst Street is 3% and well within the typical slope of crossings on the system.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of this Final EIS, regarding concerns about noise and vibrations.</p> <p>As studied in the Final EIS, the Preferred Alternative will not interfere with Walmart's loading operations, as the alignment is elevated approximately 35 feet above that location. Coordination between TriMet and property owners will continue as design progresses.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period, including the amount of time provided for public comment on the Draft EIS.</p> <p>In your comment, you also expressed a preference for light rail along an I-5 alignment in Segment C, which was studied as Alternatives C1 and C3 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p>

Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>Additional information and impacts not addressed in Appendix E are presented using the same format as in Appendix E, Pages E-15 and E-23:</p> <p><b>APPENDIX E</b></p> <p><b>Design Refinement 5: Elmhurst Page E-15</b></p> <p><b>Refinement 5:</b></p> <p>Elmhurst</p> <p><b>Transit travel time</b></p> <p>PSU - Tigard TC or Bridgeport</p> <p>Would reduce travel time because it would shorten track distance</p> <p><i>Travel time may not be shortened (additional distance 775') because of the steeper grade from 72nd to Hermoso (at least a 6.8% slope rather than the 4.1% along Beveland). 72nd elevation is about 20' higher at the Design Refinement 5 crossing than at the Beveland crossing based on City maps. Design Refinement 5 and Alternative C5 along Beveland have a similar distance from 72nd to the Hermoso elevation of about 196'. Also, homes on Hermoso Way will require slow train speed to lower noise and vibration and this increases travel time.</i></p> <p><b>Ridership</b></p> <p>Line riders and new system transit trips Could increase ridership slightly because of the faster travel time.</p> <p><i>Faster travel time is unlikely as explained under "Transit travel time" above but the time difference associated with an additional distance of about 775' is not likely to affect ridership.</i></p> <p><i>Decreased ridership is more likely because the Elmhurst station is further from the thousands of employees, hotel guests, and students located in the southern portion of the Triangle.</i></p> <p><b>Acquisitions &amp; Displacements</b></p> <p>Residential, business and employee displacements</p> <p>Would avoid impacts on SW Beveland St. (mostly businesses) but add impacts on SW Elmhurst St. (mostly residential)</p> <p><i>Impacts also occur to Hermoso Way neighborhood in addition to the impacts to the SW Elmhurst St neighborhood. Impacts occur to other property along Design Refinement 5 route as well. Two private and quiet neighborhoods will be significantly impacted by Design Refinement 5. There are no similar neighborhoods to be impacted along Beveland.</i></p> <p><i>With Alternative C5 along Beveland, track will be mostly on existing public right of way. Design Refinement 5 requires significantly more property to be purchased because it does not use the existing public right of way. Additionally, because the Hermoso and Elmhurst neighborhoods are mostly secluded from a busy street and enjoy privacy and quiet, Design Refinement 5 will impact overall livability in the neighborhoods. With slight adjustments, Alternative C5 and C6 along Beveland could minimize further impact to offices. The C5 and C6 route along Beveland will temporarily impact businesses but the Design Refinement 5 impact to the Hermoso Way and Elmhurst neighborhoods is permanent and irreparable.</i></p> <p><b>Cost</b></p> <p>Operating and maintenance No change</p> <p><i>It appears Design Refinement 5 could increase cost because of maintenance associated with the steeper slope. The Design Refinement 5 route has a slope of at least 6.8% for about 725 feet, whereas the Alternative C5 and C6 Beveland route has a slope of 4.1% or less.</i></p> <p>Capital</p> <p>Would reduce cost</p> <p><i>Design Refinement 5 cost is expected to be larger due to the larger amount of property to be purchased by not using existing public right of way along 70th and Beveland. Compensation will be greater for damage caused to the Hermoso neighborhood and the Elmhurst neighborhood. Also greater compensation is expected for homes that remain in both neighborhoods due to livability damage. Construction associated with track at a 6.8% slope or more is expected to be greater than that for Beveland at a 4.1% slope or less.</i></p> <p><i>Alternative C5 and C6 along Beveland is expected to cost less than Design Refinement 5 because it uses primarily public right of way, the track slope is less, and the intersection of 72nd/Beveland is flat and without noticeable slope.</i></p> <p><i>Analysis of the Design Refinement 5 in Appendix E does not adequately address the effect on property west of 72nd and especially on the Hermoso neighborhood. It also does not address the crossing of 72nd on a slope near SW Elmhurst. It does not analyze the effect of a light rail train eventually crossing 72nd every 6 to 10 minutes that randomly stops traffic flow close to the primary Triangle</i></p>	

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p><i>intersection of Dartmouth/72nd Avenue. The impact to the Dartmouth/72nd and Beveland/72nd intersections has not been addressed and both are close to the random train crossings that cause traffic flow to stop unexpectedly near SW Elmhurst St.</i></p> <p><b>Other</b></p> <p><i>Additional trade-offs</i></p> <p><i>Alternative C5 and C6 along Beveland has a slope of 4.1% and Design Refinement 5 has a steeper slope of at least 6.8% for 725 feet. Alternative C5 and C6 along Beveland temporarily impacts a business area, whereas Design Refinement 5 permanently impacts two separate residential areas.</i></p> <p><i>Alternative C5 and C6 along Beveland requires 72nd to be crossed by light rail where it is already a flat intersection. Design Refinement 5 route does not cross 72nd where it is flat.</i></p> <p><i>Design Refinement 5 is more likely to impact the primary Triangle intersection of Dartmouth/72nd than Alternative C5 and C6 along Beveland because the light rail crossing of 72nd near SW Elmhurst St is not only too close, it is about half the distance of a 72nd light rail crossing at Beveland.</i></p> <p><i>The Alternative C6 along Beveland option with bridge to Hunziker was to include an important vehicular portal to the Triangle. C6 does not appear to permanently impact businesses in the Triangle. Neither Alternative C5 along Beveland nor Design Refinement 5 provide a vehicular portal to the Triangle.</i></p> <p><i>Design Refinement 5 property acquisitions will include the purchase of more homes than with Alternative C5 along Beveland because of impact to two neighborhoods and other unexpected issues. Most property acquisitions along Beveland will be small property slivers adjacent to public right of way that do not alter the ability to conduct business. Most property acquisitions along Design Refinement 5 will be large purchases that permanently alter the livability of the neighborhoods.</i></p> <p><i>Design Refinement 5 moves the station further away from thousands of employees, students, and hotel guests. Alternative C5 and C6 along Beveland allows for a station to be located closer to the southern portion of the Triangle where ridership can be expected to be higher.</i></p> <p><i>Design Refinement 5 is indifferent to the major and permanent impacts on private property owners in two different neighborhoods. Worse, the neighborhood impacts promoted would serve Design Refinement 6, a last minute route change introduced to have a station regardless of safety, usefulness, and traffic impacts to reach closer to downtown Tigard.</i></p> <p><b>APPENDIX E</b></p> <p><b>Anticipated Effect of Design Refinements on Initial Route Proposal Alignment Alternatives, Page E-23</b></p> <p><b>Description</b></p> <p><i>This design refinement alignment would turn west from SW 70th Avenue at SW Elmhurst Street instead of turning west further south at SW Beveland Street to cross over Highway 217. This would shorten the curve and reduce the length of light rail guideway to be constructed.</i></p> <p><i>The slope of the track is increased significantly from 4.1% to at least 6.8% for about 725 feet and this can increase cost. Track length would be reduced by about 775 feet.</i></p> <p><b>Impacts Addressed</b></p> <p><i>This design refinement would substantially reduce the number of partial property acquisitions between SW 70th Avenue and Highway 217. Noise impacts during construction and operations would also be reduced for homes in this area.</i></p> <p><i>There are two private and quiet neighborhoods seriously impacted by Design Refinement 5. There is no private and quiet neighborhood on Alternative C5 and C6 along Beveland. Hermoso and Elmhurst neighborhoods both have quiet surroundings.</i></p> <p><i>Businesses close at 5pm and do not expect to be quiet and relaxing areas. Neighborhoods are open 24 hours and do not close as a business generally does. Neighborhoods are expected to be quiet and relaxing. Far more homes will be impacted by Design Refinement 5 than by Alternative C5 and C6 along Beveland.</i></p> <p><i>Several acres of commercial property will be impacted by Design Refinement 5. Alternative C5 and C6 impacts using Beveland are generally small because little property is needed in most property acquisition cases. Public right of way provides the bulk of the property needed for light rail. Impacts from Design Refinement 5 are permanent whereas most impacts from Alternative C5 and C6 along Beveland are temporary and can be worked around.</i></p> <p><i>72nd is sloped where light rail is to cross near Elmhurst. The Alternatives C5 and C6 along Beveland both cross 72nd in a flat area without noticeable slope.</i></p> <p><i>The Dartmouth/72nd intersection can expect to be impacted if 72nd is crossed by light rail near SW Elmhurst Street because of its close proximity to the intersection. Alternatives C5 and C6 along Beveland cross 72nd much further (about double the distance) from the Dartmouth/72nd intersection and is less likely to impact it.</i></p>	

Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p><b>Key Assumptions</b></p> <p>The horizontal elevation of the guideway and approach to the crossing of Highway 217 would generally be the same as that proposed for Alternative C1.</p> <p><i>The track slope from 72nd to the west most portion of Hermoso will need to be at least 6.8% and is steeper in Design Refinement 5. This will require additional construction to accommodate the increase in slope. The effect Design Refinement 5 will have on Walmart is unclear.</i></p> <p><b>Overall Changes in Impacts or Other Benefits</b></p> <p>This design refinement alignment would be faster and increase ridership compared to the alignment along SW Beveland Street of Alternative C1. <i>There is no benefit based on track slope. The Design Refinement 5 using SW Elmhurst is about 775' shorter, and is steeper with at least a 6.8% track slope over a distance of 725 feet rather than 4.1% along Beveland. Time savings is negligible and unlikely to increase ridership. However, a station on Beveland using the Alternative C5 or C6 route along Beveland would likely increase ridership because it is closer to the southern portion of the Triangle where large buildings exist and thousands of employees work, students attend school, and hotel guests are staying.</i></p> <p>Compared to Alternative C1, this design refinement would use less of the existing transportation right of way along SW 70th Avenue and SW Beveland Street, thereby reducing local traffic and access impacts during construction and operations. This would also reduce noise impacts during construction and operations to single family homes along these streets. <i>The Alternative C5 and C6 along Beveland option has access from Hermoso Way, Lowes, 72nd, and 70th, so it should be possible to work around construction issues. Also, use of existing public right of way along Beveland and 70th will significantly reduce far more impact to private property in the Hermoso and Elmhurst neighborhoods. It is not a benefit to move noise impacts during construction and operations from the office area along Beveland to the residential area of Hermoso and Elmhurst neighborhoods. Local traffic impacts will be much larger with Design Refinement 5 because the random traffic flow stoppage resulting from the trains will impact the Dartmouth/72nd intersection far more with Design Refinement 5 rather than using the public right of way along Beveland to cross 72nd.</i></p> <p>This design refinement would result in a substantially smaller number of partial property acquisitions but a greater number of full acquisitions to homes along SW Elmhurst Street and SW Hermoso Way. There would also be a partial acquisition of a large commercial property (Walmart) under this design refinement. <i>The difference in the number of partial property acquisitions appear similar. However, most of the partial acquisitions along the Beveland portion of the C5 and C6 route will consist of small portions of property adjacent to existing public right of way to be used by light rail. Many of the partial acquisitions along the Elmhurst/Hermoso Way portion of Design Refinement 5 will be large. Far more homes are affected, and the impact will be greater for each home with Design Refinement 5 because they are located in quiet and private neighborhoods as opposed to Beveland which does not have a quiet and private neighborhood. It is unclear what impact Design Refinement 5 will have on Walmart whereas Alternative C5 and C6 along Beveland routes have little or no impact on Walmart.</i></p> <p>Both this design refinement and Alternative C1 would impact a similar area designated as Clean Water Services Vegetated Corridor and City of Tigard Goal 5 Habitat classified as "Strictly Limit."</p> <p><i>The crossing of Hwy 217 using Alternative C6 with a bridge for vehicles has much less impact to the Triangle and on Beveland, as well as less impact on wetland areas. Tigard downtown can still be reached with WES near SW Bonita Road or connected by bus near Hunziker.</i></p> <p>Noise and vibration impacts would be reduced south of SW Elmhurst Street due to avoidance. New noise and vibration impacts would be expected at remaining residences along SW Elmhurst Street west of SW 70th Ave. Mitigation to address these added noise and vibration impacts could include sound walls for noise where possible, ballast mats and resilient fasteners for vibration</p> <p><i>Noise and vibration impacts in the Elmhurst neighborhood west of 70th will need to be reduced by slowing the train speed when passing residential areas. Noise and vibration impacts from Design Refinement 5 will also need mitigation near and along the Hermoso neighborhood west of 72nd. The trains will need to travel at a very slow speed through much of the Triangle because 70th is largely a residential area as is Hermoso Way and SW Elmhurst St. west of 70th. Both 69th and Beveland are primarily business oriented streets and less sensitive to noise and vibration.</i></p> <p>A light rail street crossing as shown on Hall Blvd, 72nd Avenue, and Dartmouth Street, stops traffic flow at random times and can severely impact traffic flow through the nearby intersections circled. This occurs because lanes at the nearby intersections may not clear during a single green cycle due to vehicles that have been unexpectedly backed up after stopping for a train. The frequency this occurs could eventually be once every 6 minutes. Current traffic analysis submitted in the DEIS does not account for this type of traffic impact at the intersections.</p> <p>70th is narrow near Dartmouth with buildings bounding both sides. A bridge must be used for the light rail crossing as shown otherwise it will impact the traffic flow through the Dartmouth/68th intersection and possibly also impact I-5. However, if a bridge is used, it appears extremely difficult to use that portion of 70th for vehicles as well.</p>	

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>Light rail street crossings as shown on Hunziker for Design Refinement 6 stops traffic flow at random times and can severely impact traffic flow at the Hunziker/Hall Blvd intersection as circled. This occurs because lanes at the intersection may not clear during a single green cycle due to vehicles that have been unexpectedly backed up after stopping for a train. The frequency this occurs could eventually be once every 6 minutes. Current traffic analysis submitted in the DEIS does not account for this type of traffic impact at this intersection.</p> <p>The stations as shown for Variation 1 and 2 do not safely or reasonably serve the downtown core of Tigard as they are in the industrial area, will impact traffic flow on Hall Blvd, and require pedestrians to cross Hall Blvd after walking a significant distance. Consequently light rail should remain parallel to I-5 and not be routed towards downtown Tigard for numerous reasons.</p> <p>This map shows the primary neighborhoods impacted by light rail routes in the Tigard Triangle and north of Hunziker.</p> <p>If light rail remains parallel to I-5, at least 3 neighborhoods will not be impacted (Knoll Dr, Hermoso Way, Elmhurst)</p> <p>If the office based street of 69th is used with Beveland instead of 70th and Elmhurst, then at least 3 neighborhoods will not be impacted.</p> <p>If Alternative C6 is used, 3 neighborhoods will not be impacted. If 69th is used, 4 neighborhoods would not be impacted.</p> <p>There are no quiet and private neighborhoods along Beveland. There are a few isolated homes surrounded by offices.</p> <p>The light rail route of 70th with a turn west on SW Elmhurst Street (Design Refinement 5) does not minimize impacts to homes but avoids primarily temporary impacts to businesses.</p> <p>Beveland business area has primarily temporary and small impacts resulting from the loss of small slivers of property along Beveland public right of way. A few homes and businesses could have larger impacts depending upon using Alternative C5 or C6.</p> <p>Light rail should remain parallel to I-5 as shown by Alternative C5.</p> <p><i>(Note: additional markups are shared in the original version of this comment submission as overlays atop Figure E-6 and E-7 from Appendix E, Potential Design Refinement Concepts and Options, of the Draft EIS, as well as on a map created by the commenter. These markups can be seen in the original comment, which is provided in Appendix J3, Original Copies of Draft EIS Comments, of this Final EIS.)</i></p>	
I371	Martin, Steve	<p>On a separate note, I think the owner of the business that was laughed at (filling in for Bill?) when he said it would “kill” his business should be given an apology. It was disconcerting when I saw so many people laughing at his statement because this is very serious business and he was not laughing. Instead of asking why it would kill his business, there seemed to be indifference.</p> <p>My approach to light rail routes would have been to only consider routes that absolutely minimize impact to homes, neighborhoods, businesses, and traffic impact. This is not what is happening. The problem caused by crossing Hall Blvd and its impact on the Hall Blvd/Pacific intersection should have been identified 2 years ago but it was ignored in favor of reaching downtown Tigard even though there is no plan to ever continue towards Sherwood from downtown Tigard. The same analysis applies to every intersection and street along the line. Upon finally having the traffic impacts explained on Hall Blvd, the Refinement 6 was created at the last minute. It too has various problems. So many that to justify it, the complete transformation of an industrial area is suddenly considered without involving the owners of the businesses. It contemplates riders walking more than a half mile in the dark rainy nights to ride light rail. Promoting designs where “the end justifies the means” appears to be the approach now in use by the Cities. At least Tualatin understood that bus service between its downtown and light rail along I-5 is what really made sense.</p> <p>The SW Corridor project was to relieve traffic congestion but it appears that it will not do that because of the traffic impacts it will have throughout Pacific Hwy and in the Triangle. Hopefully someone will see that any project that requires so many bridges to work properly (and this project needs more bridges), will see that something is wrong with the project.</p> <p>Thanks again, and for the good work you do trying to implement what you have been given to work with. Maybe the Steering Committee will set aside personal interests in favor of metro wide interests. Tigard at the moment is acting against metro wide interests.</p>	<p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project’s traffic analysis. Other impacts to businesses and neighborhoods are described in Chapter 4, Environmental Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail.</p>
I372	Martinez, Kate	<p>I work at the National University of Natural Medicine (NUNM) in South Portland. I sometimes bike to work and the traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
I373	Matos Coelho, Fernanda	Rating 5	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		I think it necessary to bridge Portland and Tigard since traffic jam at Barbur happens often.	
I374	Matteri, Robert	<p>according to google maps, i can drive this route in 27 minutes right now (9 am during morning rush), from bridgeport to psu. i believe that it's time to really develop 'light rail' as rapid transit, not mass transit; that is, not a fancy street car, which is what the gresham and hillsboro lines are. if you can drive from your home to downtown and park with your car, faster than the trip by max, then large numbers will still drive for convenience (look at the banfield and sunset any day, both in the morning and afternoon rushes, which last hours).</p> <p>at least design the system with an express option that avoids so many stops, or/and is completely separate from cars. one could have "cut and covered the lines" downtown to bury the max lines when all the street and transit mall surface work was done---- a great opportunity missed. almost every german city has now buried their downtown streetcar lines, and separated their streetcar lines from cars as they leave the downtown. you know we will eventually bury the downtown lines as a 'subway' type system, don't you?</p> <p>why isn't the 'rapid' in rapid transit for our light rail lines even discussed? especially when new lines are being built and planned? the lines must go faster than one can go by car. when self driving cars come, the rapid part will even be more important.</p> <p>thanks</p>	<p>To learn more about transit travel time and reliability, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 12 regarding your preference for tunneled options for the Project.</p>
I375	Mattson, Bethany	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur. Thank you!	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I376	McClain, James	<p>1. I don't feel that the SWNI community has not had a strong voice with Metro. This is a Metro plan. Show me how the SWNI transportation committee has successfully modified it?</p> <p>2. There should be a lot more planning discussions around connectivity and pedestrian/bike safety. This is the preference of the neighborhoods ahead of the construction of light rail. Most of these 17 SWNI neighborhoods have lacked thorough planning. In the original design of SW, we did not have this level of density. Approaching light rail in a piecemeal fashion is not good enough, especially since the original design of SW Barbur was from the 1940's or 1950's. The car was king. In 30 years, it may not be the case. What are you doing with SW Barbur?</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period, including outreach to different communities and groups. Additionally, the response to Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc.'s comments submitted during the Draft EIS public comment period is included in Appendix J2.2, Organization Comments.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support of bicycle and pedestrian improvements as part of the Project.</p>
I377	McEwen, Ian	<p>I've been commuting to and from Southwest PDX to downtown PDX over the last 20 years as both a student PSU and for work. I've taken the bus at times and currently drive. I use Barbur and I-5 primarily. I agree that we need to improve transit options, but I'm opposed to the light rail project. I'd like to understand why the steering committee chose light rail as preferred to rapid bus. Rapid bus is a much more simple and viable option. For one, you're not tearing up already built infrastructure to lay track and also losing a lane of traffic at the same time. Barbur is already bus ready and paid for, let's get more buses running on there. You can run them on biofuels as well. Buses can go places rail cannot, serving more people and places. Construction and maintenance for light rail is vastly more expensive than bus. It seems like Tr-Met wants to be a developer as much as a transit agency to tout these capital projects that turn into expensive boondoggles ie. WES train.</p> <p>Barbur is also the pressure release valve for I-5 at the Terwilliger curves. Losing a lane or lanes on Barbur for vehicle traffic is folly when we need that release valve more than ever. Don't tear up current infrastructure for trains. Rapid bus on Barbur is the solution. If you have to use the big FED bucks on a train then make sure you are not tearing up current built roads for it. Find throughways to lay track or use current infrastructure like the tracks along Highway 43/Macadam. Don't tear up built and paid for roads please. Say yes to versatile rapid bus and trains as the backup plan when you can minimize tearing up built infrastructure.</p> <p>Thanks,</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard.</p>
I378	McKennon, Monique	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I379	McLauchlan Stone, Kelly	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists like myself. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I380	McMinn, Carmie	I am in support of a max line along Barbur. I have lived near Barbur and 30th for 20 years and the rush hour traffic continues to get worse between Portland and Tigard and South towards Bridgeport.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I381	McMonagle, William	<p>I WOULD SUGGEST THE ENTIRE LIGHT RAIL LINE BE RUN OVERHEAD ALONG BARBER BLVD. AND INTO TIGARD WITH ACCESS STATIONS AT GROUND LEVEL WITH ELEVATORS AND ESCALATORS UP TO THE LOADING RAMP AT THE TRAIN.</p> <p>THIS PLAN WOULD FULLY PROVIDE SERVICE TO THE ADJACENT NEIGHBORHOODS AND BUSINESSES. AN OVERHEAD SYSTEM WOULD ELIMINATE INTERFACING WITH TRAFFIC AND UNDERGROUND UTILITIES. RUNNING THE TRAIN ALONG 1-5 MAKES NO SENCE AT ALL. THE OVERHEAD LINE COULD COME BACK TO GROUND LEVEL TO SERVE THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE IF NECESSARY.</p> <p>CONSIDERING THE DISRUPTION OF UTILITIES, TRAFFIC WHICH IS ON GOING, SIGNAL RETOOLING, ETC. THE OVERHEAD CONSTRUCTION WOULD BE STRAIGHT FORWARD WITH THE SUPPORT SYSTEM AND PRECAST RAIL BEAM, SORT OF A PLUG AND PLAY SYSTEM OF CONSTRUCTION AND IN MY ESTIMATION WOULD BE MUCH LESS EXPENSIVE TO BUILD, A SMALLER FOOT PRINT, AND LESS EXPENSIVE TO MAINTAIN. CONDUTORS FOR THE TRAIN POWER WOULD BE IN THE RAIL BEAM INSTEAD OF UGLY OVERHEAD SYSTEM THAT ARE SUBJECT TO WEATHER CONDITIONS.</p> <p>WE GO UNDERGROUND FOR THE SAME REASONS WE SHOULD GO OVERHEAD.</p>	<p>It is TriMet's preference to grade separate all light rail crossings. However, this is not always feasible due to budget constraints. Where at-grade crossings are proposed, TriMet ensures these are designed and built to the most current safety standards. Traffic impacts are analyzed at each crossing location in this Final EIS. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS for more information.</p> <p>Typically, elevated guideway is significantly more expensive than guideway that is at-grade. It can also result in different adverse effects than at-grade structures, including impacts related to noise, visual change and the community. Overhead catenary poles are still required on structures for light rail systems; therefore, utility relocations would be reduced but still required everywhere there is a bridge column, and traffic signals would need to be modified due to changed sight distances created by a structure. Additionally, escalators and elevators at elevated stations increase both the construction costs and ongoing operating expenses.</p>
I382	Mcneal, Jennifer	<p>I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur..</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
I383	Mehr, Jessica	<p>I live in SW Portland along the I5 corridor and highly support this plan. This would hopefully alleviate some of the traffic along I5 and bring some much needed development to Barbur Blvd. It would also improve access to downtown which while is close in distance, can be difficult due to heavy freeway traffic.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p>
I384	Mehrabji, Michelle	<p>As a lifelong Oregonian and resident of SW Portland I can not believe Metro and ODOT continue to want to funnel so taxpayer money to Light Rail, while ignoring the clogged highway system of the Portland Metro area, along with surrounding suburbs. Automobiles are not going to disappear anytime soon. Americans enjoy driving. Uber has taken over. Every time I travel to the airport the Max line is virtually empty. How much money was spent on that line? Was it really necessary? No it was not. Another lane on I205 was needed. I travel all around the country and most major cities have commuter lanes on their highways except Oregon! Not to mention what the congestion does to freight and commerce. It's a shame. Things have to change. There has to be more balance and money spent on the majority of taxpayers mode of transportation: ROADS.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for highway and roadway investments instead of light rail.</p>
I385	Merklin, Lee	<p>N. Interstate Ave. used to be a pleasure to drive, wide, easy navigation, it is a disaster now.. We need NO More of that. Because of the congestion I will no longer go out there.</p> <p>SW Barbur Blvd is used frequently by me to go to OSHU and Downtown. It is currently a pleasure to drive as opposed to I=5.</p> <p>It is also the only wide emergency outlet if there is an event on I-5 that precludes its use. Only Taylors Ferry exists and it is loaded with traffic at rush hours. There are only 5 traffic lanes available to use if there is an emergency on any one of them all of SW will be tangled up in a web</p> <p>To reduce the number of traffic lanes available to South West traffic, crowd in light rail, and bicycle (primarily used three months of the year) lanes will make it the disaster that N. Interstate is. Those are some of the reasons voters in this area have regularly voted against any light rail. and will continue to do so.</p> <p>We know that one of the ideas is to increase Multiple dwelling units along the route increasing congestion and making the traffic in the SW even more taxing,</p> <p>I know you think light rail will relieve congestion, that is what was said when Neil Goldsmith and other politicians threw out the transportation plan for the Metro are that was put in place about 1948, What a terrible mistake that was, to build the I-84 Max line, it did not happen, congestion was not reduced on the highway and is now often at a dead stop.</p> <p>To build a fixed route system like max is a mistake. buses are far more responsive to emergency conditions. Fixed routes usually do not go where people want to go and due to the time to make multiple transfers, to get to where a person wants to go is ridiculous.</p> <p>Do not reduce any traffic lanes now serving the SW corridor or increase congestion thereon!!! WE Need to have relief valves for I-5. In will not vote for any bond or plane that does.</p> <p>I have more reasons as to why this expenditure should not be made, one of the first is ODOT, a political body like Metro, has a history of not keeping Promises made to Wilsonville, Tigard and Tualatin, about road improvements it would make when the 1948 transportation plan was thrown out, and it appears that they will never keep those promises. There are others that are more current but you do not care to her them.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I386	Meserow, Nancy	initially I wanted it. but since you are placing it on Barbur, rather than I-5, I am against it. the impacts to existing housing and businesses on Barbur will be terrible -- you have maximized adverse impact, not minimized it. You have NOT improved transit travel time; due to all the cross streets on the Barbur route, the transit time will be slower for everybody, on and off the Max. the impact on neighborhoods will be terrible -- I am now 100% against this, and will vote against it, every chance I get.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.  Please see Master Response 17 regarding property acquisitions and business displacements.  To learn more about transit travel time and reliability, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.
I387	Messimer, Jacob	Rating 3  This route ABSOLUTELY needs to serve the Kruse Way/Meadows Rd business park in Lake Oswego. I don't have data on how many people work in the approx 15 5-7 story towers in this development but I can't believe it's anything less than 4000-5000 people, especially when you factor in all the ancillary restaurants and services in the area. It is unfathomable to me that we don't have a viable connection to this area. I live near the NE 60th Max Station and I would gladly take transit instead of drive alone in my car, but it is completely impossible with current service. A 20-30 min drive vs a 2 hr bus ride (with inconvenient frequency) is a non-starter.	Please see Master Response 15 regarding your support for an extended I-5 alignment, which would have brought the light rail along I-5 and past Kruse Way.
I388	Michtom, Glen	I have scanned the plans and while I have neither the patience nor the expertise to understand it all, in general I am in favor of extending Max to SW and using Barbur Blvd. It is unfortunate that some businesses will be impacted but that is the price of progress. Having lived in the San Jose area after one county refused to let BART extend to the South Bay, I can tell you how short-sighted that was. Getting into and out of SF from just about anywhere south of the city was a nightmare. Portland is already moving in that direction and this can definitely help (way more than the silly tolling plan).  Please do not let the anti-transit, anti-government, anti-progress, NIMBY crowd dissuade you from moving forward on this valuable transit extension.  Thanks,	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I389	Michtom, Glen	Rating 4  Happy to see Max come to SW. Connecting to Tigard and Barbur TCs would seem to be essential, but it is not clear that this route goes to the Tigard TC. Can't tell from the diagram.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  In your comment, you expressed a preference for an alignment that serves Tigard Transit Center in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin). All six alignment alternatives in Segment C studied in the Draft EIS directly served the Tigard Transit Center, while Refinement 6 would provide a station east of Hall Boulevard, approximately 0.25 mile from the Tigard Transit Center. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.
I390	Miguel, China	Rating 5  It's almost as good as the wes train from wilsonville to btc its just the only difference is we wont have to hop off and go to another train just to go to portland. Also depends on the ammount of stops and its hours if it goes till late like the 12 bus and some other maxes count me in. Ill vote for behalf of the people in tigard. Good idea.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I391	Mijares, Alex	Hello. Thank you for your time. My name is Alex Mijares. Oh, my name is Alex Mijares. Thank you for your time. I live it Tualatin, walking distance from the Bridgeport stop and so I just have some concerns. My city has been increasingly being more gentrified over the last years, and my cost of living has increased hundreds of dollars every year. So I'm worried that for myself and my family who all live very close to that Bridgeport area that the new light rail system will give landlords even more reason to increase our rent, which is every year becoming more and more difficult to being able to do. The next thing that is -- my partner and I were discussing is that it's incredibly difficult and discouraging to look through the appendix of certain things such as -- like such as -- wow, that's really loud. Like, what exact locations will be affected and how much that will, like, with tearing down old apartments and what addresses will be affected and how much that will cost. And if there can be -- before the testimony period ends, if there can be an easier pamphlet or way of navigating that versus telling us to go online, when we're working class, low income people who are busy and worried about other things. It's just very discouraging to see this huge appendix and it's, like, I don't want to bother with that. It's another headache.	Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns about gentrification and indirect displacements.  Regarding your concerns about the volume of information provided in the Draft EIS and its complexity, the Project has included a robust public engagement process to provide information and opportunities for members of the public to speak to project staff regarding specific concerns they may have. Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period.
I392	Mileham, Steve	My wife and I have been following the progress of the light rail extension process with great interest. As residents of the West Portland Neighborhood, and with an additional rental property in the same neighborhood, we will be significantly affected by this proposed development. I appreciate the opportunity to submit comments and hope that all comments will be received and considered objectively.  A. Concerns regarding the additional investment in light rail  Initially, I was in favor of the extension of the light rail line. However, after some research, I am not in support of the extension of the light rail down Barbur Boulevard from downtown Portland to Tualatin, due to the extreme cost and the limited ridership projected. As it currently stands, every light rail rider is already significantly subsidized, and this new route will be no different.  "In FY 2016 TriMet had total operations revenue of \$542,200,000 but only \$118,069,000 came from passenger fares. That means TriMet riders received a 78% subsidy from other sources." <a href="http://www.cascadepolicy.org/audio/oregon-taxpayers-not-riders-pay-most-costs-of-public-transit-operations/">http://www.cascadepolicy.org/audio/oregon-taxpayers-not-riders-pay-most-costs-of-public-transit-operations/</a>	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.  To learn more about the transportation modeling used to project ridership, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.  In the Final EIS, the models for both the No-Build Alternative and the Preferred Alternative, which incorporate local and regional land use and transportation plans, include growth in population and traffic.  Please see Master Response 18 regarding your comments on development and transit-oriented development.  Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period.  In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>Serious funding will be required to capitalize this project, and additional funds will encumber taxpayers for years to come to operate this additional line. Without even close to a break-even scenario, as a taxpayer I am not in support of this effort.</p> <p>It appears the main intent of this additional line is to encourage more of the public to ride mass transit to downtown Portland from the SW Portland area (and Tigard and Tualatin) in order to reduce vehicular traffic. However, recent studies have shown that since its inception of the light rail, the percent of ridership here is already down.</p> <p>"Two of the initial light rail metros, Buffalo and Portland, had significantly higher transit mode shares in 1980 (7.9 and 9.7 percent, respectively) than they did in 2012." <a href="https://www.citylab.com/transportation/2014/04/have-us-light-rail-systems-been-worth-investment/8838/">https://www.citylab.com/transportation/2014/04/have-us-light-rail-systems-been-worth-investment/8838/</a></p> <p>And now we want to spend even more on the light rail system? Ridership will continue to decline due to many current trends and developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increase in telecommuting</li> <li>• flexible work schedules are allowing more workers to adjust schedules to avoid rush hour</li> <li>• increase in ride sharing and carpooling in Portland and suburbs</li> <li>• the homeless issues in downtown have people avoiding going downtown</li> <li>• the impending access of autonomous vehicles will increase the ease of using this mode of transportation</li> </ul> <p>According to some studies, "there is little evidence that rail transit has reduced traffic congestion. According to the 2002 Urban Mobility Report, traffic congestion in American cities both with and without light-rail transit has steadily increased since the 1980s...Cities with light-rail transit, such as St. Louis and Portland, have all experienced a continued increase in traffic congestion." (<a href="https://www.stlouisfed.org/publications/bridges/winter-20032004/lightrail-transit-myths-and-realities">https://www.stlouisfed.org/publications/bridges/winter-20032004/lightrail-transit-myths-and-realities</a>)</p> <p>The introduction of this light rail line may entice bus riders to switch to light rail. While this may reduce vehicles on the road, it is slight and does not warrant such a significant investment, since the current transit population is already being served. Studies have clearly shown that bus ridership is more cost effective than the investment in a light rail system.</p> <p>Additional claims for the viability of a light rail system is for the synergy of potential development of Transit Oriented Development (TOD). However, this should not be the goal of this investment, and this could be just as effective with the proper development of the bus transit station areas, without the additional cost of the light rail line.</p> <p>Frankly, I cannot see how this project is a cost-effective effort to significantly improve commuting from SW Portland. However, as these public projects go, the decision to go forward with the Barbur Boulevard light rail project may already have been made in spite of this logic. Therefore, I would like to air my concerns over the recent Refinement B-2 option at Taylors Ferry Road, an option that is very short-sighted.</p> <p><b>B. Public Outreach</b></p> <p>In addition to accessing information available online, I took the time to attend two recent public presentations:</p> <p>6/25/18 SW Corridor Plan CAC meeting at Multnomah Arts Center</p> <p>6/26/18 SW Corridor DEIS Open House at Markham School</p> <p>I appreciate the public outreach efforts and the opportunity to gain additional information and have questions answered. These sessions only strengthened our concern about the recent option B-2 Refinement developed for the West Portland "Crossroads" (SW Taylors Ferry Road/ Capitol Highway/ Barbur Blvd.).</p> <p><b>C. Opposition to Refinement B-2 option</b></p> <p>I am very concerned about the Refinement B-2 option that would divert the light rail to a route along Taylors Ferry Road, out of concerns for traffic and safety. It was mentioned at one of these public sessions that this option may have been proposed as a cost-savings measure (as it might result in more on-grade transit and could be less expensive than building additional structured ramps). However, any decision to pursue this option primarily due to cost savings is incredibly short-sighted from a planning standpoint.</p> <p>As a Managing Principal in one of the top 3 Architectural Firms in Portland (LRS Architects), I have worked on numerous master plans, and know the need to investigate all options, evaluate alternates, and present the information for public feedback. I understand the pressure to find cost-saving measures. On our most successful projects, we have listened to the feedback from the community and revised the designs to address and accommodate those requests. In some cases the best solution was not the least expensive solution, but one that addressed the significant public issues and looked at the real benefits of long-term improvements.</p> <p>Accordingly, the option to route the light rail line onto any portion of Taylors Ferry Road (west of the Barbur Transit Station) has too many issues to ignore. This option should be avoided at any cost for the following reasons.</p> <p><b>1. Traffic Congestion</b></p>	<p>regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle mobility and station access improvements.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>Taylor's Ferry Road currently serves as an arterial that collects traffic from the entire West Portland area for eastbound traffic heading toward Portland (and other areas) in the morning, and for commuters heading back home in the evening.</p> <p>This route is already overstressed, with significant traffic backups in the morning, often before SW 48th Avenue (especially during the public school and PCC school year). Most mornings during rush hour it takes 4-5 minutes to get through the Capitol Highway intersection, which exceeds traffic standards. When the traffic backs up to 48th, it can take 6-8 minutes just to get to the intersection with current traffic. This is also compounded by the fact that the traffic must get through additional signalized intersections at Taylor's Ferry Road/ Barbur Boulevard, and at Capitol Highway/ Barbur Boulevard. Any additional delays caused by additional traffic or transit at the Taylor's Ferry/ Capitol Highway/ Barbur Boulevard intersections will only exacerbate the congestion.</p> <p>While this is an established neighborhood, there is the potential for additional traffic on Barbur Boulevard passing through this intersection. The addition of light rail and increase in parking at Barbur Transit will increase traffic. In addition, plans appear to be proceeding to introduce rush hour tolls on I-5 northbound, which will divert more traffic onto Barbur Boulevard.</p> <p>If the Refinement B-2 Option is pursued, it will invariably add congestion to the Taylor's Ferry Road/Capitol Highway intersection, especially if the light rail line is on grade. The addition of on-grade transit through this intersection will delay vehicle passes through this intersection, further backing up traffic on Taylor's Ferry road heading eastbound in the morning (as well as westbound in the evening).</p> <p>The left turn lane on eastbound Taylor's Ferry Road is only a few vehicles long as it stands now, and any additional traffic will back up further west on the single lane of eastbound Taylor's Ferry Road traffic, delaying all traffic trying to work through the intersections.</p> <p><b>2. Current Congestion at Barbur at Capitol Highway</b></p> <p>Current traffic congestion at the Barbur Boulevard/ Capitol Highway intersection has residual effects on traffic on Taylor's Ferry Road already. Any increase in traffic or delay of vehicle passage by the addition of light rail movement on Taylor's Ferry Road across Capitol is greatly concerning.</p> <p>Vehicles northbound on Capitol crossing Barbur are currently held up due to the constant line of traffic and need for some vehicles to turn left onto the I-5 Southbound ramp. The sensible solution would be to add a left turn signal for these vehicles. However, now ODOT is considering a "jug-handle" solution to require northbound Capitol Highway vehicles to turn east on Barbur and then west onto Taylor's Ferry Road (westbound) and then south on Capitol to access the I-5 onramp. <a href="https://www.odotr1stip.org/explore-by-program/safety-arts/or99w-safety-projects/or99w-at-capitol/">https://www.odotr1stip.org/explore-by-program/safety-arts/or99w-safety-projects/or99w-at-capitol/</a></p> <p>This "jug-handle" proposal will increase the number of vehicles already backing up at the Taylor's Ferry Road/ Capitol Highway intersection. The addition of traffic due to the light rail line on Taylor's Ferry Road will only make a significant problem intolerable.</p> <p><b>3. Safety</b></p> <p>The Taylor's Ferry Road/ Capitol Highway intersection is currently not safe. Taylor's Ferry Road is already underdeveloped with no bike lanes or pedestrian sidewalks. Conflicts between vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians occur regularly, and safety is currently a real issue. PBOT already classifies the intersection of Barbur and Capitol Highway as a High Crash Intersection. <a href="https://pdx.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=47c2153a3fa84636bb63e25b451372d0">https://pdx.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=47c2153a3fa84636bb63e25b451372d0</a></p> <p>The addition of light rail along Taylor's Ferry Road and additional traffic will only exacerbate the safety issues. The light rail line should stay away from Taylor's Ferry Road.</p> <p><b>4. Alternate Routes</b></p> <p>The increase in vehicle traffic at the Taylor's Ferry Road/ Capitol Highway intersection will cause unintended repercussions to traffic in this area. As it is, when traffic backs up in the morning rush hours to 48th or further west, many vehicles (myself included) head north on 48th and eventually commute via Multnomah Ave to I-5. With increased traffic, this trend will only increase, and it is doubtful that the Multnomah route is adequate for significant increased traffic.</p> <p>More concerning is when this additional congestion becomes more common, many commuters will instead choose to join Barbur Boulevard at SW 64th Avenue (near Baxter Auto Parts). The roads leading to this existing intersection are definitely not structured to accept this increased traffic, as these are only residential streets. The repercussions are enormous, and the costs to rectify that route to handle the additional traffic should be included in any estimate.</p> <p><b>5. Impact to Businesses</b></p> <p>No matter where the light rail route is directed, there will be a significant cost to adjacent properties. But the proposal to route traffic along Taylor's Ferry Road will affect significant structures, including the office building at Taylor's Ferry Road/ Capitol Highway, Barbur World Foods, and Capitol Auto Body. Any required demolition of even a part of the building will likely trigger a seismic evaluation and possibly a seismic structural upgrade to those buildings that should not be underestimated.</p> <p><b>5. Pedestrian Overpass at SW 53rd</b></p>	

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>I understand that part of the proposal is for a pedestrian overpass at SW 53rd from the neighborhood north of I-5 to a station south of I-5. This would be a significant waste of money. There is no need for this expense, as any pedestrian/ cyclist crossing here will be totally underutilized. There just isn't the bike traffic and certainly not the pedestrian traffic from this small neighborhood that would head south.</p> <p>Any pedestrian and bike traffic will still head east on Taylors Ferry Road toward the Barbur Transit Center. It is essentially the same distance, is already being used, and is more in the general direction towards downtown. Funds should instead be directed to bike lanes and sidewalks along Taylors Ferry Road.</p> <p>6. Bike and Pedestrian Improvements to Taylors Ferry Road</p> <p>As noted in the discussions above, any project should include both bike and pedestrian improvements to Taylors Ferry Road. There is an existing significant safety issue that has not been addressed. Any project to increase mass transit ridership should extend to the neighborhoods to provide a safe route for potential passengers.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>I hope you will take the time to consider these relevant issues. There are other significant issues (environmental, noise, construction) that are better addressed by others.</p> <p>Should the Light Rail extension project proceed down Barbur Boulevard, the Refinement B-2 option should be avoided at all costs for the reasons outlined above. Please pursue one of the other refinement options for the sake of our community.</p>	
I393	Miller, Cheryl	<p>I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. I would know as I have traveled these roads for over a decade. My family travels this as well as patients at the NUNM Clinic.</p> <p>The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects.</p> <p>I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
I394	Miller, Colin	<p>I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for the light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
I395	Miller, Heather	<p>We live in the area that will be directly impacted by the construction and then ongoing existence of the new Max Line. I think that a lot of the project will add to the overall livability of the area HOWEVER, I am concerned about noise. We already hear a significant amount of noise off of the trucks making the trek up and down I-5. I'd prefer the options that take the line closer to the freeway rather than keeping it down the middle of Barbur. Any improvements that can be made to minimize noise would be greatly appreciated.</p> <p>I'd also like to see minimized the damage to the Sylvania Nature Park. It's a small park but it's important to our neighborhood. In a lot of ways, it looks like the sidewalk improvements will improve the walkability of the neighborhood but we're obviously nervous about the other changes it may bring. Thank you for considering the feedback from the residents directly impacted.</p>	<p>Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of this Final EIS, regarding concerns about noise and vibration.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>For more information on impacts to Sylvania Nature Park, please see Section 4.7, Parks and Recreation Resources, of this Final EIS.</p>
I396	Miller, Jeff	<p>I am opposed to light rail along Barbur in SW Portland. It is too expensive and too disruptive and does not provide a robust public transit solution. I think massive investment in these high impact solutions should be put on hold. I think the future of public transit is in autonomous vehicles that can use existing infrastructure and get to and from where people are and where they want to be.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>Study related to autonomous vehicles is outside the scope of the Project; though, as identified in the 2020 TriMet Business Plan, autonomous vehicles are an emerging technology and will be piloted where feasible.</p>
I397	Miller, Kassie	<p>As a life-long Oregon resident, I grew up appreciating the public transit options not only when I didn't yet have my license, but especially now with the stressful, environmentally unfriendly impacts of passenger vehicles.</p> <p>I was born and raised in outer SE Portland, toward Gresham, and lightrail was the only way I could make it to my first job. Once I started using the MAX, I was so happy to have such an easy, low cost option to avoid traffic.</p> <p>I now live in Tualatin, and my biggest complaint of the last 6 years is how difficult it can be get into the city most of the day, the traffic situation is getting worse and worse every year. I would be overjoyed if the max line was extended to those of us in the southwest region - the WES isn't exactly convenient so I just end up avoiding the city altogether. When I have to go, I usually just bike out to Beaverton and take the MAX from there.</p> <p>Please please push this forward. I cannot explain the improvement in mine and my husband's quality of life and our ability to work in an office in the city. Simply wonderful to hear we have FINALLY made it this far.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		There is no way the environmental impact of the MAX line even remotely compares to the environmental impact of the thousands of vehicles on the highway every day.	
I398	Miller, Peter	Please do whatever is necessary to make more room for public transportation.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for public transportation.
I399	Mishler, Darris	Please keep the new max line on Barbur or I5. The "Design Refinement 2" is very disruptive to traffic and local business.	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
I400	Moll, Philip	I strongly support the "Marquam Hill Connection 2: Full Tunnel" option.	Please see Master Response 9 regarding the Marquam Hill Connection.
I401	Momeni, Carmen	I would love to have the light rail come to Tigard. There was a time that I couldn't drive and it really impacted the way that I lived. Bus system in Tigard is hard to navigate and takes a long time. I am not very technological savvy so a Max would be much easier to navigate and go to Beaverton and Portland.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I402	Monahan, Linda	My name is Linda Monahan, M-O-N-A-H-A-N, and I'm a candidate for Tigard Mayor. I'll be very brief. I have some remarks about light rail generally and DEIS specifically. I do not support the further expansion of light rail in the metro area and specifically Tigard. Light rail tends to support business and industry and not public transit users. Some may say light rail is an economic development engineer. I tend to think it reshapes a community, not always favorably, and drives up the cost of housing. If TriMet and Metro are committed to getting drivers off the road and on to public transit, then service, convenience, and safety needs to improve. A fare system where everybody pays prior to boarding needs to be installed both for revenue and public safety reasons.  Regarding DEIS, I was surprised to see the Tigard transit center along with a maintenance operations facility and a 300-car parking structure was planned for what is now the Archer property on Hall Boulevard. This takes yet another valuable industrial property off the tax rolls. This property is smack dab in the downtown redevelopment area. Further, the light rail land adversely affects too many small businesses and low-income housing by the sheer proximity along the line with noise and vibration. Finally, given the adverse impacts on residents and business, I believe that the idea of rapid bus transit from Barbur to Bridgeport should be explored more seriously. Ultimately, though, it will be the citizens who decide to pony up \$2.6 billion, plus whatever the southwest corridor system is in place. I hope you take into account the public comments you've heard here tonight, because the voters will. Thank you.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.  Regarding your comment about paying fares prior to boarding, MAX already requires prepayment of fares before boarding. Fare machines and Hop card readers are located on every MAX station platform.  Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.  Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of this Final EIS, regarding concerns about noise impacts.  Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus rapid transit improvements instead of light rail.
I403	Moore, Alan	This project is so exciting. The thought of being able to mix bicycle and Max modes as I commute for work is especially interesting. Please emphasize travel speed as you weigh alternatives. There is a dramatic difference in utility between high speed Max routes and other routes that run at lower speeds. Make this project happen!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  To learn more about transit travel time and reliability, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.
I404	Moore, Jaren	Growing up and living in the SW, I firmly believe that, a MAX rail line through Tigard and into tualatin, would be fantastic for everyone that needs to get into Portland, providing a reliable and efficient form of transportation.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I405	Moreland, Erin	I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is challenging, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. I am writing to voice my concern and support for light rail on Barbur, but most importantly my support of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur. Thank-you for considering community input.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I406	Moreno, Elizabeth	Good evening, dear Committee. My name is Elizabeth Moreno. I'm here to give my testimony. We have seen on the maps that it looks as though the line that is being proposed will go through the street where I live, which is Bonita Road. And we don't know -- Bonita, B-O-N-I -- yeah. Bonita Road, and we don't know how we're going to be affected by this. It's not just me or us, there's people like ourselves, we're a numerous family. It is me, my husband, my four children and we have lived in this area for over 14 years. And we have been seeing -- we have known about this development, and so we went -- we talked to our manager. She told us she had no idea. But coming here and looking at all these maps, this can look as though it could affect us. We're worried because the salary is really not that much. It's low. And we are paying a good price right now and the cost of living is going to be affected. We're worried about this. Thank you and that's it.	Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to rent prices and gentrification.
I407	Morris, Margaret	Why do you have to destroy a restaurant (Village Inn) that has been there a really long time and people like us who can go places familiar to get to on TriMet will have to figure out how to get somewhere else? TruMet bosses don't have to worry about how to get to new places and that is who makes plans. People who need travel to get to work better don't worry about finding how to get somewhere new do they?  Don't move a Village Inn I know how to get to. It's a long trip for me but then I feel like I am getting out but if you move it I can't get out anymore to one place I know how to. Please fix your plan..	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I408	Morris, Shiela	Rating 1 It makes much more sense to me for the route to follow I-5 rather than Barbur - fewer property impacts, if nothing else. I'm a property owner near SW 26th and find the route that diverts there to be the worst of the options - I personally don't want the Max that close to my neighborhood and don't think the location can support the additional pedestrians and bikes.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B. Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions. Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle mobility and station access improvements.
I409	Morrow, Vanessa	I work at National University of Natural Medicine (NUNM) in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor. Thank you for your time and consideration.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I410	Murphy, Ashly	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur..	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I411	Myszka, Jessie	I very much support the addition of this rail line even though I'll be able to hear it from my house. (behind Burlingame Fred Meyer) I hope for it to reduce the need for car rides, for my family and for others. I am especially hoping for transit-oriented development along the stretch between Fred Meyer and the Barbur Transit Center. The businesses there are not the best use of space and it is dangerous or impossible to walk on some parts. (E.g. just from 17th Dr to Capitol Hill there's no sidewalk or shoulder.) Thank you for the public info sessions! I wish you luck in hearing the fears within the sometimes poorly communicated criticisms.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. The City of Portland is currently in the process of developing a West Portland Town Center Plan, which will establish land use policies and make other recommendations in this area to help create more efficient development that can support transit. Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian improvements included in the Project.
I412	Name, No	I want to let those in charge of the new Metro line know what I personally think. I would not like the construction of the new Metro line, not because I do not want Tigard to have more access to public transportation, on the contrary I would feel very happy if there was more transportation. The problem is that if this project takes place, many people would be affected by the increase in rent. Our income is very low, and we do not want to have to leave Tigard. We hope you understand that our concern is the increase in rent. We appreciate your understanding, hoping that you can make the best decisions for the benefit of Tigard.	Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to rent prices and gentrification.
I413	Name, No	Calling to approve of the idea to extend the light rail serving Southwest Portland, Tigard, and Tualatin yes generally that's a good idea, the area is gradually growing and will be served well by a new max light rail line, it sounds great, I wish you well and hopefully you can meet the -- because currently the WES train and the heavy freight train serve those tracks only, not sure if you can switch light rails to the tracks but if you can we think it's a good idea.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I414	Name, No	I think it would be a good idea I live out here in Tigard Oregon and I would find it very helpful	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I415	Nargozian, Lara	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I416	Navarro, Rachel	I can't believe that you have not addressed the plan to mitigate traffic during construction. I see nothing at all about how residents in the SW corridor are expected to get around during construction. Without traffic, my home is an EIGHT MINUTE drive to downtown. In normal rush hour currently, it can take as long as 20 minutes. Being surrounded by hills and water, SW has very few options for getting north: I-5, Barbur, and Macadam. ALL of them are extremely congested during rush hour. When one is blocked due to construction or accidents, it's a nightmare. We already often feel trapped when trying to get N. So if you block Barbur off during construction, the other two routes are going to be absolute parking lots. I don't even think I'll be able to get downtown in less than an hour or worse. How will you manage this? The construction is going to take a really long time. There has to be a way for commuters and buses to get through on Barbur with minimal disruption. We are actually considering putting our house on the market because of this and moving somewhere else!!! I do not think light rail is the answer. Not enough people ride it because it's inconvenient, dirty, and unsafe. This only helps people living in Tigard or Sherwood who need to commute downtown. (People who don't pay Portland's sky high property taxes). For those of us living IN the SW corridor, your proposal literally makes me want to sell my house.	To learn more about mitigation for short-term transportation impacts, please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS. Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.
I417	Neal, Lori	The future of transit is NOT light rail, it's going to be self driving cars and ride share. Until Metro can break even or make money I dont think we should do any more light rail. Every time I take light rail, which is not often and only when I need to go down town,	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		there are always creepy, stinky people on board. Sorry, but it is a real turn off. Take the money that was going to be spent on this project and fix out highways. The cars are not going any where.	Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about safety on the train. Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for highway investments instead of light rail.
I418	Nelson PE, Dave	Comments on the DEIS for the SW corridor light rail project:  The stated objective for an EIS is to review the impact on human health and welfare, which includes the safety. Given that Metro is the primary body for transportation planning and development in the Metro area, their first concern is for safety related issues, not capacity issues. What is not addressed in the DEIS is the broader look at the transportation related safety issues metro wide, the major one being the seismic stability of most of the vital bridges in the metro area. Tax dollars should address those issues before capacity issues. Without addressing those needs it will expose Metro to a future lawsuit.  The second issue not addressed is how viable is Tri met. Tri met needs to demonstrate financial viability or they should not be building more projects. There are unfunded pension issues and other related issues that threaten the future of Tri met. I know the issue has been raised but not addressed in the DEIS.  The current plan does not give additional capacity in the SW Corridor. Tri-met's light rail system is a 1985 design which doesn't add capacity to transportation corridors but is a method for serving additional living spaces within the Metro area, ie the transportation related development. Given the car capacity and development within existing roadways, the system will never offer mass high speed transit. Why is a 1985 rail system being built when high speed bus corridors could actually add capacity?	Where the Project replaces structures, the new structures will be built to the latest seismic standards. This includes the SW Capitol Highway flyover, the SW Barbur Boulevard viaducts, and bridges on SW Barbur Boulevard at SW Multnomah Boulevard and SW 26th Avenue.  To learn more about how the Project would be funded, see Section 5.3, Cost and Funding Evaluation, of this Final EIS. The general financials of TriMet are not within the scope of the EIS.  Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus rapid transit improvements instead of light rail.
I419	Nelson, Leland	I go to Lewis and Clark College in SW Portland, and having additional transportation options to either go further into the city would be extremely helpful for students either wanting to visit Portland or attend classes at Portland State. Also, having easier access to Tigard without having to drive or take a long bus ride would also add an incentive to actually go to Tigard, since it would be much easier to reach.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I420	Nemarnik, David	I strongly support the light rail project. I would prefer to see the route continue on through Tualatin and Sherwood. That said, light rail is badly needed and will be a wonderful transportation alternative. Looking forward, planning a route that connects from the west side line through Beaverton and connecting to the Bridgeport station would again help with congestion and give commuters another option for getting around.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the alignment through Tualatin and Sherwood.
I421	Newman-Woods, Allison	More public transportation is a great idea and we should pursue this expansion of the light rail	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for light rail.
I422	Nick, Kristin	As a small business owner who recently moved to the area, I am dismayed to think the thriving small businesses on Beveland St would be destroyed. SW Beveland street is an ideal place for a small business to thrive with access to populations in Portland, Beaverton, Tigard, and more. Furthermore, several of the small businesses including myself are mental health providers. Seeking mental health treatment is difficult to find a good fit that is an affordable option and there are requests constantly for referral sources within the psychological community as many practitioners caseloads are full. The current proposal going through SW Beveland street would eliminate numerous independent private practices as well as a large mental health agency and would be detrimental to the general population. I support public transportation and want more people to use it, however, it should not come at the cost of a thriving business community. After reviewing the alternatives proposed, I understand Elmhurst would be a better option. It is a more cost effective option for the city and would be able to serve a larger community in terms of accessing public transportation. Furthermore, Elmhurst option would not be eliminating thriving businesses that provide a vital service to numerous populations. Please reconsider the proposal and elect to proceed with the locally preferred alternative of Elmhurst St.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for the SW Elmhurst Street alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Refinement 5 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.
I423	Nielsen, Karla	I am a Portland native and have lived, attended school and worked in the Portland area for 60+ years. I have owned residences in Multnomah, Clackamas and Washington counties. I have used every transit option available here through the years, having been a starving student, a working adult, a mom, and now a retiree.  I have to say that I am pretty much AGAINST the billions going into this project as long as we have other more pressing problems in the metro area, such as a large homeless population that affects tourism and everyday quality of life much more than transit options.  The mass transit system here has NEVER been self-sustaining, nor has it ever consistently attracted the highest number of riders that TriMet has predicted. The system ends up being paid for and subsidized by a population of folks that has never shown any inclination to give up cars, and the numbers bear this out.  I am a typical liberal-leaning, save-the-planet Oregonian, but I do not see more transit as an answer to anything right now. It truly just strikes me as TriMet and Metro trying to keep justifying their existence and spending ungodly amounts of money.  Let's focus, for example, on keeping low carbon emission standards, or enacting tolls to relieve congestion, instead of expanding a transit system that effectively only serves a small % of the population and hasn't ever been wholeheartedly embraced by the majority.	General concerns regarding homelessness, carbon emission standards and tolling are outside the scope of the Project and therefore not part of the EIS analysis.  To learn more about the transportation modeling used to project ridership, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.  To learn more about how the Project would be funded, see Section 5.3, Cost and Funding Evaluation, of this Final EIS. The general financials of TriMet are not within the scope of the EIS.  Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.
I424	Niles, Linda	Re: The Taylors Ferry loop - this sounds fairly insane. The Capitol Highway-TFR-Barbur intersection complex is jammed when school is in session, and traffic backs up for a mile, sometimes more. An enormous amount of extra work, including a new bridge over Woods Creek, would be required to build it. Then there are the right-of- way purchases and the permanent disturbance of several quiet residential neighborhoods. All in all, a dubious option.	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
1425	Nishi-Strattner, Leigh	<p>I am writing today to state my strong favor for the Design Refinement #5: Elmhurst, which spares my mother's building (Triangle Properties LLC) on Beveland st. For over two years, my family and I have closely followed the project, attended Community Action Committee meetings, spoken with representatives and met with Beveland St. community members. My mother is a small business owner on Beveland St. As you know, Beveland St. has a high concentration of small business owners who have invested countless hours and resources into making Beveland st. flourish and the surrounding neighborhood flourish. We all support each other, and we support improvements to local infrastructure and public transportation. In fact, some of my earliest childhood memories are of helping my mom paint and renovate her office building on Beveland st. My mother is a woman of color who built her private practice from the ground up; this is how she has supported her family for decades. Losing her office building would be a devastating personal and professional loss for my mother and for my family. This action would force my mother into early retirement, which would place great financial strain on our family.</p> <p>I strongly encourage you to consider the Elmhurst St. Locally Preferred Alternative as a replacement for the Beveland St. Initial Route Proposal. The Elmhurst St. option provides innumerable benefits to both the city and to the community of small business owners who call Beveland St. home. Some of those benefits include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The Elmhurst Route decreases the travel time between Portland and downtown Tigard substantially, which will increase ridership and accessibility.</li> <li>2) The Elmhurst St. Alternative would avoid two pre-identified transportation hotspots - the freight traffic from Lowes and the increased stress on street parking.</li> <li>3) This max station would provide mass transit for employees of Costco, Walmart, and Winco.</li> <li>4) This route would avoid the destruction of the Hampton Park Apartments, which would further exacerbate the housing shortage crisis.</li> <li>5) Purchasing undeveloped land for the Elmhurst Route would be exponentially less expensive than purchasing businesses and homes along the Beveland St. Route, which constitute hundreds of thousands of dollars of infrastructure.</li> <li>6) The Elmhurst route would protect the investments small business owners have made in their communities, continue to stimulate the local economy, and increase development in the Tigard Triangle.</li> </ol> <p>I urge you strongly to consider the Elmhurst St. option, as it is less costly to the city and offers several community benefits, some of which I have outlined above. Most importantly, the Elmhurst St. option does not destroy a community of small businesses or displace an affordable housing community, which would have a catastrophic impact on the community for generations. I greatly appreciate your time and attention.</p>	In your comment, you expressed a preference for the SW Elmhurst Street alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Refinement 5 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.
1426	Nystrom, Diane	I do not want the MAX train. We already have the Wilsonville to Beaverton train to assist commuters. Crime rates go up dramatically where Max trains are implemented. I do not want this for our safe Garden Home/Multnomah Village neighborhood.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime.
1427	Nystrom, Diane	Rating 1 I don't want it running this close to Multnomah Village/garden home area. It's a smaller neighborhood and safe. MAX trains bring higher crime rates. We already have a train to Wilsonville to assist commuters.	Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime.
1428	O'Brien, Attie	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur..	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
1429	Oblepias, Eric	Rating 5 It hits every destination that I might want to stop at on the way to downtown Portland.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
1430	ODaniels, Tom	<p>I would love to have The MAX going from like the AirPort to Newberg !! That would make things accessible that were out of Reach b4.....!! There is a Farm that you can work at on the way to Newberg I have seen on YouTube If you get a certain amount of hours you can earn an Alpaca that is butchered &amp; wrapped to take home...I travel by Bus/MAX &amp; WES e-Bike &amp; Bike Trailer.....&amp; I also Volunteer @ FreeGeek once a year to earn my Linux i3 Box &amp; get that home by Bus &amp; Bike.....</p> <p>I have been riding the TriMet bus since the mid 70s &amp; do remember the Orange &amp; Black &amp; also the Quarter full price fare.....Anything to do w/ the MAX coming to Tigard Thumbs Up &amp; I would gladly do anything in my power to help that along....!!</p> <p>Got my HOP card Honored Citizen thru the turnout on Lombard &amp; Broadway in Beaverton earlier on...I rode to Pioneer Square to have it transferred from HOP to HOP Honored Citizens &amp; think its awesome that you can ride &amp; pay &amp; when you hit \$28 upgrade to Month Pass Saves you from overpaying.....!! Thanks Tri-Met Oh Tigard Transit Drivers have gotten Friendlier...!! PS That is my Front Room my 2 e-Bike Fat Minis.....One thing you might think about is Bike Racks for Tires up to 5 inch</p>	Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the alignment toward Newberg. Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. TriMet acknowledges your recommendation related to accomodating increased bike tire sizes on bike racks.
1431	Olsen, Deborah	I am strongly in support of the proposed plans to bring rapid transit to Tigard and Bridgeport Village. Traffic, especially on 99W/Barbur, has increased enormously since we moved to Tigard in 1969, making both bus and car transit extremely slow. Increased	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>traffic congestion also contributes to greenhouse gasses and global warming. Oregon has been a leader in environmental awareness and concern for the health and welfare of future generations, and this project would help us continue that admirable commitment.</p> <p>I support the current proposed route and hope that the process moves quickly to construction!</p>	
I432	Olsen, Deborah	<p>I am strongly in support of your plans to bring rapid transit to Tigard. We have lived in Tigard since 1969, and have regularly visited downtown Portland for work as well as social and cultural events. We have long envied our friends in other parts of the city who sing the praises of MAX and lament the fact that it is not convenient for us.</p> <p>We are satisfied with the current proposed route and hope that the process moves quickly to construction!</p> <p>Thank you for inviting our input.</p>	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I433	Olsen, George	<p>Tigard badly needs easy access to light rail, which the SW Corridor Plan would provide. Auto and truck traffic on 99W through Tigard is very congested and getting worse, and traffic on Barbur Blvd and on I5 going past Tigard is also increasingly congested. The light rail would allow local residents a convenient route to the City of Portland for entertainment, jobs and for visiting friends, and convenient onward access to PDX, which benefits all citizens young and old.</p> <p>In addition, as the population ages and driving becomes more difficult, the light rail would help the elderly maintain their freedom of movement about the metropolitan area.</p> <p>I am greatly in favor of the light rail proposal and the route to, and beyond, Tigard.</p> <p>Thanks for seeking public input from local residents.</p>	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I434	Omansky, Beth	<p>As a blind resident of Multnomah Village and frequent rider of both the #12 and #44 bus lines, I have grave concerns about the Crossroads intersection at Capitol and Barbur.</p> <p>After getting off the #12 bus from Tigard, I find the Crossroads intersection confusing and dangerous as I try to cross to get to Capitol Hwy.</p> <p>Additionally, when I get off the #44 bus at Taylor's Ferry Rd to go to Walgreen's, I am concerned about what a flyover rail line will do to impact my ability to access the bus stops and place where I get my prescriptions. What would the noise impact be? This is an important factor in the safety and livability of blind pedestrians.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I urge you all to ensure that the Crossroads intersection be fixed and that this be considered an integral part of the overall SW Corridor plan.</li> <li>2. I would like to learn more about the potential impact of where the rail line will be placed as it goes near or around the Crossroads intersection.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you.</p>	In your comment, you expressed concerns regarding the Crossroads intersection generally and the SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center specifically in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
I435	O'Neill, Kathleen	<p>I 100% support a new MAX line through the SW corridor. Portland is clearly continuing to grow in population and this is the best approach to helping with traffic congestion and improving livability.</p> <p>Cities with the most efficient, cleanest public transportation rank highest in livability worldwide. Let's be one of them.</p>	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I436	Osterman, Richard	<p>I think you should just scrap the southwest corridor plan, not enough people want it and will use it, and it is too expensive. Instead, put the money to use in widening I-5 and adding more lanes, and improving Barbur Blvd. Putting MAX through to the Tualatin shopping center is a total waste of money, and stop trying to push MAX on neighborhoods that don't want it.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for highway investments and improvements to SW Barbur Boulevard instead of light rail.</p>
I437	Owcarz, Christian	<p>Thanks for the extensive review. I have a couple simple questions and requests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Experiencing first hand as well as anyone reviewing traffic maps in the area around Tigard can see that the bottlenecks are along 99W southwest BEYOND downtown Tigard until Durham Road. Could an alternate route include a spur that continues southwest along 99W toward King City? (I wish I could snapshot the traffic map I'm seeing as I type this @5pm Friday for you)</li> <li>2) Why is this light rail plan suddenly diverting due south after downtown Tigard to Tualatin? Can the team advise the reasoning behind it? On the face of it, it doesn't make sense. For example via Sherwood, it's worse traveling along Tualatin-Sherwood Road to get to the proposed terminus at Bridgeport Village.</li> </ol> <p>I mean... it is called a SOUTHWEST corridor plan, right. ;-) As currently planned, it seems more like it should be called the SOUTH Corridor Plan.</p>	Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the alignment along Pacific Highway (99W) toward King City.
I438	Pérez, Braulio	<p>Dear committee, my name is Braulio Pérez and I support the community of Tigard in not installing the line in Bonita (Ashopton) Road. The reason is that my peers in the community will be affected, in the sense that they will be evicted from their homes and they will have a difficult time finding a place to live within the means of their income. Thanks for your attention.</p>	<p>The Preferred Alternative studied in the Final EIS includes an elevated crossing over SW Bonita Road near SW 74th Avenue.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to rent prices and gentrification.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I439	Paau, Sze Kai	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I440	Paddock, Andrew	I fully support the bridgehead rebuilding. That area is a death trap! I think the Naito alignment is preferable to the one on Barbur. Barbur is up against a hillside; Naito is midway between Barbur and I-5 and therefore has a more comprehensive walk shed. A station up against that hill will have its walk shed halved and so its investment. I also believe having the train serve Lincoln & 3rd before heading down Naito makes sense while also getting more use out of an existing station. The station at Gibs is a good idea. It is especially useful for being an easy transfer to the pedestrian bridge to the aerial tram, all of the OHSU facilities, and the residential neighborhood immediately adjacent.  Generally, an alignment that remains on Barbur is preferable as that is the street people need and not the interstate.  The approach to Tigard TC on Ash St. would allow the most direct connection to the buses, and that transfer point should be as convenient and easy as possible. The whole interchange should look and function intuitively. I do not like the branch option or the alignment that makes a big loop into Tigard and back out as it's a poor time loss for little benefit. It's better to simply hit Tigard TC and start heading southeast to Tualatin.  I'm aware that two of the stations on Barbur are adjacent to major grocery stores. That's probably not deliberate, but it's damn good luck! Such easy access to a Fred Meyer and a Safeway will make a lot of people very happy indeed!	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternatives A2-BH and A2-LA in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.  In your comment, you expressed a preference for a center-running Barbur Transit Center station in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.  In your comment, you expressed support for the Ash alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as part of Alternatives C1 and C2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.
I441	Padgett, Toby	Rating 1  Just like The Orange Line did in Milwaukie (and I lived there at the time) the new SW Corridor Line will impact affordable housing, of which there is very little in Tigard. I am pro-mass transit and AGAINST losing affordable housing in any community, especially Tigard, as I live in affordable housing in Tigard. PLEASE consider the alternatives proposed by Tigard candidate for Mayor, Linda Monahan and/or expanding WES days/hours with shuttle buses from Bridgeport Village to the Tualatin station. Thank you.	Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to affordable housing.  Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for improvements to WES Commuter Rail and bus service instead of light rail.
I442	Padgett, Toby	Rating 1  Map is not detailed enough - I live in Downtown Tigard and need to know how this will affect my neighborhood and housing. Just like The Orange Line did in Milwaukie (and I lived there at the time) the new SW Corridor Line will impact affordable housing, of which there is very little in Tigard. I am pro-mass transit and AGAINST losing affordable housing in any community, especially Tigard, as I live in affordable housing in Tigard. PLEASE consider the alternatives proposed by Tigard candidate for Mayor, Linda Monahan and/or expanding WES days/hours with shuttle buses from Bridgeport Village to the Tualatin station. Thank you.	Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to affordable housing.  Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for improvements to WES Commuter Rail and bus service instead of light rail.
I443	Pajunas, Briita and Alex	My wife and I attended an open house at the Tigard Library and were able to gain some insights into how our property might be affected by the SW Corridor under the initial route proposal. Our home is right on the intersection of SW Evans Street and Barbur Blvd. We were told that a portion of our front yard may need to be acquired to expand the width of Barbur as well as to build a sidewalk from Barbur onto Evans Street past several lots.  In October 2017, we became first-time homebuyers at this location and it has been a little nerve-racking learning that our property will be affected by this major, upcoming project. Overall, we support the SW Corridor Light Rail Project and have benefitted from having access to MAX while living in Kenton and Rose City Park. If we could choose a preferred route alignment, it would be B4. We prefer this route because noise from the new MAX line would be lessened by its proximity to I-5. Under this route, Barbur could still be redeveloped to include sidewalks, bike lanes and a landscaped median without turning into a massive thoroughfare. Motorists will still be able to make turns and easily access businesses and local streets without having to try and make confusing U-turns.  If the decision is made to stick with the current initial route proposal, we hope that our property can maintain some semblance of privacy, and any partial acquisitions will avoid forcing us to look out from our front porch across four lanes of traffic and two lanes of MAX tracks. We have several mature trees in our front yard that provide energy cost saving shade and a scenic buffer from the traffic along Barbur Blvd. These are irreplaceable to us and would take many decades to replicate the same level of privacy and shade value if they had to be replaced due to construction.  We like the idea of having a sidewalk on Evans Street. Many cars turning onto Evans from Barbur do so at high speeds and because of the angle of the turn it can be hard for both cars and pedestrians to see each other at that intersection. This is also a hazard for us any time we back out of our driveway because we can't see around the corner to southbound Barbur traffic that may be turning right onto Evans. Perhaps making Evans a dead end and putting a barricade at the Evans and Barbur intersection would address that issue.  Another concern is how parking will work at the proposed Safeway MAX stop by Barbur and Capitol Hill. There is not a lot of on-street parking along Evans Street but it seems like it could have potential for MAX riders to use it as a park-and-ride location. I would be interested in learning about how neighborhood parking issues will be addressed in streets near proposed Max stops and also if there	Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.  Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.  Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of this Final EIS, regarding concerns about noise.  Project mitigation and urban design efforts are ongoing to address neighboring property concerns.  Please see Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of the Final EIS for more information regarding tree impacts.  The intersection of SW Barbur Boulevard and SW Evans Street would be modified to create tighter turn angle with a T-intersection, including sidewalks at the intersection.  Please see Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS, regarding concerns about on-street parking.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		will be improvements made on neighborhood streets (such as Evans and 19th Avenue) where there could be an increase in car traffic by people commuting to MAX. Thank you for taking the time to review our comments,	
I444	Palmer, Matt	Thank you for accepting public feedback on the proposal. I am a commuter that travels from Tigard to Hillsboro everyday on 217. While the new line will not specifically help me get to work faster, getting cars off the road and making transportation easier to downtown is very important. I also believe that it is important to look towards the future and try to anticipate needs before there are issues. Kudos for continuing to push for something that will benefit us as the area grows.  I really appreciate how the funding for the new line will not only go to building the light rail, but will improve sidewalks and parks and other things as well.  Thank you!  P.S. When you are done with this, can we get a monorail from Tigard to Hillsboro. There are big companies out there and we would like a quick and easy method for getting to the office.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support of sidewalk improvements as part of the Project.  Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for a rail connection from Tigard to Hillsboro.
I445	Palmer, Morgan	I am in favor of the initial route proposal (with design refinements). This project is desperately need and I fully support light-rail extension to the Southwest Corridor. Living in downtown Portland, getting out to Southwest Portland, Tigard and or Tualatin is extremely difficult on public transit. This proposal will reduce travel times and be a huge community asset. In addition to the initial route proposal, I would like to see direct connections between a light-rail station and PCC Sylvania and Marquam Hill . Also, please make the "end of the line" at Bridgeport village extendable. In other words, please avoid the situation at the Milwaukie Park Ave station where the line dead-ends into a parking structure. Some day in the future, we will want to extend the light-rail to Tualatin and Wilsonville or Sherwood and having this option will be useful. Thanks for listening!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS, particularly Section 2.2.4, Preferred Alternative: Segment B, for a description of the connections to PCC-Sylvania.  Please see Master Response 9 regarding the Marquam Hill Connection.  The alignment of the Bridgeport Station has been positioned so that the station could be reconfigured and extended in the future if an extension of the line is considered.
I446	Papaniq, Karen	I think the MAX going through the SW is imperative. I move to Portland in 2016 for the mass transport. Many of the other areas in Portland have this available so should we. I live near the Barbur transit center so if the make stops there it will be fabulous.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I447	Park, Caroline	I believe in public transportation and with the possibility of making the 5/205 into toll roads, we have to build options for our growing city. I know the Koch brothers are doing what they can to destroy public transportation. I support the max line for the SW corridor and can't wait to see it come to life. I hope there will be parking (because bridgeport is awful even without the rail line) because I want to use it. (yes, irony of using the car to the use the rail, but that is my reality). Thank you for your hard work on this and I hope you don't get discouraged by the haters. This is an ambitious and wonderful project. Thank you.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I448	Parker, Terry	When a modern light rail line between Portland and Gresham was being considered as one of several options in the 1970s, I chaired the first and original Citizens Advisory Committee in the region for a transportation project of this magnitude. One of the strongest recommendations from the committee was to take as little private property as possible. Designing the Max to go under the westbound I-84 entrance ramp at 37th and Sandy saved property taking on the South side of the Freeway. The Southwest Corridor project should follow suit with the same type of guidelines to take as little private property as possible. When the Portland to Gresham Max line was constructed, costs were shared for grading to make improvements on the Banfield Freeway, now 1-84, and for reconstructing overpasses. Sidewalks were added along the East Burnside section of the alignment as was other infrastructure directly adjacent to the alignment. The only major infrastructure enhancement not directly adjacent took place in the Hollywood District as a separate but companion PBOT project.  In that Metro wants to pay for the local share of the Southwest Corridor Project by increasing the costs of housing with a bond measure, this project should also be a bare bones project as opposed to a Rolls Royce type project that includes fingers of infrastructure into the community. Has a light rail alignment that follows I-5 between the South Waterfront and Burlingame where the built up development starts on Barbur Boulevard ever been considered? This would provide a direct connection to OHSU by way of the over budgeted Tram without adding more infrastructure. It also could possibly provide a faster route to and from the central city. In that motorist paid gas tax revenues from the Federal Highway Trust Fund will be funding nearly fifty percent of the Southwest Corridor Project, motorists need to get something back. As an alternate route to 1-5, Barbur Boulevard when upgraded needs to continue to be maintained with two full service motor vehicle travel lanes in each direction so as it won't become a peak period travel lane parking lot like Interstate Avenue has become with I-Max.  Finally, in that Metro area property owners may be footing the bill for much of the local match money, to establish equity and instead of transit riders paying fares that barely cover twenty-five percent of the operating costs, the riders need to bear some of the financial responsibility for this project with increased fares. Likewise, instead of freeloading on the shoulders of the motorists, adult bicyclists need to start paying some sort of license and/or user fee for all the bicycle infrastructure that will be included in the project	Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.  Please see Master Response 15 regarding your support for an extended I-5 alignment.  To learn more about how the Project would be funded, see Section 5.3, Cost and Funding Evaluation, of this Final EIS.  Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard.  NEPA requires FTA, Metro and TriMet to respond to substantive comments related to the content of the Draft EIS. Comments limited to public policy decisions, such as licenses or user fees for bicycle infrastructure, are not considered substantive. FTA, Metro and TriMet acknowledge receiving these comments; decision makers also received these comments before identifying the Preferred Alternative, as explained in the introduction of this appendix.
I449	Parker, Terry	My name is Terry Parker. I live in northeast Portland and I'm a property owner in northeast Portland. When a modern light rail line between Portland and Gresham was being considered as one of the several options in the 1970s, I chaired the first original citizens' advisory committee in the region for a transportation project of this magnitude. It was paid for by -- with Mount Hood highway funds. It was never built. One of the strongest recommendations from the committee was to take as little private property as possible. As an example, designing the MAX to go under the westbound I84 at 37th and Sandy saved property taking on the south side of the	Please see the response to Comment I448, above.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>freeway. The Southwest Corridor Project should follow suit with the same type of guidelines. You take as little private property as possible. When the Portland to Gresham MAX line was constructed, costs were shared for grading to make improvements on the Banfield Freeway, now I84, and for reconstructing road passes. Sidewalks were added along the east Burnside section of the alignment as was other infrastructure directly adjacent to the alignment. The only infrastructure enhancement not directly adjacent took place in the Hollywood District as a separate but companion PBOT project.</p> <p>If Metro wants to pay for the local share of the Southwest Corridor Project by increasing the cost of housing with a bond measure, this project should also be a bare bones project as opposed to a Rolls Royce type project that includes figures and infrastructure in the community. As the light rail alignment that follows I5 between the South Waterfront and Burlingame where the build up starts on Barbur Boulevard has never been considered. This would provide direct connection to OHSU by way of the over-budgeted tram without adding more infrastructure. You could also possibly provide a faster route to and from the south side, and OHSU should pay for any connection that has to be created. Voters pay gas tax revenue from the federal highway trust fund could fund nearly 50 percent of the Southwest Corridor Projects. Motorists need to get something back. As an alternative route to I5 Barbur Boulevard when upgraded needs to continue to be maintained with two full service motor vehicle lanes in each direction so as to overcome a peak period travel lane parking lot like Interstate Avenue has become with IMAX.</p> <p>Finally, even in metro, area property owners may be footing the bill for much of the local match money to establish equity instead of transit riders paying fares that barely cover 25 percent of the operating costs. The riders need to bear some of the financial responsibility for this project with increased fares. Likewise, instead of freeloading on the shoulders of motorists, adult bicyclists need to start paying some sort of license and/or user fee for the bicycle infrastructure that will be included in the project. Maybe this is where tolling should apply. Thank you.</p>	
I450	Parsons, James	I want to say that a new max line running from Portland to Tualatin is a great idea, please put this in immediately, if not sooner.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I451	Pasteris, Phil	<p>I rode the bus (95, 94, etc.) from Tigard to downtown Portland from 1978-2007. The bus service improved dramatically during this period. I was pleased to ride public transportation. I am now retired, but very pleased to not need to commute to downtown. The traffic has only increased on 99W all the way to Newburg. It is very clear to me that the infrastructure is failing and cannot carry the current and expected traffic growth. Tigard is essentially grid locked in the morning and afternoon. A real mess.</p> <p>The Southwest missed the boat on the Westside Bypass and other improvements the last 40 years. I don't know why, but there were no visionaries to get the job done.</p> <p>A surface Max line will be a tough sell. About the only way this can be done is either a tunnel or raise the line above the cars like the elevated trains in Chicago from the I-5 / 99w intersection to just over the Tualatin River. It would be a mess, but would help get traffic through Tigard. I am not sure of the reason to go to Bridgeport and have not done my homework to figure that out.</p> <p>Finally, not extending the Max to Sherwood is a big opportunity lost. It takes 30 years to put a transit system in place and I will be 96 when it happens!! Maybe?</p>	<p>It is TriMet's preference to grade separate all light rail crossings. However, this is not always feasible due to budget constraints. Overhead catenary poles are still required on structures, utility relocations are still required everywhere there is a bridge column, and traffic signals will need to be adjusted because of changed sight distances created by a structure. Typically, elevated guideway is significantly more expensive than guideway that runs at-grade. Where at-grade crossings are proposed, TriMet ensures they are designed and built to the most current safety standards.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the alignment to Sherwood.</p>
I452	Patel, Bina	C3 and C4 would be the safest and most logical options. First and foremost there are numerous businesses on Beveland Street that will be effected negatively by having a rail line going right through Beveland Street. The noise and restricted parking will make it harder for them to do business. There is also the heavy traffic to be considered on 72nd Street/Beveland Street which backs up to Dartmouth. Adding this railway line through Beveland Street will make it much worse. Safety is another concern with large delivery trucks entering the Lowes building from Beveland Street with cars parked on both sides of Beveland Street making this a very dangerous area for all persons concerned. This is why I believe that C3 and C4 makes the most logical, safe and better option.	In your comment, you expressed support for a Clinton alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as part of Alternatives C3 and C4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.
I453	Patel, Harish	<p>I am in favor of option C3 and C4 as they are the best option making this public transportation very visible and available to the very people using this area and public transport.</p> <p>Route C5, C6 will create a negative impact by creating unnecessary traffic gridlock, safety hazard on 72nd Avenue and Beveland street where there is shortage of parking and heavy trucks making delivery to Lowes. It makes no sense to uproot this model small business community developed on Beveland street. This development is just what Tigard Triangle is envisioning with high level of walkability in the remaining parts of Tigard Triangle.</p>	In your comment, you expressed support for a Clinton alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as part of Alternatives C3 and C4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.
I454	Patel, Harish	<p>My name is Harish Patel and I own a building on 7615 SW Beveland Street. I cannot attend this morning's meeting but I urge the committee to select Elmhurst instead of Beveland. As you have herd before this option does not devastate Beveland businesses. It is a win win situation for following reasons;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lower project cost because there is no need to buy out all the buildings on Beveland.</li> <li>2. Elmhurst is underdeveloped and currently attracts garbage and wrong elements.</li> <li>3. Moves the station location closer to Winco, Walmart, Costco and other places of high traffic.</li> <li>4. Recognize the considerable investment of time and energy for those individuals that developed Beveland street over the last 25 years.</li> <li>5. Protect the many small businesses on Beveland.</li> <li>6. Protects the multifamily housing on 72nd during a time when affordable housing is scarce.</li> </ol> <p>I appreciate the opportunity for our input.</p>	<p>Section 4.4, Communities, of the Draft EIS acknowledges the concerns raised about impacts to community cohesion among the business owners and employees along SW Beveland Street.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for the SW Elmhurst Street alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which is studied as Refinement 5 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and business displacements.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
I455	Patel, Saawan	<p>work at an office on Beveland Street and I am strongly in favor of Alternatives C3 and C4 for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) Business - Currently on Beveland Street there are numerous family businesses. Putting a rail line down Beveland (per every option but C3 and C4) would close many of these businesses for good which would end all the hard work put into their business.</p> <p>2) My employment - Any option but C3 or C4 would shut down my business placing me out of work.</p> <p>3) Noise - The construction work would cause so much disruption and make noise disturbing the work place.</p> <p>4) Traffic - There is already so much traffic on 72nd/Beveland/217 intersection and added construction would make the traffic situation worse.</p> <p>Alternatives C1, C2, C5, C6 and Design Refinement 5 going down Elmhurst would negatively affect the people of Tigard without a clear benefit.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed support for a Clinton alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as part of Alternatives C3 and C4 in the Draft EIS, and opposition to an Elmhurst alignment, which was studied as Refinement 5 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p>
I456	Patrick, Jovanna	<p>I am a homeowner along the line of the new Max. I have serious concerns on how the Max line down the middle of Barbur will affect me and my neighborhood. My house was built in 1928 and I received a notice that the city may take all or part of my house to build the line. I am several houses down a street off Barbur, so if my house is affected, that means the entire neighborhood will be obliterated. Our neighbors just bought their house, we just refinanced (owner since 2005), and our neighbor across the street just remodeled. All of our homeowner dreams and financial futures are at stake. I do not understand why the 1-5 route was not chosen, as that is all empty area (some homeless camps) that would be much easier to move then disrupting the whole neighborhood. I turn left onto Barbur every day for work, and this new route would cause havoc on getting around Barbur. Barbur runs smoothly all day despite freeway traffic, so why mess with one of the few routes directly downtown that is not currently a traffic hell? I cannot support this line with the route as chosen - would you if your home was directly in the crossfire? I encourage returning to the I-5 route.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p>
I457	Paulsen, Ken	<p>I like the "Barbur Undercrossing" in Tigard with the alignment on the north side of the existing Barbur Blvd. crossing of I-5. This makes the most sense - compared to the previous overpass of Barbur to avoid oncoming traffic. That overpass would have been HUGE - way up in the air and not unlike the oncoming traffic overpass built for MAX near the airport (on I-205). This route should reduce the visual and noise pollution of MAX at least to some degree because it is not in an elevated (bridge) location as was the oncoming overpass previously proposed (well above the Barbur Blvd. elevation). However, I remained concerned about the potential noise.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for Refinement 4, which would run along the south side of Pacific Highway (99W) in the southern portion of Segment B (Outer Portland) and the northern portion of Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin) and would add a station at SW 68th Avenue. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of this Final EIS, regarding concerns about noise and vibrations.</p>
I458	Pdx, Qa	<p>Looking at the proposed map, the question I had was, why does it stop at Bridgeport Village? This would be similar to the green line ending at the economic end-zone that is Clackamas Town Center. I understand that everything costs money and that is the easy answer. However, I would like to hear a debate for extending the line to at least Wilsonville or maybe even Woodburn. The population is growing out there and the traffic slow downs on I5 can even happen on weekends now. Or, I would like to hear a debate for an iterative approach to the new MAX line, where the land and corridor as far as Wilsonville or Woodburn was purchased now so that when the extension happens the economic infrastructure is already in place or development of that corridor is in place to support the extension to these new areas.</p> <p>We have a chance to get out in front of the growth in a long term way and actually think prudently now for the future.</p> <p>One other question I have is, can we build the parking for these stations so that it can accommodate growth as well. Some of these places are just strips of parking but if we can design and build them so they could be added onto easily, then the parking density at these stations can grow as well.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the alignment to Wilsonville.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS, regarding park and ride sizes and locations.</p>
I459	Peay, Michelle	<p>My name is Michelle Peay &amp; I support SW Corridor light rail project . I have lived in Tigard for 24 years, and worked here for nearly 20 years. I currently rent a house in Metzger, approx. 3000 feet from the proposed site called Refinement 4. My rent is low and my neighborhood is quiet. I worry my rent will increase with development of R-4 Of the light rail project. My neighborhood also has very few segments of sidewalk or street lights &amp; It is not very walkable to Highway which has only two pedestrian crossings possible giving me access to R-4's proposed stations on 68th parkway, being on the intersections of 68th &amp; 72nd Ave. These intersections are incredibly unsafe for pedestrians and are not an option for me or my family. Since I do all of my families' shopping along 99 in Tigard so am very aware of traffic congestion in the areas on &amp; around pacific hwy. I would prefer a station away from Highway 99 for the safety of vehicles and the ability to avoid 99 all-together if possible, as congestion and traffic in this particular area of 99 is often a problem for us, I know it will only get worse in the future.</p> <p>I feel Refinement 4 would not only destroy the aesthetic value of the streetscape entering Tigard at one of it's busiest points of entry, it also would not fit with the goals of the city of Tigard's Triangle Plan, replacing small business storefronts with light trail track segments along the upper corner of the Tigard Triangle along Pacific Hwy to I-5 and continuing up Barbur, rather than utilising mostly unused and available /vacant property as in route B-2 Base , with less visibility to the public view on 99. I feel that R-4 would have substantial negative visual impact.</p> <p>Tigard triangle current conditions and best uses for northeast triangle: from city of Tigard's Website Topography is a notable feature of the Tigard Triangle landscape. While some of the Triangle is generally flat, the northeastern portion of the project area includes some steeper sections. The topography generally slopes down and away from 99W/Pacific Highway and Atlanta to the Red Rock Creek corridor. South of Atlanta, the land slopes upward to the west, with the greatest grade change occurring near Dartmouth Street. Topographic conditions have a direct relationship with the way buildings, roads, driveways, street frontages, parking, gathering places, stormwater run-off, sidewalks and building entries can be managed and designed. For the Triangle's long term success and</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to Refinement 4, which would run along the south side of Pacific Highway (99W) in the southern portion of Segment B (Outer Portland) and the northern portion of Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin) and would add a station at SW 68th Avenue. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to rent prices and gentrification.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian improvements related to the project.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.5, Visual Quality, of this Final EIS regarding visual impacts and mitigation measures, including consideration of the Tigard Triangle.</p> <p>Please see Section 4.18, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts, of this Final EIS regarding indirect effects of the Project related to land use and development patterns.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>Please see Appendix J2.4, Petitions and Petition Comments, for the Project's response to the change.org petition (documented in that appendix as a petition from Tigard Business Owners).</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>appeal to the broadest range of people as a center for business, commercial and residential uses, providing accessible routes to and between destinations should be a priority, and street design must account for the needs of people of all ages and abilities.</p> <p>There have been no studies done to my knowledge of refinement 4 including traffic, the public perception. People I have talked to in my neighborhood are largely unaware of this refinement. At least 10 businesses &amp; properties are potentially affected by acquisitions with refinement 4, one of which is the site for the new Chick-fil-A which would bring a substantial amount of revenue to Tigard within a very short time, who's customers will undoubtedly support local small business, as I do, while in Tigard.</p> <p>With Affordable housing being developed within the area, it is important for the neighborhood to retain its welcoming appearance by keeping businesses along the south side of 99. Baylor (or Clinton station) below 99 would better serve the new affordable housing going in south of 99, also drawing traffic away from our main strip. Doing so will aid in traffic problems that already exist and could keep drivers off of Highway 99 by way of Haines, 72nd, Dartmouth or 217, avoiding 99 and I-5 completely, they could easily access a more centrally located station. That is my preferred solution.</p> <p>That way the corner of the triangle will be more appealing to new development and keeping the mixed use area from appearing quite industrial which will not be very inviting to residents old or new, and new businesses who could prospectively want to develop the area further.</p> <p>I have attached an updated copy of the Petition located on change.org including comments on Refinement 4. I Thank you for your consideration in this matter.</p>	
I460	Peay, Michelle	<p>It's "Pay." My name is Michelle Peay and I am a resident of the neighborhood just north of refinement 4. Just to be completely transparent, I'm also the manager of Lu's Sport's Bar and Lounge, and I've also been a 40-year customer of the Hi Hat -- formerly the Hi Hat, now Lu's. A couple of problems that I have with the proposed route, not only that it will acquisition my bar, that I'm not the owner of, I just worked really hard to get it where it is. To reduce the traffic congestion, it says that this will reduce the traffic congestion. And unfortunately, I live within two blocks of it, 3,000 feet, and I drive that probably 20 times a day. And drawing more drivers to 68th in a Park &amp; Ride is not going to decrease traffic in any way. I know that there's low-income or affordable housing going in underneath in the upper part of the triangle behind the bar. If the station was lower within walking distance with sidewalks down below, it would be more accessible to those people. I have talked to my neighbors and a lot of them are older demographic, and they are completely unaware that the refinement was going in at all. So I ask that you retract refinement 4 from the proposed plan and thank you.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>To learn more about ridership at specific stations, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to Refinement 4, which would run along the south side of Pacific Highway (99W) in the southern portion of Segment B (Outer Portland) and the northern portion of Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin) and would add a station at SW 68th Avenue. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p>
I461	Peck, Lauren	<p>Stop wasting our tax dollars on these useless pet projects! You add MAX service like this while trimming and cutting bus lines; how do you expect the system to work cohesively when you build trains to nowhere that no one can access without a vehicle??</p> <p>Instead of building expensive rail lines that serve no one, expand bus lines on our existing roads. Restore lines that have reduced to "commuter lines" to more full day and weekend service, expand frequent service to more lines, and hire drivers that can competently drive a bus to follow a schedule so that bus service is actually a reliable form of transportation in this city.</p> <p>Stop with the useless spending and devote precious funds to services that actually serve the greatest number of riders and encourage faith in ridership across the city.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail.</p>
I462	Pennington, Matt	Looks great, can't wait to see the project move forward.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I463	Perez, Sarah	Start breaking ground and laying rail for this project YESTERDAY! Sorely needed, infinitely RATIONAL. 20 years late... Sherwood can't benefit from it soon enough. ONWARD!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I464	Petersen, Paige	I fully support putting a Max line along the Southwest corridor. Having lived in the SW, the area is very limited on easy public transit into downtown. Traffic on I-5 from Tualatin to downtown has gotten to unreasonable levels and putting in Max could help to ease that traffic and provide an alternative mode of transportation from SW. I am looking to move downtown and the lack of easy transportation from downtown to Tualatin is one of the primary reasons I cannot get rid of my car. If there were a max line to Bridgeport Village, I would be able to seriously consider getting rid of my car and using only public transit.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I465	Petersen, Paige	Rating 5 No Comment	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I466	Phillips, Hope	I believe the decision to not cross Hall Blvd. is great! However, after speaking with a Metro representative, I was told that a park and ride would be added farther down Hwy 99, but additional parking is not planned for Tigard Transit Center. I believe this is a mistake, as the likelihood is that many from Sherwood, Progress Ridge, and Scholls Ferry Beaverton/Tigard junction would consider this a primary hub for SWC use. I also believe that traffic controls on Walnut, Greenburg, and 121st should be considered in planning as they will likely be used as alternative routes for those on the west side hoping to avoid the severe congestion on Scholls Ferry Rd to get to Hwy 217. I am specifically concerned about 121st since that is where my property is located. Currently there are 4-way stops leading to 99 in addition to some stop lights, and would like result in a bottle neck and disturbance to the neighborhood if not addressed. I work at OHSU, and they recently partnered with the ride sharing program Scoop. The "community" map for the app shows that 140 people share my route to work (on Marquam Hill), and those are just the people signed up for the app! I strongly believe these individuals would use Walnut, 121st, Hall, and Greenburg as their primary path to the SWC, and encourage the	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for an alignment east of SW Hall Boulevard in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Refinement 6 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and locations.</p> <p>Specific traffic control upgrades were not included at SW Walnut Street, SW Greenburg Road and SW 121st Avenue in the Preferred Alternative, or studied in the Final EIS. However, traffic analysis conducted for the Final EIS determined that those three streets would not experience significant traffic impacts under the Preferred Alternative compared to the No-Build Alternative. To learn more about the traffic analysis, please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		committee to consider additional parking options farther down HWY 99 in addition to assessment of the traffic controls on these routes. Possibly Trimet Line 45 adding SW Main and Scoffins or the additional park and ride could elevate some of this, or taking over the defunct Babies R' Us retail space for a parking structure. Also, the changes to the Ross Island on ramp are fantastic!	Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project.  In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I467	Phu, Leslie	I am a student at NUNM in SW Portland. The traffic that occurs around our school is very congested during rush hour, which causes our campus to be dangerous to commute to, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians (which is how many of us commute). The SW corridor project may offer some change to improve the transportation and safety around our campus. I am writing to voice my support for the light rail on Barbur. I also support the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Natio Parkway projects. I state my vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I468	Platosh, Paul	I support this plan. As a 20-year resident of SW Portland, I have felt our transit options are too limited. To get to the airport, one must take a bus downtown then transfer to a train. This plan accommodates future growth and demonstrates a commitment to a vision of a Portland that is livable, non-sprawling, eco-friendly. Thumbs up.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I469	Pliska, Sean	I am supportive of faster, cleaner and practical transit. Light rail to Tigard and Tualatin is integral to Portland. The SW Corridor Plan is incredibly important to the region. It is not merely a light rail plan, but connections to stations, for example. However, the recent DEIS images show little to no safe connections.  For example, the justification for eliminating the potential tunnel through Marquam Hill was, in part, to improve walking/biking connections on Barbur at choke (ie Vermont and Newbury viaducts) points along the bridges (the only connection to Downtown). Now the DEIS claims it will not afford to replace or retrofit these bridges for walking/biking.  Another clear example of lack of safe infrastructure concerns the consistently unprotected bike infrastructure along the route. A protected bus lane appears in one, yet vulnerable road users must ride alongside SOVs. The plan appears to almost entirely ignore standard practice protected bike lanes used around the world (See NACTO standards).  If Metro wishes to make all transit modes safer, more practical and cost effective, the current plan does not achieve these goals. I was strongly in support of the SW Corridor. Now I will fight against it.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for light rail and opposition to the Project.  Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle improvements included in the Project.
I470	Pliska, Stephen	This light rail project is a waste of money. It would be less expensive to have a large parking lot at the end and run an army of buses to carry people into Tigard and Portland. This solution will give the same results and maybe even better. Expanding light rail outside of Portland is a colossal waste of money.	Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail.
I471	Plitt, Andrew	I am a full time student at the National University of Natural Medicine (NUNM) in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for the light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I472	Pohl-Kosbau, Leslie	Need to have a bus or max stop within walking distance of two blocks.	Station spacing is a balance between light rail travel times and walk access. Surveys of passengers who walk to light rail stations indicate that people who take light rail are more willing to walk longer distances to access faster transit service. Placing stations about 0.5 mile to 1 mile apart provides an optimal balance.
I473	Prater, Stephen	Rating 5 Great, awesome, let's have it!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I474	Pratt, Doug	We already have the west side commuter line and don't need to waste another 2+ billion dollars on another light rail line...that money should be used to widen I-5 and 205. The carrying capacity of our roads and highways have not been increased since they were built in the 1950s and 60s.. You cannot MAX your way out of congestion, you need more roads. Most people use their cars for more than just getting to and from work. We do doctor appointments, run errands on our lunch hours and after work, take co-workers out for lunch, pick kids up from school, go to Home Depot and pick supplies up, go to the work out gym after or before work, etc. Stop wasting money on these rail lines and start building projects that 80% of the population uses.	Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for highway investments instead of light rail.
I475	Pridmore-Brown, Philip	I support the route and the project. Fast reliable transportation from SW into downtown and from SW to Tigard is much needed.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I476	Puckett, Jakob	Members of the Steering Committee, my name is Jakob Puckett, and I'll also be referring to a handout that's going around. I want to highlight a couple aspects of the Southwest Corridor Light Rail project that I find concerning. Two of the state's reasons for this project that we've heard mentioned so far are to reduce traffic congestion and to increase transitability for residents of the southwest corridor. To begin, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement predicts more traffic congestion in the southwest corridor if we build this rail line than if we didn't. I went through the projected levels of traffic congestion in 2035 for the effected intersection under both the build and no-build alternatives, which are provided in Attachment B, parts 8 and 11 of the DEIS. There were 44 intersections	Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.  To learn more about the transportation modeling used to project ridership, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.  Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>studied for the a.m. peak period and 85 for the p.m. As you can see on figure 1 on the handout, traffic is expected to be more congested at a greater number of intersections under the build alternative than under the no-build alternative.</p> <p>Building the light rail would lead to greater congestion at 30 out of 44 a.m. peak intersections, and 46 out of 82 p.m. intersections. On top of this, I-5 ramps along this route would also be more congested, which you can see in figure 2. In the morning, the build alternative would be more congested at five out of six I-5 ramps along the route, and the afternoon would be six out of nine. So by the project's own numbers, traffic is expected to be more congested under the build alternatives in 2035 than the no-build alternative. You could reasonably call it, based on this, the Southwest Congestion Project.</p> <p>Concerning ridership, the proposed line is currently covered by nine TriMet bus lines. Now, I calculated the ridership trends for each of these bus lines since 2001, which you can see in Figure 3. The ridership increases for a couple of years. It's been trending down since 2009, and is now 3.5 percent lower than it was in 2001. Further, according to annual reports from the City of Portland Auditor's Office, the percentage of people in the southwest corridor who use public transit as their main mode of transportation has dropped over 50 percent since 2001, which you can see in figure 4.</p> <p>So my question is this: Why would you spend \$2.5 billion to knowingly make traffic congestion worse? Why would we spend \$2.5 billion on another transit option when the majority of the people do not want this transit option, as you can see from figure 4. I think the answer is that we shouldn't. And for that reason, I urge you to support the no-build alternative. Thank you, again, for the chance to testify.</p>	
I477	Quale, Pamela	Need public transportation. Max would make it possible to stay in my home longer. Also want a line to travel along Beaverton Hillsboro Hwy 10	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for a MAX line along Beaverton Hillsdale Highway instead of the Project.</p>
I478	Quatrini, James	I am a student at NUNM. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur..	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I479	R, Charles	<p>Here are my comments focused on the area near Barbur, Capitol, and 53rd.</p> <p>Barbur/Capitol</p> <p>The proposed route modification at the Barbur/Capitol/I-5 interchange, which attempts to avoid the existing road bridge over I-5, is short sighted and does not balance minor project cost saving with negative impacts to businesses and the Crestwood neighborhood. The alignment needs to stay along Barbur when crossing I-5.</p> <p>Barbur/53rd</p> <p>This project is proposing three park-and-ride facilities within about one mile - one near 99W and I-5 in north Tigard, one at Barbur/53rd, and one at the Barbur Transit Center. Meanwhile the project appears to exclude a new pedestrian bridge over I-5 to connect the Crestwood neighborhood to the new station at Barbur/53rd, allowing that neighborhood to easily access the new facility, PCC, and neighborhood schools. If the project can only afford either a parking garage or a pedestrian/bicycle bridge over I-5 at 53rd I would prefer to see the bridge. The bridge provides multimodal connectivity to the region and serves a greater purpose than another auto-centric parking structure in this vicinity.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS, and preference for an alignment along SW Barbur Boulevard instead, which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and locations.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle mobility and station access improvements.</p>
I480	Ra, A	As a 20+ year resident of the Beaverton area with jobs in Tigard, Lake Oswego and beyond - I cannot say "YES" to this plan loud enough or with enough emphasis. This line will do so much more than the WES does (I like the WES but admit it has limits). This will be a boon for the Bridgeport area as well, win-win-win all around.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I481	Rahmani, Ramtin	<p>Rating 1</p> <p>The bicycling infrastructure is essentially nonexistent. Why does the bus lane need to be separate from the LR lane? That would free up a real bike path. This looks like absolutely no thought was put in for cyclists. And look, I'm someone who takes the bus or drives. But I can still notice careless design</p>	Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support of greater separation for bicycle facilities.
I482	Raibley, Jon	<p>Rating 1</p> <p>keep this piece of GARBAGE out of Tigard. WE DO NOT WANT IT ANYWHERE NEAR US!!!!!!</p>	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.
I483	Ramirez, Trisya	I think you should reconsider the route.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.
I484	Randolph, Christopher	I work (and previously studied) at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.	
I485	Raulerson, Sally	<p>I sincerely hope that TriMet will address the worsening crime and safety issues that plague ALL of the MAX lines before proposing another line. I would like to see ACTUAL plans to combat/curb this issue. I used to take MAX all over the city. Now I won't go anywhere near it. It's not safe.</p> <p>I would also like to see actual data that this neighborhood would actually SUPPORT this line. This area is already a traffic nightmare-tearing up the only major alternative arterial option to I5 seems insane to me.</p> <p>I'm concerned that these forums for public input are only for show, especially given that TriMet's proposal already has an estimated "go live" date for this line to be running.</p> <p>Please give serious consideration to the growing crime/safety issues first before taking on another transit line, that most of this area doesn't want in the first place.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime and safety.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p>
I486	Ray, Cynthia	<p>I commute to work every day to downtown Portland... and have do so going on 15 years. I leave at 5:20 in the morning taking I-5 to Portland in an attempt to miss some of the traffic. I leave for home by 3PM using Barbour Blvd which is busy then, but at least moving as compared to I-5. I can NOT believe that you are even seriously thinking of adding to the congestion and traffic issues on Barbour Blvd between Portland and Capitol with yet more congestion causing suggestions.... and added danger to the bicyclist, anyone walking etc!! OMG!! I seriously can NOT believe this!!!! And do NOT suggest "mass transit" I tried it...sadly was dumb enough to give it a year to prove it could be better than the epic failure it seemed to be 90% of the time .... what a total disaster!! Unlike TriMet, I DO have an obligation to follow a time schedule and appear at work when I am supposed to... not ot mention, if I am at work when the weather turns bad, I want to get home...the same day... without being dumped somewhere miles from home to figure it out and fend for myself..</p> <p>Quit making a problem area even worse!!!! Put the new line on I-5....</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p>
I487	Raymond, Belle	<p>I have lived in SE Portland and worked at the National University of Natural Medicine in South Portland for four years. Unfortunately, the traffic and congestion around NUNM is still very dangerous and patient, staff and faculty access to our campus is quite difficult. This is especially true for bicyclists and pedestrians, several of whom are in wheelchairs. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this issue and to offer my support for a for light rail on Barbur, but most importantly, I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur. Thank you for your time.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
I488	Refi, Emily	<p>Tigard - prefer the alignment on Hall for closer proximity to downtown, and to avoid more existing fragile low income housing areas. The Ash alignment is too far from downtown.</p> <p>Love the idea of strong connection to Lake Oswego so they can utilize the transit.</p> <p>From Portland, I prefer the Naito alignment.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for an alignment east of SW Hall Boulevard in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Refinement 6 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for the SW Naito Parkway alignment in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternatives A2-BH and A2-LA in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
I489	Reid, Eileen	<p>Hello, I'm a regular rider on the 96 bus line and a resident in a neighborhood close to the north Tualatin park and ride. I'm supportive of the route proposal but have two concerns:</p> <p>1) The impact that frequent train crossings will have on traffic on Carmen near I5. This area is already congested. Frequent stoppage of traffic will bring traffic to gridlock.</p> <p>2) What is your philosophy behind parking? The size of the parking lots/structures near the end of the line appear inadequate to support ridership projections. This may result in significant overspill parking into surrounding neighborhoods and businesses.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic and parking analysis.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and locations.</p>
I490	Reinhart, Carson	<p>The powerpoint at the Tigard library openhouse includes a fact about congestion between Tigard &amp; Portland, but I was told that the plans aren't limiting/reducing congestion in the areas. Any chance congestion increases with the increasing number of people moving to the area before 2027 when light rail may be finished. Many plans include new apartment complexes or houses, light pollution will increase, anyway to compensate to those affected? # of businesses negatively affected in some of the plans is frightening</p>	<p>Models for both the No-Build Alternative and the Preferred Alternative, which incorporate local and regional land use and transportation plans, include growth in population and traffic.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and business displacements.</p>
I491	Reinhart, Joseph	<p>I oppose the Elmhurst route to downtown Tigard for the following reasons. First, the route was not thoroughly vetted in the draft EIS. For example, the charts showing the number of houses, businesses, etc. affected did not include the Elmhurst route. The Elmhurst route was a late addition and the public review process was adversely affected by the addition. Second, SW 72nd (going south) often becomes clogged, especially when I-5 South backs-up. This happens often during evening traffic, but can happen during the day. I often have to go to the light a Beveland in order to turn north onto 72nd. A train crossing at Elmhurst will exacerbate the 72nd traffic problem in both directions. South bound traffic is likely to back up to Dartmouth. Third, light rail should be routed through existing</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to the SW Elmhurst Street alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Refinement 5 in the Draft EIS, and a preference for a Clinton alignment, which was studied as Alternatives C3 and C4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding property acquisitions. The Draft EIS identified properties that would be potentially affected by acquisitions due to Refinement 5 in Appendix F, Properties Affected by Acquisitions.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		retail and commercial establishments (i.e. Winco mall). The Clinton option makes the most sense in this regard. The Clinton option will also have the least impact on SW 72nd traffic noted above. Fourth, existing housing, particularly affordable housing, should be protected. The Elmhurst option will have significant adverse effect on existing housing on Hermoso. At least one house will be destroyed. Fifth, with regard to my property, the Elmhurst option will likely require the removal of existing mature Douglas Fir trees and will adversely affect habitat and wildlife, including raptors that nest in the trees. Sixth, light rail construction will adversely affect the value of my property, including blocking the territorial view. Operation of the light rail line will further reduce the value due to noise, light and vibration. The Clinton option addresses all of these issues and is the better option. The Elmhurst route will significant reduce the livability of this neighborhood.	Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis. Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to affordable housing. Please see Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of this Final EIS regarding tree impacts. Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of this Final EIS, regarding concerns about noise and vibrations. Please see Section 4.5, Visual Quality, of this Final EIS regarding visual impacts.
I492	Renner, Jon	Rating 1 Cost benefit numbers argue to stay with busses. Light rail too expensive for anticipated use. Thanks!	Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail. Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.
I493	Renshaw Ruddell, Matthew	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I494	Repeau, Dave	I like the beginnings of these plans quite a bit! As with the case with all Max endeavors, I think that it's important to make sure that it's safe and comfortable to ride on. I think we need to come up with a longer term plan to makes sure that fares are enforced and that people can find help when they need it on a train. I'm a big proponent of the light rail, and I think we need to make it the best it can possibly be! I look at systems like the Metro (which is not light rail, but is a train) in Washington DC, and how seamlessly it all works... and I would love for our trains to be that clean and safe. Also, one thing that makes me less inclined to take the Max is the sheer number of stops. When I take the blue line through downtown... it takes forever to get downtown due to the excessive number of stops. (Sorry to go off topic, there.) But my point is, on this new line we need to get smarter about the number and location of stops. Also also... I really want it to be the "Silver" line. Thanks!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about safety and fare enforcement. To learn more about transit travel time and reliability, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS. Trains on the existing MAX Green Line will continue through Portland to serve the Southwest Corridor. To avoid confusion for current riders, it is TriMet's practice to postpone referring to a new line by its color until about a year before the new service begins, around the start of the public process to discuss potential bus service changes that will complement the new MAX service.
I495	Resendiz, Emma	Good evening, my name is Emma Resendiz. I'm here to deliver this letter to you. This is a letter that states everything that we want in our community. This all why I'm here tonight.	Thank you for submitting a letter on behalf of Unite Oregon and Tigard SW Corridor residents. A response to the letter is included in Appendix J2.4, Petitions and Petition Comments, of this Final EIS.
I496	Resident, Local	Rating 1 I don't want this MAX line built at all.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.
I497	Reuler, Peggy	I live on SW 53rd at SW Coronado St. I understand that there will likely be a station at 53rd and Barbur. I've heard that driverless shuttles may take riders to PCC on 53rd. Access to the campus through the neighborhoods is not something PCC is entitled to--it needs to be negotiated with the neighborhoods. There are not supposed to be vehicles going thru the fence at the end of 53rd--it's understood that that is for bikes and pedestrians. Unless there was a shuttle on the other side, people would still need to walk a distance to get to campus buildings. Makes more sense to have buses meeting the trains that can take students, etc., directly to the main entrance of campus. I am in favor of an enhanced bike and pedestrian connection between 53rd and Barbur and the campus. Improvements on 53rd may include a sidewalk on one side of the road and maybe a bioswail on the other. I would favor constructing them to minimize the impact on people's front yards. My understanding is that the city has 30' on either side of the center line of the road to make improvements. Please don't use 30' on each side if it's not necessary. When considering the intersection of Barbur/Capitol Highway/Taylor's Ferry Rd., please consider at least making a left turn signal for turns onto Barbur or to I-5 S. from Capitol Highway.	Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS, particularly Section 2.2.4, Preferred Alternative: Segment B, for a description of the connections to PCC-Sylvania. The Preferred Alternative studied in the Final EIS does not include modifications to vehicular movements at the intersection of SW Barbur Boulevard and SW Capitol Highway. However, a separate ODOT project is being advanced in coordination with the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project. This project would modify the Crossroads intersection area to direct traffic from northbound SW Capitol Highway to turn right at SW Taylors Ferry Road, then turn right again onto SW Barbur Boulevard to head south or to access I-5 South. ODOT considered adding a left-turn signal from northbound SW Capitol Highway to SW Barbur Boulevard and I-5 South instead; however, the traffic analysis for this scenario showed a substantial increase in congestion on streets surrounding this intersection.
I498	Rhyne, Keenan	I fully support a light rail line connecting SW Portland and Tigard to downtown. I won't be able to make it to any of the upcoming meetings, but want my voice to be heard. Barbur is a perfect place to run such a line, and it will be a great addition to the public transportation infrastructure that will improve the livability of our neighborhoods (and make it easier to get to downtown and/or the airport without having to worry about parking). My only complaint is that it won't be available sooner. I understand that it will cause additional congestion during the construction phase, but I believe it will be well worth it in the end. Thank you for planning ahead and addressing some of the problems of future growth now.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I499	Ribner, Jason	Please do not force people to see their houses. I received a notice that my property could potentially be affected, which I'm assuming it will as I back up to Barbur. This is awful for my family and I'm totally opposed to it...	Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.
I500	Richmond, Rod	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur..</p> <p>In addition, patient's often comment on how hard it is to find and leave the NUNM campus and clinic area. I have seen in other cities and campus's official signage, to direct those trying to find and leave the area. In my few years here, it is quite common to observe drivers who are lost speeding around the streets surrounding our campus trying to find their way away from the campus. I was hoping that the Portland DOT could work wit the school to create and post appropriate signage for drivers attempting to leave or find the school and clinic.</p>	
I501	Richter, Adam	Instead of expanding, why don't you invest in existing infrastructure? Specifically the Sunset Transit Center. I would take MAX every day in if I could but there is never any parking available at Sunset Transit Center.	Improvements to the Sunset Transit Center are outside the scope of the Project.
I502	Rivera, Rodrigo	<p>Rating 1</p> <p>Tri-met is a waste of money, nobody uses it, it leads to greater congestion and blight.</p>	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.
I503	Roach, Mike	The argument for the 2- lane bridges next to the current historically significant bridges is very compelling and common sense, not withstanding the engineering challenges of so doing. It would seem to be very important to have this in the final draft as a potential alternative as we go forward with so many unknowns. Those bridges would give us more flexibility in dealing with potential eastbound traffic gridlock in Hillsdale during key phases of the construction.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail to the east of SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Refinement 1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.
I504	Robinson, Tyler	<p>RE: light rail route options at Crossroads area.</p> <p>Given the high cost and significant logistical challenges of re-building the existing Barbur overpass above I-5, plus the negative effects on traffic, pedestrian circulation, access to adjacent businesses and overall visual amenity that would be caused by raising/berming the whole Barbur/Capitol intersection, identifying an alternate light rail route west of Barbur Transit Center seems very appropriate.</p> <p>Of the two alternates shown in current DEIS maps, one south and one north of the main intersection, the northern Taylors Ferry option seems preferable because it takes advantage of both the existing grade drop where Taylors Ferry crosses the upper end of Woods Creek, and the east end of the existing I-5 grade cut west of the intersection. Presumably this would result in a lower and less costly/less visible overhead ramp structure than the south option ramp crossing high over Capitol and Barbur. Although the Taylors Ferry route would seriously impact or remove a couple existing commercial buildings on either side of Capitol, the overall impact to existing businesses looks like it would be less than the southern route. And while the northern ramp would cross the headwaters of Woods Creek, it would probably have fewer negative affects on downstream drainage and green space amenities than the Taylors Ferry culvert and I-5 cut and fill already have.</p> <p>On another subject and slightly further west, I hope one of the station access pedestrian overpass options identified at or near the proposed 53rd station will survive the planning and budgeting process. They would provide ideal local access to the whole light rail system for the Crestwood and Ash Creek neighborhoods.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle mobility and station access improvements.</p>
I505	Robinson, Tyler	Prefer Barbur to Naito - less properties taken	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I506	Robinson, Tyler	<p>Thank you for working to bring MAX to SW Portland! As a long-time resident I've been hopeful this last quadrant of the Metro area would see the public transit and urban development benefits it has brought to the other areas it serves - and while I'm still around to use it.</p> <p>Pending seeing further design work, I'm tentatively supportive of the shorter I-5 crossing west of Barbur transit station using Taylors Ferry and a new light rail overpass over the Capitol Hwy exit ramp. This support is based on the assumption it would be less costly and less disruptive than either rebuilding the existing Barbur bridge over I-5 or a new light rail overpass south of the Crossroads intersection. It's also assuming that surface traffic and station access walk/bike improvements (SA16) would still be included at the Taylors Ferry/Capitol Hwy intersection to improve walk/bike safety and address rush hour traffic congestion.</p> <p>I'd also strongly support the inclusion of one of the two proposed walk/bike bridges over I-5: Luradel (SA19) or 53rd (SA20). Either would significantly improve light rail access for the Crestwood neighborhood, as well as provide much better access to Markham School, Capitol Hill Library and PCC Sylvania. Of the two, the 53rd bridge directly to the 53rd station would be first choice, in part because it would put my house just a few blocks from a MAX station - a tremendous retirement benefit allowing easy access to downtown Portland and the whole MAX system!</p>	Please see the response to Comment I504, above.
I507	Robinson, Tyler	<p>As a long-time resident of SW Portland, I strongly support the SW Corridor project and look forward to the access to the entire max system from a light rail station near my home! A pedestrian bridge to access the proposed 53rd station from the north side of I-5 (the Crestwood neighborhood) would be very desirable!</p> <p>The middle class is being taxed out of existence! Looking through the equity lens, it is only just that transit fair be increased to help pay for infrastructure - including an extra charge for bikes that take up passenger space. Motorists paid taxes that fund the roads that busses travel on -one bus does as much damage as 1200 cars - should not used to subsidize light rail infrastructure. Likewise,</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle mobility and station access improvements.</p> <p>To learn more about how the Project would be funded, see Section 5.3, Cost and Funding Evaluation, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>The Marquam Hill Connection is part of the Preferred Alternative, and provides an important connection to Marquam Hill and OHSU. As such, its costs are included in the cost of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		residential property taxes should not be raised to pay for light rail. It only increases the cost of housing for homeowners and renters, the light rail passengers need to pay at least a portion of the price tag! Also, OHSU on Pill Hill needs to pay for the Marquam hill connector - not the other tax payers. The people in the middles are being squeezed to subsidize the low income which is totally unjust.	
I508	Rockwell, Mark	Good evening, I'm Mark Rockwell. I've lived in the Lake Oswego/Tigard area since 1984. And I'm here just to make very brief comments on behalf of saving the Village Inn. There are really three reasons why I think that should occur. First, I am convinced that there are superior alternatives. I am absolutely convinced there are. Secondly, the Village Inn was relocated once before to accommodate another transportation need. So they are currently sitting where they are because they were moved once before. I think that is something that we should not forget. This is a local business. A local business that has been around for 40-some years. It should not be treated like a punching bag. And lastly I would say, that at a time when we all need to be considered -- or considerate of community, the Village Inn is part of the culture and fabric of this community. It should not be treated like a piece of dirt. Thank you.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
I509	Rodriguez, Rosa	I am here to inform you and to request that the rent does not go up anymore. In the last few years, the rent in the house where I live increased from \$775.00 to \$945. I'm a mother of two teenage daughters who lives with limited resources. This project is planned to be implemented. It could be less expensive to the families. Thank you	Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to rent prices and gentrification.
I510	Rodriguez, Victor	The SW Taylor's Ferry crossing would have an immense negative impact local business, and home owners, and anyone that commutes on Taylor's Ferry. The road is already a mess during the morning commute with east bound traffic backed up for blocks as it approaches Capitol Hwy. If you want to improve things, then fix the shoulders along Taylor's Ferry and SW 62nd so people can walk along the road. Anyone that walks these roads now is taking their life in their hands.	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B. Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian mobility and station access improvements.
I511	Rohweder, Laura	Rating 4 Would prefer it was more direct from tualatin to Portland. Would not use it if it took longer than the 96 express bus.	To learn more about transit travel time and reliability, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.
I512	Rose, Mikel	The train should be kept off Barbur as much as possible. The Tigard branch option is preferred.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B. In your comment, you expressed support for a branched alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), studied as Alternatives C5 and C6 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.
I513	Rosenthal, Gerritt	I was going to send in a couple late comments, to wit 1) they did not stress connectivity with other transit options as a goal; should have been 2) the long range consideration should be to connect all suburban communities, including Sherwood and Tualatin (stopping at Bridgeport does nothing to resolve the Tualatin River crossing bottlenecks) 3) route and P&Rs need to be chosen and constructed to encourage electric vehicle usage, and, when they become safe, autodrives vehicle access to the transit system dly, contrary to your phone note, the comment period closed at 8:59 (20:59)pm, not 11:59 so I was not able to add these comments	Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project. Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for connecting Sherwood and Tualatin with light rail. The Principles, Goals, and Objectives that guide the Project emphasize the importance of designing the Project to adapt to future modes and technologies, particularly as they relate to first-last mile connections. TriMet does not have a policy requirement for electric vehicle charging stations within park and rides, but is open to including them on the Project. The technology has been piloted at other park and ride locations, such as at SE Park Avenue on the MAX Orange Line. However, without regular enforcement, these designated spaces typically get used by traditional vehicles during peak usage. As identified in the 2020 TriMet Business Plan, autonomous vehicles are also an emerging technology and will be piloted where feasible. TriMet will also look to local jurisdiction design guidelines for requirements on electrical charging standards and other technologies.
I514	Ross, Madeline	I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. It is very difficult for me to exit the area safely in my car as well. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I515	Roth, Isadora	I am happy about the prospect of a light rail to sw Portland and beyond. I urge you to consider avoiding Taylor's ferry at the Capitol highway/barbur I-5 crossing and ask that you keep the light rail on barbur or along the i-5 due to concerns about impinging on green space (woods park) wildlife habitat. In addition I have oncerns about bicycle and pedestrian safety and traffic congestion. Thank you.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
I516	Roth, Noah	Rating 5	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		The route (as proposed) includes good access to the downtown areas, good connections to existing transit centers and other modes of transport, specifically WES, and also reduces cost in areas that are not as important.	
I517	Ryan, Jennifer	I work full-time at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I518	S, Miss	Rating 5 We NEED to provide alternative transportation opportunities for our growing community and we must accept and embrace this growth. This will potentially help people contribute to society in so many ways and will do our part to protect the environment.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I519	Salisbury, Amy	We are thrilled with this plan, we wish it was happening sooner!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I520	Salkeld, Eric	I have lived in and near and around downtown Tigard and the surrounding area in the same house since 2002. I use the WES train and in fact, I can wave at the conductor and passengers from my porch as the rails are right across the street on SW Commercial. I am an avid user of Trimet. However, I can't understand why you would change the route out of Downtown Tigard. It doesn't make sense and will discourage people from my neighborhood from using it. Nobody really lives close to where you are proposing to move the station out of downtown Tigard. Just have it go into the same place where the WES goes in the Transit Center and call it good. You are making a big mistake by taking it into the industrial area. You have to be creative to get it to go to downtown but it will infuse that area with LIFE and create a hub and help the businesses down there and give you riders. It is not clear from your DEIS where exactly the station will be and that is confusing to us who are trying to make sense of where the station is going to be. You need to be clearer about the exact spot. Right now, it seems like you are being vague about its exactly location. Thanks for all the work and I'm just giving my opinion based on the experiences I have as someone who lives in this area and only uses Trimet to get to work.	In your comment, you expressed opposition to an alignment east of SW Hall Boulevard in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Refinement 6 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.  The location of the Hall Station in Refinement 6 was described in the Draft EIS in Appendix E, Potential Design Refinement Concepts and Options, and specifically shown in Figure E-7.
I521	Sampson, Jason	Will you be getting stoping the express bus 94 line once all done?	Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project.
I522	Sandell, Beth	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for light rail on Barbur, but most importantly, I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur..	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
I523	Sanders, Dave	I happen to live 1/2 mile from the proposed Bonita stop. My interest is in any safety analysis that has been done. Specifically, how will neighboring communities be effected by the max, given the ridership that has been displayed in Milwaukee and areas of Portland. What proposed increase in police resources have been estimated to allow surrounding communities to enjoy the safety that we have grown to love in Tigard? This is a HUGE concern for me and is why I took time out of my schedule to come to this forum. I have felt much anxiety about this and have already started conversations with my wife about moving. I was told at this forum that no analysis has been done about this, which surprised me. I would like to be contacted about this. Thank you.	Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime and safety.
I524	Sanders, Tom	Hi, my name is Tom Sanders. In 2010, I retired from 40 years of driving all over the United States with around three million safe miles. All over the U.S. and Canada for that matter. I went back to school and I'm a graduate in gerontology from Portland State and I have used the WES, the bus, and MAX considerably over that period of time. And if you know anything about the age-friendly initiative in Portland, I'm one of the chief investigators in research assistance on that program.  My two main things to comment was already brought up. One is the parking at the – for instance, at the Tigard transit center, if you don't get there by 6:00, you won't get a park, There is no parking. That's one of the major problems. Two, in a eight-year period, I have seen transit police probably five times. And that's on all of the different systems I've been on. So there is a problem about having transit police on the systems.  The buses, I love the buses. The only thing is getting to them. The second part is we're doing a study -- or have been working on a study at Portland State and one of the major demographics that is happening is the over-65 moving into our area from all different states. And the people over 65 want transportation that comes to them, that they don't have to go to. And that's one of the primary problems with light rail is you have to go to light rail, whereas bus comes to you. So I want that one to be considered a lot more because we have the increase -- that's why we have the increase in assisted living buildings that are going on all over the metropolitan area.  So the major things I would like to have considered is better police on the system, and two, that you consider better bus system that the people can use that goes out to them so that they can actually transport back and forth. And I have to admit I, also, in the past 40 years have been going to the Village Inn. That's one of the places I've always gone. I was going there when it used to be a rock pit.	Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and locations. Please see Master Response 14 regarding your support for more transit police. Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project, and regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		Okay. Thank you very much for this time. And like I said, the important thing to me is I do support mass transit. I love it. I mean, after all those miles, I never drive if I can get out of it so -- but it's the kind of system is what's important as far as I'm concerned. Thank you.	
1525	Schaper, Joel	<p>I have several questions I'd like to see actually answers to that are created by this present plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) How much would it take to tunnel the train under all of sw Portland? Been told its cost prohibitive. Seattles was 4.2 bil for 2 miles.</li> <li>2) Is there money set aside for the 2000 plus displaced workers due to project?</li> <li>3) Is a 12-13 story flyover proper for an area with its present highest man made structure is 50ft?</li> <li>4) Is there enough ridership to justify building this rail line?(Your ridership numbers are inaccurate. Counting a rider twice during single trip due to transfer gives incorrect data)</li> <li>5) Why does Train route mainly go between shopping centers and not Metropolitan centers?(Basically Pioneer square to Bridgeport Not Portland to Tualatin)</li> <li>6)Is there a plan for all the displaced property owners?</li> <li>7)Is acquiring property through (public right of way projects) seems arcane and a land grab technique for a poorly designed Trimet project.</li> <li>8)With a steady 3 year ridership decline on all Max lines and 10% plus decline in Wes ridership what justifies more rail projects? Trimets own data hows the decline. What makes project designers think ridership will increase when data condricts this for 3 years straight and is on track for fourth year of decline?</li> <li>9)Poll after poll results are people dont feel safe on Max.<a href="https://www.oregonlive.com/.../06/hot_button_question_do_you_fee.html">https://www.oregonlive.com/.../06/hot_button_question_do_you_fee.html</a> With this issue not addressed what makes designers think their predicted ridership numbers will be so high when data and facts state the opposite</li> <li>10)With only 1, that's only 1 bus route dedicated for riders on Barbur Blvd, what justifies a \$233bil per mile max line for 5100 daily riders? (Note ridership numbers are inflated by incorrect data collection)?</li> <li>11)Has any plan to help all the displaced businesses?</li> <li>12)Why as every major metropolitian is buring their mass transit(London,Los Angeles,Seattle,etc.) is Portland trying to make a traffic congesting device in the middle of mulitply well established neighborhoods?</li> <li>13) Since the majority of people question the present form of project why is it even moving forward in present form?</li> <li>14)Why is Trimets budget such a mystery? Why does Trimets funding grow but we get no better services, less frequent services, and falsafied and corrupted data on ridership?</li> <li>15) Since paying for Uber/Lyft/Cab rides for every rider of present route plan would be cheaper till the end of eternity why are we considering this project?</li> </ol> <p>Make Trimet accountable!!!!!!!</p>	<p>The cost to tunnel the entire alignment was not studied; however, the cost to study two portions of the alignmnet (OHSU to Hillsdale and Barbur Transit Center to PCC-Sylvania) was studied in 2014, before the Draft EIS. Tunneling to OHSU ranged from an estimated cost of \$623 million (for a 1-mile-long short tunnel exiting at SW Hamilton Street) to \$1.8 billion (for 4.25 miles of tunnel, exiting at Barbur Transit Center), while a tunneled route from Barbur Transit Center to PCC-Sylvania campus was estimated to cost approximately \$375 million. However, these were very high-level estimates, and risks of unexpected complications are higher with tunneled routes than with surface routes. The Robertson tunnel, which provides MAX access to the Oregon Zoo, ultimately cost 80% more than expected due to unforeseen complications. Please see Master Response 12 for additional information regarding tunneled options for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p> <p>Bridges on the Project would be generally 20 to 25 feet tall and would accomodate clearances of roadways below that are typically a minium of 20 feet. There are a few locations where bridges would be higher, such as being 30 feet over I-5 near the Barbur Transit Center and 40 feet over the deepest section of Red Rock Creek.</p> <p>To learn more about the transportation modeling used to project ridership, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the alignment farther into Tualatin.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about safety.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p>
1526	Schiffke, Heather	I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur..	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
1527	Schoebel, Alex	The more light rail the better. It would reduce traffic and therefore lower pollution and congestion. Many economic benenefits can be derived from expanding the infrastructure.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for light rail.
1528	Schoknecht, Kate	I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
1529	Scott, Brenda Ray	I am interested to see more information communicated about how this line will integrate with existing lines. As a resident of the Sellwood neighborhood, I am particularly interested in knowing what the plans are for making it possible to make connections from my neighborhood and the Orange Line Max.  Thank you.	Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project.
1530	Scott, JoAnn C	<p>Don't they teach you guys at traffic planning school to avoid connecting THREE (217, I5, 205) major freeways within a short distance? You are making I-5 Tualatin to Wilsonville a parking lot today, and this will just make it worse!!!</p> <p>Route your light rail from Tigard to Tualatin along or near the existing railway right of way. Allow walking to Bridgeport, not light rail to Bridgeport. It's only a block or so.</p> <p>Connecting light rail from Tigard to downtown Tualatin (not BRIDGEPORT) further enhances both towns' walkability factor. This idea of congealing all the rail/road traffic at Bridgeport and Boones Ferry is absolute INSANITY.</p>	<p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed support for a railroad alignment connecting from Tigard to downtown Tualatin instead of Bridgeport Village in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin). This option was not studied in the Draft EIS; however, a railroad alignment from Tigard to Bridgeport Village was studied as part of Alternatives C2 and C4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		Stay on the railway right of way along Boones Ferry Road !!! It goes all the way to Wilsonville. We've already adapted to it and businesses less impacted/dislocated. PLEASE!!!	Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for serving downtown Tualatin instead of Bridgeport Village and continuing on to Wilsonville.
I531	Scott, JoAnn C	Rating 2 YES to LIGHT Rail. NO to proposed end of route to Tualatin!! Why do you head back to Bridgeport???? Why not stay near the railway right of way and Boones Ferry and head directly to Tualatin??? I oppose the targeting of the Bridgeport Village and the exacerbation of congestion at Boones Ferry/ I-5/ Bridgeport. Connect directly to the City of Tualatin to improve their walkable downtown!!! Leave the present businesses along freeway alone!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for light rail. Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the alignment further into Tualatin.
I532	Scott, Mel	I am worried about being priced out of the area. I was excited until the realization of gentrification happens around upgrades such as this. Yes, these statistics were around the Max but light rail when you look at who lives in the Pearl district and the price of apartments are very telling about how this might unfold. I am frightened. The Pearl district is made up of \$2000+ apartments that are even sponsoring the light rail at one of the stops. The whole district is posh and on my salary is too unaffordable. I'm a FoodFront co-op owner which is located on Thurman but to get those groceries home is a rail and then at least one bus or two. I live where I do because it's affordable and close to where I work. I do not want the stress of being forced to move. A 96 running to Portland all day would be better for the community in that regard. I'm also feeling likd there is more interest to own an SUV than to take mass transit steps because of the low price of gas and it feels like you're not in the club of smaller footprint and working on saving the environment but rather unfortunate because you take TriMet. Either way, as not an over \$40 grand a year household, I feel like this caters only to that bracket and to the tourist and does nothing to better the working class who live in Tigard/ Tualatin area. I feel that once this is gone, the working class becomes the food stamp and HUD housing class if they or I should qualify if we still live in the area. Three modes of transportation because of gentrification occurring will not be fun and will be stressful. The cherished barista deserves to live close enough to work and this plan destroys that scenario.	Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to rent prices and gentrification. Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail.
I533	Seaman, Peter	I spent 45 minutes reading the paper copy of the DEIS in the PCC library. Thanks for providing a paper copy there. Also I've been following the reporting on the project, in the local press, for the past couple of years. There was also an excellent article on the project in the bikeportland.org blog by Jonathan Maus. Also I signed up to receive regular e-mails about the project, so I feel as though I have made a good effort to stay informed about the project. I hope you will give these comments their deserved weight of consideration - that you would distinguish between knee-jerk reactions to the project and really thoughtful reactions.  I live and work in SW Portland and will be directly affected by this project, every day. Here are my thoughts about the project:  1) I am a big supporter of public transit and I want to see the MAX come to SW Portland. I've taken Trimet buses and trains all over Portland, and I've observed how poorly SW Portland is served by public transit. It is absolutely SW Portland's turn to get some "love" from Trimet.  2) While I support public transit, I oppose the project in its current configuration because it doesn't do enough to improve other modes of transportation. Specifically, it does not do enough to improve cycling opportunities in Southwest. I've been saying to anyone who will listen, since the start of this project, that any effort to upgrade the SW corridor *must* include dedicated bike lanes in the Vermont and Iowa gaps on Barbur Blvd. Those of us who have advocated to close these gaps, with the City of Portland and ODOT, have been told for YEARS that the SW Corridor upgrades will close these gaps, but the DEIS indicates that the project will NOT close the gaps. I'm amazed that you can't figure out a way to include bicycle accommodations in a \$2+ billion project! You can't add \$5 million and do something? Have you really tried? I would like you to go back to the drawing board and tell us specifically why you can't add bike lanes to the new bridge or bridges you'd need to build over the Vermont and Iowa gaps.  3) I understand the project could make big changes to the intersection at SW Taylor's Ferry Rd and SW Capitol Hwy, with its problematic four-way stop. This intersection is currently "so dangerous that it is safe," as you may have heard. I would like for you to keep the MAX away from this intersection completely, as adding the MAX to this intersection will make it so congested that NO ONE will be happy, as everyone will need to wait a long time to get through. If you are going to re-do this intersection, you need to find a way to let people get directly onto I-5 south without having to go through the intersection. As I write these words, I can hear you saying "The project is just to add the MAX and it can't fix everything," but I'm telling you that if you add the MAX and it makes the "crossroads" area a lot more congested, everyone is going to blame the MAX. So I'd recommend you keep the MAX away from the crossroads area unless you meet a standard of "Do no harm" to the existing configuration, which seems awful but is actually not that bad - and this is coming from someone who cycles through that intersection every day, Monday thru Friday, in all traffic conditions, in both directions.  4) I favor an alignment that follows I-5 and provides faster travel times. If the MAX train is slower than the #12 bus, then there's really no point in building it.  5) I'm in favor of SW 53rd Ave improvements that will provide improved cycling and pedestrian access to PCC Sylvania, but the big reason to improve that street is for the shuttle or whatever will bring students directly from the MAX to PCC Sylvania. Not building a tunnel is a huge opportunity lost, in my opinion, but if you're not going to build a tunnel, you must seize the opportunity to make the	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support of improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities as part of the Project. In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS, and a preference for an I-5 alignment, which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B. To learn more about transit travel time and reliability, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS. Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS, particularly Section 2.2.4, Preferred Alternative: Segment B, for a description of the connections to PCC-Sylvania.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>transfer to PCC Sylvania really efficient. Otherwise students are just not going to use the MAX - they will continue taking the PCC shuttle from PSU to PCC b/c it will be faster and more direct.</p> <p>Here's a concluding, general comment:</p> <p>The big danger I see in this project is that it will make so many compromises that it will satisfy almost no one: transit riders will think it's too slow and doesn't go where they need it to go; drivers and cyclists will be angry that the MAX is slowing down their commutes as they wait for it to pass; and potential cyclists will NOT ride bikes b/c the project will actually make it more dangerous for them or preserve the dangerous status quo.</p> <p>If you are going to spend \$2+ billion of taxpayer dollars, then please make sure the project really makes things better overall in Southwest Portland. Please don't jam a MAX line in here just because you really want a MAX line. Thanks for reading my comments.</p>	
1534	Seifert, Rick	<p>During construction, Please don't disrupt or block traffic that normally goes through the Hillsdale Town Center. It will put many businesses out of business. ALSO I favor the on-Barbur alignment making sure that feeder streets to stops have much improved pedestrian amenities.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	<p>To learn more about mitigation for short-term transportation impacts, please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland, which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support of bicycle and pedestrian improvements on connecting streets as part of the Project.</p>
1535	Sheikh, Laila	<p>Every major city in the world has Better travel options. Traffic and aging population requires. Faster easier travel options</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p>
1536	Sheikh, Laila	<p>I think it's about time We had a fast. train</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p>
1537	Sherraden, Catherine	<p>I am very excited about the SW Corridor Plan, and the prospect of getting MAX light rail out Barbur Blvd. I can't wait for it to be built! As a cyclist who currently uses Barbur to get to the center city from a bit past the intersection with Terwilliger, I do have a few comments about the improvements along Barbur as a whole that include the current bike lanes and how they may change.</p> <p>--Currently, Barbur is the flattest, most direct route for cyclists from many Southwest Portland neighborhoods. Most other routes are hilly, indirect, or both. It is also unpleasant and at times even terrifying, but its directness and even grade are so rare and critical that it still draws many cyclists. I strongly suspect many, many more people would start biking into downtown if it felt safe and comfortable--I can't tell you how many times I've heard from people explaining why they don't bike into downtown, "I really don't want to bike down Barbur because it is so unsafe, and Terwilliger is dark and hilly.". Plans for Barbur really should--need--to include a safe, separated, protected bike route. Particularly along the two mile or so stretch between Terwilliger and Hamilton, where there are no intersections and cars drive 55mph, the bike lanes should be combined with pedestrian access and separated completely in a well lit, parallel pedestrian and bicycle route that feels pleasant and safe. The bike lanes should NOT remain in their current configuration on the shoulders of this four lane high speed mini highway. And, bike improvements, to the extent possible, should continue farther out Barbur, separated from high speed traffic whenever possible.</p> <p>--The two bridges on Barbur between Terwilliger and Hamilton are a mess for cyclists and pedestrians. I understand that there is a proposal to re-route the light rail around on a new elevated bridge east of Barbur, between Barbur and I-5, and leave these two bridges as-is; If so, the new light rail bridge should include a separate bicycle and pedestrian path, removing pedestrians and cyclists from Barbur Blvd altogether.</p> <p>--While it makes a lot of sense to leave these bridges as-is for cost savings reasons, I am concerned about seismic strength. It doesn't do much good to have a historically designated bridge that will fall apart when there is a big earthquake--it won't exist any more to be historic, and might kill people in the process. I know a lot of bridges and other infrastructure in Portland are also vulnerable in an earthquake. Still, a capital improvement project presents the prime opportunity we have to upgrade our infrastructure to meet new seismic standards. Public safety should be a very high priority.</p> <p>--I live on Capitol Hill Rd, one of the City streets in Portland slated for improvements along with the light rail. I am SO excited about the prospect of a sidewalk! I really would like to understand more about what these improvements may be, either from Metro or the City of Portland, because it seems like there is hardly enough right-of-way to accommodate everything the Plan calls for, and certainly not without retaining walls etc. I also fear we be liable for right-of-way improvements on our property. What would these improvements look like? What would be included--bike lanes, sharrows, sidewalk, parking strip, stormwater management, curb bumpouts, crosswalks, parking, etc?</p> <p>Again, I'm excited about this project, and look forward to using the new MAX line and the improved bike lanes to get in and out of our neighborhood and into the center city.</p> <p>Thanks for your hard work.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support for improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities as part of the Project.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed concerns related to leaving the existing Vermont and Newbury trestle bridges in place and constructing a new structure east of SW Barbur Boulevard in the Woods area of Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Refinement 1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p>
1538	Shoulders, Tatiana	<p>Rating 5 Great idea! I work in Tigard.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
1539	Shultz, Lisa	I study at NUNM in South Portland and am also a patient at the NUNM clinic. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur..	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
1540	Siegberg, Gary	Rating 1 No one goes to downtown Tigard. Shoppers going Bridgeport village, like all other shoppers need there cars for their packages. Every MAX line so far is just a conduit for crime. Tigard voters have already voted down to support a MAX line to Tigard and Sherwood. So you cut out the line to Sherwood to get around this. Like most Metro projects. They just shove it down our throats. If we want it or not.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime. Please see Master Response 16 regarding the potential for light rail service to Sherwood. The Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project is under the authority of the Federal Transit Administration, Metro and TriMet; the Tigard charter amendments passed with Ballot Measures 34-255 and 34-210 do not apply to these authorities, only to the City of Tigard. Please contact the City of Tigard directly for how the charter amendments are being applied to their involvement in the Project.
1541	Skelton, Kelly	I think you should drop the Taylors Ferry Refinement and rebuild Barbur at Capitol Highway and run the light rail straight down Barbur. That triangle is a mess already. I'd also hate for it to negatively impact Barbur Foods.	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS, and preference for an alignment along SW Barbur Boulevard instead, which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B. Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and business displacements.
1542	Slater, Debra	I live near SW Capitol Hwy/SW 49th Ave. (West Portland Park), and work downtown. I do not believe a MAX route in this area will be utilized enough to justify the cost and the negative impacts to traffic, neighborhoods and businesses on the surrounding streets. I drive to work along SW Barbur Blvd. as a preferred alternative to I-5, and the last thing I want or need is a LONG period of construction on Barbur Blvd! Nor do I want to have to share space on the length of Barbur with a MAX track and stops. There will NOT be adequate "park and ride" lots because there already is not enough space at the Barbur Transit Center to make riding the bus from there feasible. When I need to use alternate transportation I walk 3 blocks to catch the 44 bus which goes all the way downtown. Sometimes (during snow or if I miss the 44) I walk the mile to catch a bus on Barbur, but could not do so every day. I would NOT ride MAX if it were running on Barbur. We already have several bus routes (some express) that go that way and they work fine. Furthermore, as some people have pointed out, where the MAX goes so does crime and creepy people. I would not feel comfortable riding MAX alone on my way to work and back. I would NOT want to see more homeless people camping in my neighborhood. If it also eliminates some bus routes along Barbur, that would not be acceptable. Just because so much money and planning has already gone into this proposed project, does NOT mean it is the best option. (Think "Columbia Crossing.") The cost and disruption will not be worth the dubious convenience for some people. I would suggest improving the bus routes and providing more "park and ride" space so people could take better advantage of the existing bus routes. Some improvements to streets that provide access to PCC would help students walk and bike there. I do not plan to sell my house and move out of the neighborhood, but if this project comes to fruition I may change my mind.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. To learn more about mitigation for short-term transportation impacts, please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of this Final EIS. Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and locations. Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime. Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project, and regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail. Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS, particularly Section 2.2.4, Preferred Alternative: Segment B, for a description of the connections to PCC-Sylvania.
1543	Smith, Dean	Suggest you consider an alternative to the alternative that would use SW Taylors Ferry and the Taylors Ferry/Capitol Highway crossroads. To wit: Instead of using SW Taylors Ferry road before crossing over I-5 west of the Capitol Highway bridge, suggest paralleling the southbound ramp off of Capitol Highway to I-5. Would require taking out the small liquor store at the corner of SW Barbur and SW Capitol Highway and presumably some of the parking lot of Walgreens, but would minimize disruption to the Taylors Ferry/Capitol highway intersection, removal of several commercial buildings north of SW Taylors Ferry and incursion into the Ashcreek and Crestwood neighborhoods. Thank you.	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS, and preference for an alignment paralleling the I-5 southbound on-ramp from SW Capitol Highway instead, which was not studied in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
1544	Smith, Ed	What designates a historical property? We live in a home which is over 100 years old and our property is affected by Design Refinement 2. We are not sure how this impacts our property.	In your comment, you expressed concerns related to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B. Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and Section 4.6, Historic and Archaeological Resources, of this Final EIS regarding historic properties.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
1545	Smith, Edward	<p>Hello, my name is Edward Smith. I live in the Crestwood neighborhood. I'm south of Taylors Ferry Road. I've lived there since 1989. I appreciate the opportunity to speak here. I'd like to speak primarily about design refinement 2, and I would like to urge the Steering Committee not to adopt the IRP featuring alternative B2 with design refinement 2. This plan has been in development since about 2011 and this design refinement wasn't made public until April of 2018, as part of the publication of the DEIS. It stated in the DEIS the design refinements have not been analyzed at the same level of detail as the alignment alternatives in the draft EIS, and so I believe this is still evolving and in need of further study before it would be adopted as the IRP.</p> <p>The purpose and need statement in the DEIS notes a limited street connectivity, and gaps in pedestrian and bicycle facilities create unsafe conditions for traffic access, and the travel is slow and unreliable on congested roadways. Rather than being redressed, I think these conditions will be exacerbated by design refinement 2. The intersection at Capital Highway and Taylors Ferry is already dangerous for motorists, pedestrians, and bikers and well above capacity during peak hours, with queues up to half a mile long. Add a light rail crossing with additional traffic created by assumed storage lanes added to Capital and Taylors Ferry, and assumed adoption of the proposal will increase congestion and slow traffic even further. Additional storage lanes along with retaining walls and sound mitigation measures may make it more difficult to construct the sidewalks and bicycle lanes which must be included in this project regardless of what configuration is selected as the locally-preferred alternative. The planned station expansion of the Barbur transit center, including additional parking, makes it mandatory that station access improvements as stated in 16, are concurrent with project construction, not postponed until after project completion.</p> <p>From a more personal perspective, the property potentially affected by acquisition described in figure F10 in the DEIS, as number 20716, this would be the one that is dissected diagonally by the proposed route, is more familiar to me as my backyard. Although, a separate tax lot, it is conjoined to my property 4542 Southwest Taylors Ferry Road, which is occupied by my 108-year-old house, and therefore, should be considered a potentially eligible historic property. A portion of the property lies in an environmentally-protected overlay zone, as does the lot adjacent to the east that surrounds headwaters and woods creek. It's an environmentally-sensitive area and a vital part of the Fanno Creek watershed. This lot is one of few privately-owned greenspaces of its size remaining in the aftermath of relentless infill development. Given its proximity to the creek, it has provided habitat and refuge for many varieties of birds and animals. The foliage provides a buffer against noise and emissions from nearby I-5. It's alternatively served the community as a garden, dog run, snow park, chicken range, and even hosted a wedding. The bride's choice of locale based on her childhood memories there.</p> <p>With Memorial Park and the community garden on the north side of Taylors Ferry Road, and these large tracks on the south side, not necessarily a rural feel, they should be allowed to remain at least until infrastructure improvements make further development logical. If the goal is to avoid major reconstruction of the crossroads intersection, a network of seven intersection which include Capital Highway, Taylors Ferry, the better solution would be alternative B2 in its base design without design refinement 2. I believe this design would have less impact on residential property and wouldn't likely increase congestion that we've seen lately.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS, and a preference for an alignment on SW Barbur Boulevard east of the Barbur Transit Center and adjacent to I-5 west of the Barbur Transit Center, which was studied as Alternative B2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding pedestrian and bicycle mobility and station access improvements.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and Section 4.6, Historic and Archaeological Resources, of this Final EIS regarding historic properties.</p>
1546	Smith, Jeanna	<p>I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur..</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
1547	Smith, Keith	<p>Why doesn't the proposed Southwest Corridor have a transfer point to WES at Tigard in stead of running beside it for miles? The tracks could then extend to King City and Tualatin?</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for WES Commuter Rail improvements instead of light rail.</p>
1548	Smith, Sara	<p>How many parking garages will be built for park and ride? Half the battle for people in the suburbs riding transit is getting TO the transit. I really dislike Bridgeport village being the end of the line, and I can unfortunately imagine this upscale outdoor mall being a panhandlers paradise. It would also be unfortunate to impact the Village Inn restaurant. I would rather see money be spent to extend already existing service, like a bigger parking garage at sunset transit center, or designated security guards on trains. It also seems strange to stop at Bridgeport, when the new bulk of Tualatin commerce is farther south at Nyberg. Would it also be possible to get rid of the outdated WES train, and just extend the line to Wilsonville? If you really plan on improving the SB I-5 commute, this is necessary.</p> <p>This area has historically not been interested in added transit options. Lake Oswego voted against an extension of the Portland Streetcar. The housing in the area is already priced at 400k and above. Why build a transit system for low-income housing that does not currently exist? I see significant barriers to the Tigard Triangle affordable housing proposal, as it requires many changes to city code just to make it feasible. The Tigard Triangle has enough rush-hour problems with people passing through it, it would only be worse if it was also a destination.</p> <p>What is the participation with ODOT? Will they be improving the 72nd Ave overpass? If housing is added, it will definitely need to be addressed, as it is already insufficient.</p> <p>Finally, and perhaps most importantly, MORE transit is not a substitute for BETTER transit. I was a trimet commuter for 5 years, living in Beaverton and working downtown Portland. I was consistently late to work due to any number of delays in transit. It is still</p>	<p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and locations.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.</p> <p>Improvements to the Sunset Transit Center and funding for security guards on trains are outside the scope of the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the alignment to Wilsonville.</p> <p>The Project does not directly serve or travel through Lake Oswego.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to affordable housing.</p> <p>Modifications to the SW 72nd Avenue overpass are outside the scope of the Project. To learn more about the Final EIS traffic analysis, see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report.</p> <p>Increased traffic throughout the region have negatively affected the performance of TriMet buses operating in shared roadway lanes. TriMet is working with local jurisdictions to prioritize efficient and reliable bus service, such as with the</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		nowhere near as reliable as it could be. We should be striving for quality, not quantity. Efficiency needs to be a priority, work on making the system timely and safe. We still have issues running the trains in hot weather, which is going to continue as a trend in the coming years, which only adds to the delays. I can not count on trimet as a reliable service. Until its most basic issues like safety and reliability are addressed, I will not be supporting any trimet initiatives.	Rose Lanes Project in partnership with the City of Portland. In addition, TriMet has increased bus replacement purchases so that TriMet's bus fleet is newer and less likely to experience breakdowns while in service.
1549	Smith, Shane	Placing max stops on hall and Bonita is a ridiculous idea. Traffic is stop and go on those streets every day already . Adding max stops will not release congestion it will create more congestion . The trains that already pass through the area are a major contributor to that problem. Please consider those of us who have to commute from this area before you make decisions. The plan I see proposed here will leave us trapped and unable to leave our neighborhood without being stuck in traffic for an hour.	Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.
1550	Squires, April	Rating 2 How are we to get to the light rail station downtown from all parts of Tigard? What is the "hub" plan? Will there be energy-efficient buses feeding residents to the new station in downtown Tigard or will they have to drive and park ? Is this covered elsewhere in the documents?	Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes. Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, regarding park and ride sizes and locations.
1551	St Clair, Taylor	I go to school at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
1552	St Pierre, Janelle	Good evening. My name is Janelle St. Pierre, and I'm a natural resource ecologist, and I am part of the West Willamette Restoration Partnership and we are a group of folks that do restoration work, including public agencies, non-profit partners, community partners. And we're trying to be able, essentially, to create viable nature in the city between Tryon Creek State Park and Forest Park. And so I wanted to bring a couple of concerns today about potential impacts to Terwilliger Parkway and George Himes and a number of the natural areas that are being looked at for the Barbur section , and particular for the Marquam Hill connection.  The Marquam Hill connection, depending upon, like, what options you're looking at would actually, like, cut straight across a wildlife habitat corridor and that's really not adequately addressed in the draft environmental assessment. Also, Terwilliger and Marquam are landslide prone, highly active, steep slope, unstable slopes areas. And I feel like the assessment does not adequately do enough investigation to be able to address what would be the impacts. So I'm really essentially asking for future work that additional work be done to be able to really look at what's going to happen to that area. Because right now, the way the assessment is listed, it doesn't even acknowledge that Terwilliger is a natural area. And also part of that is that it doesn't reference that there is the Terwilliger Parkway Corridor Plan, which is a Portland City ordinance that requires that we maintain the natural features and the kind of viewshed, and to keep that as a place that people can really be able to use as a parkway.  So one of the things that we're going to have with population growth is a lot of new people in the area, and I think it's important to be able to preserve and protect the places that people can actually access. And so light rail will improve access to the natural area, but a lot of places, you can walk downtown in 15 minutes. So it's kind of important that we really look at the impacts of what's going to be, you know, a benefit as compared to what's going to happen with the resource. So I feel like what's been looked at so far for the Marquam Hill connection really doesn't address the natural resource access that we have in that section. That's what I have and thank you for your time.	Please see Appendix D, Final Section 4(f) Evaluation, of this Final EIS for more information on impacts to George Himes Park.  Analysis of the project area in the Draft EIS indicated that historical landslides and steep slopes exist in these areas, which are common to all alternatives. Mitigation of active or historical landslides and steep slopes will be addressed as project designs continue to advance.  Please see Master Response 9 regarding the Marquam Hill Connection.
1553	St Pierre, Janelle	All of the Marquam Hill Connection options have significant impacts to the natural and historic resources of Terwilliger Parkway that are not adequately addressed in the DEIS. Terwilliger Parkway is a historic park, recreation area, and significant natural area. It is a part of a larger network of natural areas that makes up the Westside wildlife corridor. This is a critical link for wildlife between other large natural areas. The area around the proposed Marquam Hill Connection cuts through the center of a corridor that is in the process of being actively restored with grant funds from Metro and many other partners. It is part of a 10 acre area of high quality mature Oregon White Oak- a special status habitat for the City of Portland. This 10 acres of oak is also part of corridor of oak along the Willamette escarpment that is a critical corridor for a number of migratory birds including sensitive bird species. The proposed connection is between two existing trails that are currently used to travel between SW Barbur and SW Terwilliger. It would be much more cost effective to improve the existing trail along SW Whitaker rather than create an additional trail through a steep area with a high potential for landslides. A reasonable connection could then be made between SW Terwilliger Blvd and the OHSU campus, including a safe crossing for pedestrians. The Terwilliger Parkway Corridor Plan requires that any development minimizes the visual impact to the parkway and protects the canopy screen. OHSU is not the dominant feature on the landscape. Most of the buildings are currently screened from view, allowing park users to benefit from access to nature in the city.  The DEIS does not adequately address the potential for landslide issues along SW Barbur and SW Terwilliger in Segment B. Per DOGAMI records (see attached map), most of the area has a high susceptibility for landslides. Some ares with recent or historic landslide deposits have a very high risk. Many of these landslides can be seen clearly on the landscape when you look at a LIDAR map of the area. These area coincide with section of SW Barbur that would need to be widened significantly, essentially cutting out the toe of the slope in areas of high risk. The analysis for the alternatives that include this work do not adequately address this high potential risk and impact.	Please see Master Response 9 regarding the Marquam Hill Connection and Terwilliger Parkway.  Analysis of the project area in the Draft EIS indicated that historical landslides and steep slopes exist in these areas, which are common to all alternatives. Mitigation of active or historical landslides and steep slopes will be addressed as project designs continue to advance.  The Preferred Alternative as studied in the Final EIS retains access to SW Barbur Boulevard for the existing Buhler cutoff stairway.  In your comment, you expressed an interest in light rail to the east of SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Refinement 1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		In addition, the segment of SW Barbur between SW Capitol Highway and SW Hamilton is already a dangerous corridor for pedestrians with several apartment complexes. It is necessary for pedestrians to be able to cross to access bus stops along SW Barbur. This safety concern needs to be addressed in this plan. One trail, the Buhler cutoff, connects SW Terwillger and SW Barbur in this section. The connection to the trail needs to be preserved. The Barbur Woods East-side Running design refinement would address a lot of the landslide risk, public safety, and natural resource impacts in this section, but further study is needed.	
1554	Staloff, Steve	<p>Re: Crossroads -- the sw corridor's crossing of Capitol Highway:</p> <p>My understanding is that the planning for light rail at this intersection was undertaken without a traffic study. That seems to be a major blind spot in the planning perspective.</p> <p>The Crossroads intersection interacts with intersections located short blocks to the north and south, be almost unavoidable for travelers over a fairly large area of SW Portland and Lake Oswego. Thus the combination carries a lot of traffic.</p> <p>The intersection at that point is already complex with a southbound freeway entrance at the corner, a complex intersection at Taylor's Ferry Road and a northbound freeway exit that would both be directly impacted and which feeds much of its traffic to the Barbur Blvd crossing on Capitol Hwy.</p> <p>Rerouting and disrupting traffic would be minimized by running light rail directly down Barbur, compared to other alternatives.</p> <p>Another advantage of the Barbur Blvd direct option is that the other I-5 crossing, to the south, can also utilize Barbur, minimizing off-road disturbances.</p> <p>A secondary consideration is the opportunity to redesign and modernize the intersection at Barbur and Capitol, since the structures would likely have to be replaced or modified to support light rail.</p> <p>So my preferred option is to route light rail straight down the middle of Barbur Boulevard.</p>	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS, and preference for an alignment along SW Barbur Boulevard instead, which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
1555	Stanford, Kathy	<p>I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.</p> <p>These projects are in the best interest of the entire Portland community! Time to move these projects forward!</p>	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
1556	Stanley, James	This is a waste of money for something that's only going to cover 12 miles. 2.9 billion is ridiculous. Put that money into schools and health care or helping the homeless.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.
1557	Steele, Jenna	I, Jenna Steele, am a student at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous, and access to our campus is very difficult, particularly for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
1558	Steeves, Bonnie	<p>I work off of Barbur Blvd and believed in and supported the plan to bring lightrail down Barbur because of the promised improvements of bike lanes, side walks and trees. This was the selling point for picking Barbur over I-5.</p> <p>Now it appears that the viaducts won't be widened to allow for bike lanes and sidewalks. Shame on you for selling the Barbur plan for the improvements it would include and then eliminating them in the final proposal.</p> <p>Many of us would have rethought our support for the Barbur route had we known the promises for improvements were empty.</p> <p>Do it right or we'll end up like the mess that is the Sellwood bridge with no one happy. Being in a leadership position isn't always about consensus. Sometimes someone has to decide to do what's best.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and energy spent on this project</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support of improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities.</p>
1559	Steinberg, Edward	The plan does not offer sufficient parking. I commute via bus 3-5 times a week to Portland State where I both take classes as well as mentor students. Except for Fridays there is never any spaces at the Barbur Transit Center. Many other commuters I have talked to have the same problem and park on the street. In your parking analysis you need to take into consideration those commuters who are currently using street parking for the current bus service as well as the growth expected.	Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and locations.
1560	Stellar, Andrea	When they put the light rail on the east side, they certainly did not locate it on Sandy Blvd. Which Sandy Blvd is twice the width of our poor little Barbur Blvd. There is simply not enough room for a light rail. Plus, Barbur is one of the only main roads that go out to all the neighborhoods on SW along the boulevard. As a resident of SW Portland my whole entire life - this will hinder how we - the people who live in the area get around. Instead of driving to Safeway that takes only 5 minutes now, it will take a longer time. For example: Drivers will have to drive 5- to 10 blocks more, so they are able to take a left of right and go the direction they need to travel because the light rail will be a huge ordeal to get around. It is already tough enough to get across Barbur through a light. The light rail will not cut down on any traffic. If you actually look how many travel on the PCC buses that PCC supplies, I see sometimes on 1 to 0 to maybe	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>5 students. It only depends on certain times of day. Fall term is the largest group and enrollment is certainly very low at this time. TriMet's rush hour there is a few people who ride the bus, so put more buses on the route during RUSH HOUR. Problem solved,... less a billion dollars that we can not afford.</p> <p>WE HAVE HOMELESS STARVING CHILDREN. PLEASE THINK!!!! What are our priorities.</p> <p>My father died when I was 10 years old but in those short 10 years he taught me what a dollar is worth. I do not think it takes a Doctorate Degree to understand - priorities. Nor someone who has not lived in the region to understand the actually nature and environment it will be disrupting. This IS SW PORTLAND - do not destroy it!</p> <p>Keep the light Rail ON THE TRAIN RAIL were it belongs. Do not ruin our neighborhood. Have you noticed how many bridges and over passes their our on Barubr? This will be a huge expense and it will never - never balance out. Keep the rail on the tracks and far away from Barbur Blvd.</p> <p>People who live on the East side - don't even come to SW PORTLAND. Known fact. Check your facts. It is SW people that comes to the EAST side. The people who live on the East side of Portland do not know the WEST side at all. Do a survey, learn some important facts.. SAVE SOME MONEY! Give Portland what they needed to be sustainable.</p> <p>One last thing: IT SNOWS AND ICES MORE THAN IT DOES anywhere in PDX -- in SW Portland. The max won't be able to run (the max gets shut down when it is too icy), and people who needed to get around such as emergency vehicles, will -hinder- their capability to be successful for all emergencies.</p> <p>There is simply not enough room... for the MAX to be anywhere on Barbur Blvd, especially from Hamilton to the beginning of Tigard by I5 freeway...For emergencies alone - DO THE MATH!</p> <p>Better yet, employ me - I will be the hardest worker you ever had and I wont sway the results. I will earn every cent. I have a Bachelors of Science in Community Health</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to a center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>TriMet has existing policies and procedures for inclement weather including plowing, sanding and deicing. Because the Preferred Alternative studied in the Final EIS would maintain two lanes of traffic in both directions on SW Barbur Boulevard south of SW Naito Parkway, emergency vehicles will generally have the same roadway options during inclement weather as they do today.</p>
I561	Stellar, Andrea	<p>Thank you for your reply. I should have taken more time on my letter. I typed it out very fast and sent it in. I was in a fowl mood and realized how I still needed to type this out before it was too late. I should have a least spent a few minutes proof reading it, but I has an appointment.</p> <p>I am not a very good writer but hopefully I made a few points for people to take into consideration.</p> <p>Light rail should go on 205 or 217 freeways- first. That is where the traffic is getting worse by the day. And a lot worse than I5 - rush hour.</p>	<p>A light rail alignment along Interstate 205 or Highway 217 was not considered for this project because such alignments would not meet the purpose and need of the project. Please see Master Response 16 regarding other routes or destinations that were not studied in the Draft EIS. Please also see Chapter 1, Project Introduction, of this Final EIS regarding the Project's Purpose and Need.</p>
I562	Stello, Noelle	<p>I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project is a well-thought-out opportunity to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
I563	Stensland , J	<p>Rating 5</p> <p>Good connections points for local and commuters. Avoids residential area to reduce noise . Should include connection to PCC</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS, particularly Section 2.2.4, Preferred Alternative: Segment B, for a description of the connections to PCC-Sylvania.</p>
I564	Stevens, Kimberly	<p>Rating 5</p> <p>It makes sense to have the light rail on Barbur. It links many parts of the SW and is under utilized. Also, the transit center is already there and could be expanded for more parking.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p>
I565	Stienke, Tom	<p>Rating 1</p> <p>will make barbur/pacific far more congested because of every street light rail crosses that already has cars backed up. This bad impact cannot be mitigated except by overpass or underpass of all streets along barbur. commute will be far worse after light rail. primary users will be those that would have used bus anyway. stops along existing bus route. slows down transit time. route needlessly impacts too many homes and neighborhoods. Tigard triangle 2nd station should be further south for those in the big buildings and schools. Tigard downtown should be part of Beaverton and Bridgeport connection, not Portland to Bridgeport. Impact and cost needlessly large because of the awkward path that does not even reach downtown Tigard. widen freeway instead as it will be much more useful. fix bridge over river as it is the cause behind northbound commute problem for the interstate freeway.</p>	<p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>It is TriMet's preference to grade separate all light rail crossings. However, this is not always feasible due to budget constraints. Overhead catenary poles are still required on structures, utility relocations are still required everywhere there is a bridge column, and traffic signals will need to be adjusted because of changed sight distances created by a structure. Typically, elevated guideway is significantly more expensive than guideway that runs at-grade. Where at-grade crossings are proposed, TriMet ensures they are designed and built to the most current safety standards.</p> <p>To learn more about transportation modeling used to project ridership, and transit travel time and reliability, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
			<p>In your comment, you expressed concerns about the SW Elmhurst Street alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Refinement 5 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 16 regarding your support for downtown Tigard being served through a Beaverton to Bridgeport project along the existing WES corridor.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for highway investments, including freeway widening and Marquam Bridge improvements, instead of light rail.</p>
1566	Stienke, Tom	<p>Rating 1</p> <p>3% of \$2,800,000,000 is \$84,000,000 6% of \$2,800,000,000 is \$168,000,000 Interest rates are rising. This costs too much for something that will take 45 minutes from Bridgeport to Portland. Not 30. This is an ill-conceived project. Please stop.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>To learn more about transit travel time and reliability, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p>
1567	Stiffler, Gail	<p>I would like you to reconsider the route down Barbur...a route between Barbur and I5 makes more sense. However, do you realistically think that this will be funded? I seriously doubt there will be federal funding and I seriously doubt citizens in Clackamas and Washington counties will approve a bond measure. So this all strikes me as very similar to the attempt to build a new interstate bridge...millions wasted on planning that could have been spent more wisely...like filling the thousand of potholes on Portland streets that are turning into sink holes.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>To learn more about how the Project would be funded, see Section 5.3, Cost and Funding Evaluation, of this Final EIS.</p>
1568	Stiffler, Gail	<p>I urge you to reject the current DEIS. It fails to make promised and needed improvements at the Capitol/Barbur intersection. It will increase traffic congestion on Barbur and impact lots of housing along its path, much of it fairly affordable. If you must keep doing this, please realign the route between Barbur and I5 where the impact will be less on housing and congestion and the added expense of construction associated with dealing with the bridges on Barbur will be eliminated. As I understand it, once a plan is finalized, it will be submitted to the federal government. If approved, is federal funding of part of the project then automatic, or is federal funding a separate step? Thank you for your consideration and assistance</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p> <p>To learn more about how the Project would be funded, see Section 5.3, Cost and Funding Evaluation, of this Final EIS.</p>
1569	Stockton, Michael	<p>I work at an office on Beveland Street and I am strongly in favor of Alternatives C3 and C4 for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Business - Currently on Beveland Street there are architects, mediators, therapists, psychologists, financial advisors, attorneys, accountants, optometrists, etc. Putting a rail line down Beveland (per every option but C3 and C4) would shutter all of these businesses (many permanently) with the months spent building the rail blocking access.</li> <li>2. My employment- Any option but C3 or C4 would cause my office to close.</li> <li>3. Noise - All of the businesses listed above would be negatively affected by the noise brought on by a train, further harming them.</li> <li>4. Cost - The project would not need to purchase all of the property on Beveland Street, reducing cost.</li> <li>5. Traffic - The number of vehicles on 72nd Street/Beveland Street is already absurd. I urge the designers of the Corridor Plan to spend an afternoon looking at the traffic around the 72nd/Beveland intersection. Often traffic will be backed up to Dartmouth Street and beyond on a 2 lane road.</li> <li>6. Traffic (again) - Freight Traffic to Lowe's and parked cars on Beveland (often lined all the way up both sides of the street) would be blocked by the rail and have no outlet.</li> </ol> <p>Alternatives C1, C2, C5, C6 and Design Refinement 5 going down Elmhurst would negatively affect the people of Tigard without a clear benefit. Thank you.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed support for a Clinton alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), studied as part of Alternatives C3 and C4 in the Draft EIS, and opposition to an Elmhurst alignment, which was studied as Refinement 5 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p>
1570	Stone, Donna	<p>Yes please! I live downtown and work in Tualatin. A max to That area would be awesome. Thank you</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p>
1571	Stoops, Melinda	<p>In reviewing Appendix F, tax lot 16443 (SEC 3rd &amp; Sw Barbur) is listed as vacant. This lot is the Fulton Community Garden, and part of the reason we bought our little townhouse across the street. I'm very concerned the garden will be torn out or paved over. It's a beautiful community asset and offers some peace from the traffic of I-5. Many deer, rabbits, coyotes, birds, and other animals hang out in the glen and pass through this area. I agree that we need improved transit in SW, but the proposed plans will further isolate (in a bad way) our small neighborhood. As it is, the houses in our neighborhood are between the freeway and Barbur. Without the garden and the apartment building (lot 6508) next to us, I'm afraid we'll go from a quiet little neighborhood (with I-5 noise) to being sandwiched between the freeway and a noisy light rail track with loss of visual and audio buffers. Like any other homeowner I'm concerned about the value of our property if the surrounding areas are converted to pavement. We love having quiet dirt road with only cars from gardeners - there's no need for sidewalks and I'd rather have a one lane street than a paved double lane that removes the gardens. of the plans involve tracks along our section of Barbur, but the people, wildlife, and noise level will be dramatically impacted if all buffers are removed.</p>	<p>Please see Section 4.7, Parks and Recreation Resources, of this Final EIS regarding impacts to Fulton Community Garden.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
1572	Story, Misty	I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. It is even more difficult for those unfamiliar with the area to navigate safely to and from our campus. We have patients, visiting students and professors/doctors, and many conferences each year, that bring in additional numbers of people to the Portland area. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
1573	Strapp, Reri	Rating 1 I currently take a bus weekdays from Tigard to Downtown and the commute is usually not long. When I lived in a different part of town and traveled by MAX train, I did not feel as safe as I do now traveling by bus. If this plan is adopted, I am concerned that commuting by bus will no longer be an option, my commute will become longer, and I will feel unsafe. I also fear that a MAX stop in my neighborhood will bring crime.	Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime and safety. Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project. To learn more about transit travel time and reliability, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.
1574	Stroble, Eric	The Westside bypass from Wilsonville to Vancouver is far more important to voters and taxpayers. I do not support TriMet line south to Bridgeport Village. Take a poll of what people would prefer. The Max Line south won't help.	Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for the Westside Bypass instead of the Project. Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.
1575	Strong, Tom	Important to preserve the neighborhood businesses which are community centric such as Barbur foods, barber shops, liquor stores etc. Although the Portland development hub/spoke model continues to be the focus at some point we need to start connecting the suburbs. I live 6.2 mile from my business in Beaverton but can walk to work in the same or shorter period than riding Trimet. Light rail may help but still requires an unnecessary trip downtown.	Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and business displacements.
1576	Styner, Jon	I have participated in the Portland Bike Commute (More) Challenge for the past three years. The first year I commuted from the Barbur Transit Center using the 99W / Barbur corridor but the segment of Barbur Blvd. below Terwilliger Blvd. is dangerous. There are two or three narrow bridges without adequate space for bikes, and the north bound crossing of the on-ramp from Capitol Highway 10 onto Barbur Blvd. is dangerous. The past two years I have participated but not commuted because I am not comfortable with this segment of the Barbur corridor. The SW Corridor project should incorporate comprehensive safe bicycle commuting improvements in conjunction with light rail. The conceptual cross-section of Barbur Blvd. shows center-running LRT, two auto lanes, bike lane, street trees and sidewalk. If possible the street trees should be relocated so they provide a physical safety buffer between the auto lanes and the bike lane or the bike lanes should be raised 6 inches above the auto lanes.	Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support for separated bicycle facilities as part of the Project.
1577	Styner, Jon	I have participated in the Portland Bike Commute (More) Challenge for the past three years. The first year I commuted from the Barbur Transit Center using the 99W / Barbur corridor but the segment of Barbur Blvd. below Terwilliger Blvd. is dangerous. There are two or three narrow bridges without adequate space for bikes, and the north bound crossing of the on-ramp from Capitol Highway 10 onto Barbur Blvd. is dangerous. The past two years I have participated but not commuted because I am not comfortable with this segment of the Barbur corridor. The SW Corridor project should incorporate comprehensive safe bicycle commuting improvements in conjunction with light rail. The conceptual cross-section of Barbur Blvd. shows center-running LRT, two auto lanes, bike lane, street trees and sidewalk. If possible the street trees should be relocated so they provide a physical safety buffer between the auto lanes and the bike lane or the bike lanes should be raised 6 inches above the auto lanes.	Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support for separated bicycle facilities as part of the Project.
1578	Styner, Jon	This is a follow-up to my comment for yesterday (June 27, 2018): The SW Corridor Light Rail Project should incorporate comprehensive safe bicycle commuting improvements in conjunction with light rail. The conceptual cross-section of Barbur Blvd., from the June 26 Open House, shows center-running LRT, two auto lanes in each direction with bike lanes, street trees and sidewalks. Locating the bike lanes where the trees are and the trees where the bike lanes are would create a protected bike lane that would slow down traffic and make the bike lane safer. (see attached photo from NACTO and NACTO link): <a href="https://nacto.org/publication/urban-bikeway-design-guide/cycle-tracks/raised-cycle-tracks/">https://nacto.org/publication/urban-bikeway-design-guide/cycle-tracks/raised-cycle-tracks/</a>	Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support for separated bicycle facilities as part of the Project.
1579	Subotnick, Matthew	Rating 5 It covers all the bases and is sorely needed.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
1580	Swanson, Karl	No branches in C. Eliminate C5 and C6 options.	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a branched alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Alternatives C5 and C6 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.
1581	T, Marie	Please do not bring more crime or spread the homeless crisis into our neighborhoods with the MAX Southwest Corridor. People that need to commute via public transportation already have the TRIMET located close on Barbour. A MAX line will only bring transients	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		and increase crime. Let alone extending it all the way to Bridgeport is ridiculous because Bridgeport's target market does not commute via public transportation.	
I582	Talbot, Wendy	My husband does have Parkinson's but can still drive. We would support the proposed light rail. The traffic on I-5 at rush hour, especially through the Terwilliger curves, makes it very arduous for drivers. I would much prefer using light rail to navigate through PDX.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
I583	Taxpayer, John "Q"	Rating 1 It's just a crime train. I wouldn't ride it if I had to. Take the orange line and see all the trash on there. 30 minutes from Bridgeport to psu. That's a joke! More like 1hr or more. Waste of money, time and my house! Plus you think 35000 people a workday will ride that? Completely wrong.	Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime. To learn more about transit travel time and reliability, and the transportation modeling used to project ridership, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS. Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.
I584	Taylor, Cynthia	Rating 2 As a Hillsdale resident that would be impacted by the proposed route through the wooded section of Barbur Blvd and particularly by the removal of the frontage road near the intersection of Barbur & SW 3rd Ave. , I cannot endorse the current plan. I have concerns about noise and accessibility to my neighborhood if the frontage road were to be removed. I chose this neighborhood because it was conveniently located, but also quiet and well-treed. There has been much unchecked development (thank you lack of proper infill oversight) and the resulting loss of tree canopy has increased the noise level from Barbur significantly. The proposal stands only to make this situation worse, with the removal of yet more trees , disruption of the community garden , noisy light rail trains passing less than a block from my home and so forth. The plan shows little consideration for the people that live in closest proximity to the proposed corridor. Yes, light rail is a positive in terms of mitigating traffic and congestion; ever, a closer look at the negative impacts to those living in established neighborhoods closest to the proposed route is warranted.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of this Final EIS, regarding concerns about noise and vibrations. As studied in the Final EIS, the Preferred Alternative includes removal of the SW Barbur Boulevard frontage road between SW Third Avenue and SW Fifth Avenue. Access to SW Fourth Avenue and SW Fifth Avenue will be maintained through an extension of SW Nevada Court. Please see Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of the Final EIS for more information regarding tree impacts. Please see Section 4.7, Parks and Recreation Resources, of this Final EIS regarding impacts to Fulton Community Garden. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.
I585	Taylor, Robert	We need Transit. Get this on the 2018 ballot. I was sad Tigard almost killed this. Transit is a big part of the post car living in Portland in the coming decades. We need to g3t a new line in at least every 10 years to keep up with population growth.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for transit.
I586	Terrell, Murphy	I understand you are considering putting a bridge for the train over the south end of Wood Memorial park. I object. It may be splitting hairs, but... a fly over is still disrupting the park or rather disturbing the peace I can find in the park and sure to reduce the adjacent homes value.  Since the City insists in cramming as many people as possible into this corner of Portland with little consideration of terrane and allow Development to chop down trees and destroy natural water conveyances to that end, the parks and the peace they provide will be ever increasingly valuable and imperative.  Your plan might not trigger Federal attention, but you break the spirit of the law and the spirit of the neighborhood. It is not good civic leadership. It will be remembered come election time.	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
I587	Terrell, Murphy	Rating 1 Vera Katz wanted Portland to turn into her idealized memories of Brooklyn. What she didn't remember is how Brooklyn got to be so wonderful was at the butchering hand of R.Moses. The Bronx gutted alive (with the Major Degan) and sidelining of Queens (with elevated trains.) NYers ran to Connecticut (we call inside NE and Skyline), to Ft Lee NJ (we call Aloha) , to the Oranges (we call Hillsboro) and some to Staten Island (we call Sherwood.) I live in Multnomah Village, quite near Capitol /Barbur . DO NOT build an elevated train. I know the area is fraught with geological traps and limited by finances, BUT DO NOT BUILD an EL! Last, Please forward the name of the lawyers, hired by the rich Portlanders who did not want their view of the Freemont Bridge blocked. I have a job for them.	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
I588	Terusaki, Gary	I am unhappy with the plan to remove the Village Inn restaurant at the south end of the line. There are no decent places to get breakfast in that neighborhood. The Taco Bell does not qualify as a restaurant that serves a decent breakfast. The ability to enjoy a meal enhances the opportunities to shop in this neighborhood. Without this, I can see retail traffic decreasing. There is no reason to use this facility except for park and ride.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
I589	Tevlin, Michael	I have lived on Southwest Corbett Avenue in the Lair Hill neighborhood since 2005. When I first moved here and began exploring the neighborhood by foot and by bike, I soon realized that it been seriously compromised by highways. Perhaps most egregious was Naito Parkway, a legacy of automobile-centric planning if ever there was one. This thoroughfare takes a knife to livability by eliminating the local street grid and rendering east-west movement nearly impossible. And I found it odd and awful that eastbound traffic approaching the Ross Island Bridge was shuttled onto Southwest Kelly Avenue, turning Kelly into a bumper-to-bumper parade every weekday evening past neighbors' homes.  As I began researching the issue, I stumbled on old documents from the 1970s. My God, I saw, planners have been talking about fixing this problem for (at the time) about 30 years!  That is why I am so excited by the Ross Island Bridgehead alternative, known in the DEIS as A2-BH. Here, finally, would be a solution to return sanity to the Ross Island westside approaches, return livability to Lair Hill and reunite the neighbors on the Corbett Avenue side of the 'hood with our brethren on the First Avenue side. Hello neighbor, indeed!	In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>I see the Ross Island Bridgehead alternative as a once-in-two-generation opportunity to undo the sins of our car-crazy past. In Portland, we justifiably take pride in how we removed the Harbor Freeway from the waterfront and turned it into the aptly named Tom McCall Waterfront Park. But if we are to honor the legacy of the great Tom McCall, we have unfinished business to take care of. Our dirty little secret is that Southwest Naito is a highway that cuts right through the heart of Lair Hill.</p> <p>As outlined, the A2-BH alternate would not only restore livability to Lair Hill and fix the approaches to the west side of the Ross Island Bridge. A2-BH would also open up several acres of land for housing and commerce. Being the first neighborhood south of downtown, and an easy walk, bike ride, streetcar ride or, potentially, light rail ride away from downtown, Corbett/Terwilliger/Lair Hill offers incredible potential as a vibrant, livable neighborhood, akin to Northwest Portland. But as it is currently configured, it is underutilized and undervalued. A2-BH could change that.</p> <p>I realize that the DEIS preferred alternative A1 does not route the light rail on Naito. I'm sad to hear that. But I'm heartened that A2-BH is still an option. Whether funded separately or as part of the light rail project, we must take this opportunity now to once and for all fix Naito and the Ross Island Bridgehead. Please find a way to make this happen!</p>	
1590	Tevlin, Michael	<p>Rating 4</p> <p>I have lived in the Lair Hill neighborhood since 2005. From the day I moved here, I realized the street design was a legacy of the days when planners ruined neighborhoods to make way for highways. In particular, I found it awful how Southwest Naito dissected the neighborhood, destroying the grid street pattern and nearly eliminating east-west pedestrian and bicycle movement. (My only path to downtown or to the Lair Hill section along First Avenue is through the urine-soaked, graffiti-splattered, occasional homeless camp/tunnel beneath Naito. No sane woman would dare walk through there at night.) I also saw how terrible the westside Ross Island Bridge approaches were, shuttling traffic onto Kelly Avenue in front of people's homes. Therefore, I want to see the A2-BH alternate built, whether as a part of the light rail project or as a separately funded project in conjunction with the light rail construction. The Ross Island Bridgehead has been studied since the 1970s. The building of the Southwest Corridor Light Rail represents a generational (actually, two generations) opportunity to take back Lair Hill from the automobile and restore its livability.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
1591	Thamert, Kayla	<p>I am a student at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic around the school is dangerous and access to campus is very difficult. In the three years I've studied at the school, two of my classmates have been struck by vehicles near the school, a patient of our clinic was struck by a car while attempting to cross Naito and I have experienced several near misses in my car and as a pedestrian. And these are just the experiences of one person. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
1592	Thelen, Christopheer	<p>I would like to see the light rail stay off of Barbur and other major streets as much as possible. As long as this does not mean buildings and housing has to be removed.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to a center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p>
1593	Thoren, John	<p>Rating 1</p> <p>I know this will get put in the trash but I think when you take out 50% of the car lanes on Barbur to put in light rail which gets 1-3% use it will make the area even more gridlocked. I know you dream of 60% of the car users giving up their cars and riding your system but it hasn't happened anywhere else in the city and I see no reason why it would happen here. So you say, lets make it so bad for car owners that they will be forced to ride your system but people will stay in their cars and just endure it to avoid the light rail crime, loss of freedom, speed and no way to get to work from the light rail stations, no way to do an errand at lunch time etc. Also when I-5 has an accident Barbur is an alternative and half of that capacity would also be lost. I doubt you have read this far but if you have thanks for reading.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard.</p>
1594	Thorpe, Tom	<p>Hi, Tom Thorpe here. First of all, I just want to say no collusion with the Village Inn. I am a patron. Not a relative of -- or a relative of the employees, just a patron. And it's one of my favorite places to go get a good, light breakfast before I hop on the MAX train. Oh, wait, MAX isn't there yet, but it's going to be. And do I want to get up early in the morning on a gray, drizzly Portland day and go have a cup of shoes or buy a suit? No. But I might like a hot cup of Joe and a slice of apple pie, and then get on the MAX train and go to work or go to the airport. Coming back from the airport, I'm usually hungry. When I get off the MAX train at Bridgeport, I'm going to grab a bite to eat. I don't want to go cook food. I've been on a long trip.</p> <p>The Village Inn is an anchor and it's been that way despite TriMet -- it's -- I don't know if there would be Bridgeport without the Village Inn. There's so many people that come there, even during off hours, which is when I go because there's so many people there during on hours. I'm wondering about comparing the amount of employees that will be displaced compared to other locations. If you're thinking about eminent domain issues, I think there's some other properties in that locale that are more close to where the station would be that might be considered. I don't want to put anybody at risk, but I think there's a lot more employees and a lot more community attending the Village Inn.</p> <p>Which someone else brought up, and I've been thinking about it too, there have been some concerns -- when I turn on the 11:00 o'clock news and I hear Gresham and the MAX station out there, murders, rapes, awful stuff going on out in</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		Hillsboro at the end of the line. Do we want Bridgeport to -- I don't know what's going on out there. I haven't been out there, but I know if you get off a train at night and there's a warm, welcoming restaurant there, it's going to add security. Consider that while we work together on making this right. Thank you.	
1595	Titus, Stephen	Rating 1 Bridgeport Village is the wrong destination. There is no room for expansion of parking and expansion of ridership. If you really cared to place this corridor in a more useful area, pick Scholls Ferry Rd and out to Roy Rogers Rd. The huge development of homes in this area and land is available for parking. Tualatin already has a completely underutilized WES so it's just not understandable why Trimet-Metro would want to go to Bridgeport Village.	Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the alignment toward Sherwood.
1596	Titus, Susan	Rating 5 I'm hoping that this will lessen the impact of traffic around the 217/15 interchange	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.
1597	Towne-Smith, Nancy	We own one of the properties on Taylors Ferry that would be scheduled for acquisition if design refinement 2 goes into effect. Our main concern with the new plan is the impact on the crossroads with Capitol, Barbur, Taylors Ferry and I-5. We have lived in the neighborhood for almost 30 years and over that time, promised improvements have not materialized. As infill is added on Taylors Ferry, failure to address the infrastructure is making a bad situation worse, Congested traffic conditions have cars regularly lining up and blocking driveways and feeder streets along Taylors Ferry. This impacts neighborhood livability and constrains biking or walking to retail and transit in the area. This is not sustainable! The addition of an LRT at this intersection will not lead to needed improvements, but instead blow up a neighborhood to drive a train through an environmentally sensitive area. This design refinement is a obvious attempt to skirt the issue of addressing much needed seismic and infrastructure improvements to the overpasses crossing I-5. The same overpasses that neighborhoods will be utilizing to access the Barbur transit center and planned park and rides.	In your comment, you expressed concerns related to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
1598	Towne-Smith, Nancy	We live on Taylors Ferry and may be impacted if design refinement #2 is approved. We have served on the Crestwood NA in the past and attempted to have traffic-calming (bumps) added. The request was denied due to the need of emergency vehicles utilizing Taylors Ferry as a main route. How will this be addressed if the Crossroads + Taylors Ferry are impacted by the light rail	In your comment, you expressed concerns related to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
1599	Tran, Trinh	Prefer to have light rail going through Downtown Tigard through Ash or Wall.	In your comment, you expressed support for an Ash or Wall alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which were studied as part of Alternatives C1, C2, C5 and C6 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.
1600	Tran, Trinh	I-5 branched on alternative C5 and C6 are good, but don't think if Beveland (from 72nd to west) is big enough for cars and light rail. Can someone please contact me?	In your comment, you expressed a preference for a branched alignment in Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Alternatives C5 and C6 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.
1601	Travillion, Karen	I am excited about having light rail access in our area but worried about traffic issues during construction at the Barbur/15/Taylors Ferry interchange. How will I be able to get around this intersection I use at least twice a day?  I am hoping that the stores that make my neighborhood walkable (Barbur Food, Walgreens and starbucks) won't be leaving the area. The alternate route that avoids the Crossroads intersection and goes onto Taylors Ferry is my preferred route.  I work in the Cedar Mill area and have to go through at least two transit centers to get there by bus. I am hoping a circle of transit to connect the outer ring of communities will happen at some point. Bus is good, light rail would be great!	Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.  Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and business displacements.  In your comment, you expressed a preference for a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.  An alignment connecting the outer suburbs with light rail was not considered for this project because such an alignment would not meet the purpose and need of the project. That alignment would also fail to support existing land use and transportation plans, including the Southwest Corridor Land Use Vision, the Southwest Corridor Plan, and the Barbur Concept Plan.  More information about the process by which the Preferred Alternative was identified can be found in Appendix I – Project Background and Alternatives Considered of this Final EIS.
1602	Trigoboff, Michael	I have not ever been able to get a definitive and unambiguous answer to this concern: does the plan include subtracting lanes from anywhere on Barbur Boulevard? I can assure you that if lanes are going to be subtracted, the opposition from me and many in my area in Tigard will be intense, and we will do everything we can to stop your project at the Portland-Tigard border.	Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard.
1603	Trumper, Karen	Rating 5 It's very much needed!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
1604	Trygstad, Jean	I heard that the plan does not include upgrading the Barbur -Capital Hwy intersection. This is a very dangerous intersection for pedestrians; especially for elderly or disabled people. Crossing Capital Hwy to Walgreens is also dangerous I don't walk it any longer.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment and upgrades to the SW Barbur Boulevard and SW Capitol Highway intersection in Segment B (Outer Portland), which were studied as Alternative B4 and Alternative B1,

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		I support the 1-5 option. I understand it may be more expensive to build. The benefits of the i-5 option include placement of the rail line further from existing residential housing. For those of us living/working near Barbur, the placement of light rail on Barbur will increase the sound decibels; which at repeated exposure to sounds at or above 85 decibels produces hearing loss. Repeated exposure can also lead to depression and other health conditions. If you have data on the decibel levels I would like to read the report.  Thank you.	respectively, in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.  To learn more about noise impacts and mitigations, please see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of this Final EIS. For additional detail on decibel sound levels, please see Attachment F, Noise and Vibration Technical Results Report, of this Final EIS.
1605	Turnquist, Crystal	Max line to Tualatin would help take away from the traffic on I-5. Will help the environment and increase people to venture more out of inner city	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
1606	Unknown, Austin	Good evening. It's an honor to be in your presence, especially TriMet Doug Kelsey and Metro members of the Board and the City of Portland, Donald Saltzman. I do really believe in this project because it will help. I hate it when people say they're against it, but they don't have an alternative. Like what happened in Nashville when they had an ambitious plan for a new light rail and bus rapid transit, but they overwhelmingly turned it down, but not have an alternative. So we can't just say no and not do this. It's not like ODOT can build five more lanes of freeway on the I-5 and that will solve congestion. It simply won't. Look at Houston, Texas. I believe this will work. Sorry, I'm a little nervous. Thank you. We need to look at other transit agencies. Sound Transit and King County Metro up in Seattle are amazingly successful, becoming a bus-loving community, while also expanding their current light rail. I think it would not hurt to follow other transit agencies, especially those of Los Angeles and Seattle because they somehow manage to have high ridership and we need to follow their example. So even after building this light rail project, we should shift our focus to improving our current bus network and more bus rapid transit because it is cost effective and will still help alleviate congestion in the short term. And that's all I have to say. Thank you.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project.
1607	Unknown, Hazel	I think that the next train line should be the Rainbow Line.	Trains on the existing MAX Green Line will continue through Portland to serve the Southwest Corridor. To avoid confusion for current riders, it is TriMet's practice to postpone referring to a new line by its color until about a year before the new service begins, around the start of the public process to discuss potential bus service changes that will complement the new MAX service.
1608	Unknown, Jan-godaddy	I am deeply opposed to running light rail from Barbur transit station across barbur and on to Taylors ferry to then cross over behind Walgreens to new bridge to then cross Barbur and I 5 to SW 53rd near PCC.  The congestion on SW Taylors Ferry is horrible on weekdays as people approach Capitol Hwy. and contend with traffic exiting I5 on to the Capitol Hwy. exit. This is a major traffic snarl. Adding light rail at that busy area will make it even worse! The Capitol Hwy. bridge crossing over I5 must be rebuilt to withstand light rail running along the south side of Barbur from the transit area down to the station at SW 53rd. To do otherwise will severely impact the Crestwood neighborhood area negatively!!	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
1609	Unknown, Jan-godaddy	I strongly object to running lightrail from SW Barbur Transit Center across Barbur (behind Barbur World Foods) on Taylors Ferry to a new bridge that will then cross over I5 to The area for PCC transit Ctr. at SW 53rd.  Anyone who lives in this area knows the intersection at Taylors Ferry and Capitol is a traffic nightmare. Frequently, in the mornings traffic is backed up all the way to SW 53rd Ave. with a solid line of traffic heading towards SW Capitol. To add additional chaos and traffic from lightrail will only make this worse. This is one of the worst intersections in the city!!!!!! Lightrail MUST continue on the same side as the Barbur transit center, cross over Capitol, and continue along Barbur to the proposed PCC stop. I understand that the issue is that the Capitol Hwy. Bridge won't handle lightrail crossing over it. Well, we need to rebuild that bridge and do this properly! This piecemeal approach is just crazy.  SW Capitol and SW Taylors Ferry area is very dangerous presently for cars and pedestrians. It is a matter of time before someone dies there. NO LIGHT RAIL RUNNING ON TAYLORS FERRY BEHIND BARBUR WORLD FOODS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
1610	Uribe, Brandon	Hello there,  My name is Brandon - a student at Portland State with an interest in the Southwest Corridor Project. I am aware that the Trimet 7/31 public opinion deadline on the SWC has passed, but if I may, I have a unique suggestion for the project.  Like most of my fellow Oregonians, I have a natural passion for everything regarding environmental stability. I know the SWC Project will do much good for the community through the traffic relief, uniting urban with suburban and expanding the possibilities for a Trimet ticket holder. It is clearly a win-win for everyone.  I'll get to the point - with a proposed 12 mile track, I propose for all of it to be built over and surrounded by grass. With such a major project in the works in one of the most pro-environment cities in the country, installing a "green track" system for the project would ideal for all involved. I was in Amsterdam last month, and was inspired by their tram network being entirely fitted with a rail lawn. This real world example proves that the mechanics and inner-workings of light rail systems can be modified to fit a green system.  With the current state of MAX tracks, cobblestone in downtown and loose rocks everywhere else seems to be the materials of choice. There's nothing wrong with the current look, but why stick with the old and bland when given the option for a completely new look? Having green tracks would boost the city's pro-environmental image and leave a lasting impression on locals and tourists alike. Attached I have a few images (PNG) of such a system implemented and functional in Europe.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  The MAX Orange Line project installed a test section of green track at the Lincoln Station. While the capital costs for green track were not much more than those for concrete track, maintenance of the green track is four times as expensive as maintenance on a comparable amount of concrete track.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>Regarding finances, the hefty cost of installing cobblestone/gravel would be avoided. This alone can support maintenance costs for some time. Of course, the big disadvantage would be having recurring costs like cutting and maintaining the grass instead of just dumping gravel and forgetting about it. Despite this, the cost of mowing and watering every now and then would be far outweighed by the impression it will leave on the proposed thousands of daily commuters.</p> <p>I strongly support this proposal, and if needed, would be willing to pitch this idea to anyone who may have any doubts or comments. I hope I'm contacting the correct addresses (and of those who may express interest), if there are any others I should get in touch with, I would greatly appreciate having their contact information. Let's all make this green proposal a reality. Thank you!</p>	
I611	Usov, Viktor	<p>I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for the light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
I612	Valle, Shane	<p>Rating 2</p> <p>First of all, thank you for your work on this. This is a massive, multi-year process with stakeholders large and small with so many moving pieces it's hard to keep track of it all. How to balance both the needs of the region and keep folks at the local scale along the lines happy? How to truly influence and transform how the tri-county area gets around? My only ask is that you re-examine the purpose of this investment and reconsider how you have chosen to weigh the costs and benefits of different project options. In my opinion, we should have a greater appreciation for how our choices now will impact how people get around in the next decades and even the next century. The MAX Blue line is going on 40 years now, is stronger than ever, and still influencing how and where people choose to live and work. Let the still-occurring long-term changes catalyzed by the Blue line remind us of the longevity of the project before us now. More specifically, I think we need to weigh the future benefits more heavily against the short-term impacts if we are going to move the needle on how people get around the region. We have to put our high-quality, congestion-free transportation options at the hearts of our communities, not just where it is most politically expedient to lay tracks during the planning process. For Southwest Corridor, this means putting stations within an easy walk of where people are and where they want to be: OHSU Marquam Hill, Hillsdale, Multnomah Village, Barbur Transit Center, West Portland, PCC. We've been down this pathway before where we compromise on our alignment and cost (Green line (I-205 vs 82nd Ave), Orange Line (Railroad right of way vs Milwaukie Ave), Red Line (I-205 vs 82nd), Yellow Line (Interstate (not actually all that bad) vs MLK)) and fail to transform how people get around because the new transportation options don't offer enough of a benefit over what exists today. The options aren't transformative because they skirt the edges of our communities instead of becoming integral, indispensable parts of them. Our failure to put our congestion-free transit options in the center of where people want to go and be means we've spent billions of dollars and seen no relative increase in the number of people who get around by transit. I think it's time we re-examine how we plan transit, specifically how we are weighing short-term costs (construction impacts, financial costs) and long-term transformations (equity, sustainability, quality of life, safety). I would like to see a reassessment of some of the alignment and station options that were taken off the table early on with this re-weighting in mind. Thank you for your time.</p>	<p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, and Appendix A, Detailed Maps and Descriptions of the Alternatives, of this Final EIS for more information on the alignment alternatives considered for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 9 regarding the Marquam Hill Connection.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 12 regarding your support for improved connections to Hillsdale, Multnomah Village, PCC-Sylvania and OHSU.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative would include a light rail station at the Barbur Transit Center, which is in the West Portland Town Center.</p>
I613	Vázquez, Karla	<p>My name is Karla Vázquez, I am writing this letter to express my concern for the new MAX lines. As part of the ministry of St. Anthony Parish, I have seen that many families are more concerned with housing, expensive and dignified rents than with transportation problems. If the new MAX lines open, will the rents increase further? What will happen to the families that are evicted because of the new MAX lines? I am concerned about the families that will be affected, because we are a very vulnerable community in this country. Thanks for your attention,</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to rent prices and gentrification.</p>
I614	Vega, Silvia	<p>First, good evening. Thank you for being here and for taking into consideration our concerns. I work in downtown Tigard. And I want to congratulate you on this project. It's a very interesting project that could benefit us greatly, especially those of us -- we're mothers with kids and who are always running against time; speeding things up is good. And I -- at the same time, I'm concerned about some of the effects I've seen about 3 years ago until now, the changes that are happening in Tigard. It's been getting prettier but it's also been getting more expensive, rents are going up, and I'm concerned with the changes coming, it will just make it worse. Especially those of us who have small businesses, increase taxes and rents there, too, could be affecting us. And I also wanted to add the request that if you have to move people from their from living, from their housing, that you consider the expenses, recurring expenses that they incur not -- regardless of their immigration situation. And I work in downtown Tigard so I hear people talking and they're worried about that, so I thank you for taking that into consideration. That's all.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 18 regarding your concerns related to rent prices and gentrification.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions and residential displacements.</p>
I615	Velji, Hitesh Tex	<p>First off, thank you very much, Councilmen, for being here. Closer? That's too loud. I want to just say thank you and joining us for this. So I live in Tigard and I work all the way in the Lloyd district. Yeah, I grew up here. I went to Metzger Elementary, Fowler, and Tigard High. I've moved away and come back a lot of times and seen the changes and I've seen some good and some bad. Honestly, I'm very, very happy that this is actually being built. I think it's overdue, long overdue. And I would like to see this being built with less impact to anyone. I know there's going to be negatives either way, whether it's going to be environmentally, whether to businesses, or with displacement. Honestly, the Ash modification plan looks pretty good, but also so does the Clinton. I do understand that some</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>businesses will be displaced or affected, but I also see there will be immense potential as well, because I've seen downtown Tigard decline, and it looks like it's coming back up, kind of. Which also I can appreciate that, that's cool. But my growing frustration is having to go to work and having to spend one and a half to two hours having to catch three different buses, and sometimes being late. A lot of times, actually, being late because of the traffic or crossing the bridges over, downtown to the other side, east side. Honestly, even though this is well overdue, I am glad that this is here -- this is being thought of. I would like to see the least amount of impact, so whatever works. Now you can translate. Thanks very much.</p>	
1616	Viteritti, Tracy	<p>Two issues.. I am a little unsure of why the Rail has to dead end to Bridgeport. Doesn't it make more sense to invest the funds to get commuters further south, connect with the lightly used rail coming from beaverton that goes to Wilsonville? I live in Tualatin, I5 is a bottleneck at Tualatin, the highway expansion may help with that but a rail station at Durham it will clog an already packed intersection and jam I5 at Durham/Tualatin again.</p> <p>I work at OHSU, I start at 5am I would love to take transit, but it is not feasible (I really don't want to start my commute at 3am) nor would I feel safe traveling between 3am and 5am, and transit to OHSU currently isn't until 6am.</p> <p>I am originally from NYC, I have been commuting since I was 14, I am a fan of mass transit! But... if you do not live on a direct access line and travel during peak times it is a 2 hour commute each way. Unfortunately a 4 hour and scary am commute on transit will keep me in my car.</p> <p>You are in a horrible position, you cannot make everyone happy and you want tax dollars to get a necessary and visionary job done. If no one has said it, I thank you for your efforts!</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the alignment to Wilsonville.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about safety on the train.</p>
1617	Von Renchler, Marvin	<p>1. This is pork at its worst. I do not believe that anything we say here or at meetings will make a difference. This is beyond the few of us little people. Usually a choice has to be made and what's good for the majority is the only route, while the few have to take it. In this case---its being 'represented' as the best thing for all when it will only benefit a few hundreds while all the rest of us get stuck with 3 billion in debts. No rail system in this state has ever taken stress off traffic or gone into the green. These systems bleed us and officials can sit back and say they have been progressive. So, I have no hope that our voices of reason will be heard. Chasing higher government funding is what you want, its a 'use it or lose it' thing. Others had valid data and comments. Parking will increase cars in and out. parking also will NOT BE NOUGH to provide enough riders to have any hope for return on investment. You could multiply the planned number of riders by 20 and it wouldn't take pressure off traffic. Take far less from taxpayers and fix the roads! Fix the bridges! How about the schools? My house is in the line to be taken by the city. This house, 7475 sw hermoso way, is my ONLY retirement or inheritance for my kids. It . I am severely handicapped from polio and have this house set up for me. You would not pay enough for me to clear all debts and come out with enough to do anything in the future. Taking my house will destroy what's left of my life. As of now, NOBODY in these areas can sell if they want to. A plague is upon us all because no one knows what's going to happen. My problems aside---please do what's right for all the home and business owners and the tax paying citizens! This makes no economic sense at all. Portland, laughingly, says its the 'City That Can'. Tigard may soon be 'The City That Shouldn't Just Because They Can'. The rail is supposed to make it easier for workers to get to their employers??? How is that!!! Are all employers in one spot? Are there futuristic conveyor belts that take each person to the work site? Come on. The use of cars is increasing and the use of public transit is decreasing. Its just a fact that its a losing proposition and its this way in many cities. Thank you.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>To learn more about the transportation modeling used to project ridership, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for roadway or bridge improvements instead of light rail.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p>
1618	Von Renchler, Marvin	<p>Rating 1</p> <p>A colossal waste of money. It will cause MORE traffic, not less.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p>
1619	Vranas, George	<p>I am very much in favor of light rail service coming to Southwest Portland and Tigard. I have been looking closely at Refinements 3 and 4 described in Appendix E of the DEIS. From a purely selfish point of view, and because of my desire to age in place, I was pleased at the thought of having a MAX station at Baylor and 70th. I also believe, because 70th Avenue is presently a track, that a route along 70th would disrupt traffic less than a track along 68th.</p> <p>Now it seems Metro is moving away from a station at Baylor, preferring something farther north, closer to, but south of 99. In that case, it seems logical to focus on Refinement 4, as that alternative will mainly disrupt businesses instead of residences.</p> <p>Businesspeople, given an ample compensation package, could more easily move to another good location than many residents in the Triangle and Far Southwest who may be of more limited means. Also, a station closer to 99 would draw more passengers to the MAX as it is closer to Fred Meyer and other established businesses.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed support for Refinement 4, which would run along the south side of Pacific Highway (99W) in the southern portion of Segment B (Outer Portland) and the northern portion of Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin) and would add a station at SW 68th Avenue. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p>
1620	Vranas, George	<p>Dear People: I am writing to let you know that Metro's plans for the Barbur Boulevard segment of the SW MAX line project are a winner to me. Today Barbur Boulevard suffers lots of problems. It is a hazard for pedestrians, and for cyclists, as it lacks sidewalks and bike lanes for most of its length. The only really attractive part of the boulevard is the Woods, which is undeveloped and attractively green. The rest of the route consists of dated and run down businesses that obviously need a lift, an infusion of public interest in Barbur that could encourage attractive new businesses and the modernization of old ones. I also hope that improvements along the route will allow developers to build apartments and condos at all price levels---affordable, mid-level, and high end, to house the many people who will want to live here because of the ease of access to downtown, to OHSU, and to PCC-Sylvania, and because of the availability of seismically safe, new, clean multiunit dwellings. I look forward to an end of derelict looking structures, such as the ugly</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for center-running light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternative B1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>In your comment, you also expressed support for a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS, and Refinement 4, which would run along the south side of Pacific Highway (99W) in the southern portion of Segment B and the northern portion of Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin) and would add a station at SW 68th Avenue. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>properties at the proposed SW 53rd Avenue site, which, until recently, were lap-dancing facilities. It is also important, as stated by Metro, that Barbur will continue to be two-lanes in each direction for its entire length.</p> <p>Metro's plans for the Crossroads seem particularly complex and, not being an engineer, I cannot really comment on how viable they are. However, I think that running the MAX along SW Taylor's Ferry for a short distance sounds pretty good. Earlier in the decade, when we were new to the area we learned about the Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability discussions about the West Portland Town Center at the Crossroads, I was greatly impressed with the vision and the interest the city had concerning this area. It is still a great idea, and one that I hope can bear fruit as the plans and funding for the MAX line become a reality.</p> <p>I have been particularly interested in Metro's refinements, particularly Refinement 3 and Refinement 4, as described in Appendix E of the DEIS. While I might personally prefer a station on Baylor, that I could easily reach by crossing the Haines St/Atlanta Avenue overpass above I-5, I realize that Refinement 4, more than 3, would improve the look of the initial stretch of Pacific Highway west of the city line, in Tigard. I know that Tigard voters were adamant in keeping Pacific Highway the way it has been, car-dominant, light-rail free, without sidewalks, and with all the cruddiness of strip malls built in the 1950s and 60s. At least a clean, new MAX line, going west, but safely south of 99, that turns south, at your imaginary 70th Avenue, would close down a number of 1970s era businesses, and utilize vacant or presently unoccupied plots. Refinement 4 also provides easier access to Fred Meyer, other businesses, and residential areas on the north side of 99. Metro has a good record of helping businesses reestablish elsewhere. I also like the idea of an overpass above 68th Parkway, to assure that a bottleneck from 99 could be averted.</p> <p>I think the SW MAX line will ensure a vibrant future for this part of the Metro area. I may not live to see it, but I hope I do.</p>	
1621	W, Julie	<p>Please do not use Barbur as the route for MAX! Barbur is the alternate route used by many when I-5 is at a standstill - Not just people from sw Portland but many others get off I-5 North when a backup starting at Capitol hwy and hwy 99. I can't imagine how much horrible it will be as an alternative when if it were to have one lane each way. It will be just like Interstate Ave, which is a terrible alternative to I-5.</p> <p>Now that there is talk of tolling I-5 in future even more people will find alternate driving routes thru town to avoid tolls. Taking away 2 lanes of traffic on Barbur is not the answer.</p> <p>I am not against light rail. It would some elevate traffic on I-5 especially to downtown and Rose quarter. But the place for it is along I-5. Everyone cannot use lightrail and do have to drive their cars to work or passing thru town or getting around town in general.</p> <p>Please do not take away any driving lanes on Barbu.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p>
1622	W, Ted	<p>I am in favor of the light rail project. However, I object to closing The Village Inn. It is a gathering place for mostly seniors and was relocated when the Bridgeport shopping center was built. I think one relocation is enough to tax the resources of the owners of The Village Inn.</p> <p>The seniors need a restaurant at the current location as evidenced by their support and dining attendance. It would be a travesty to move it to an outlying location. It would be great if you could find another place for the bus turnaround. Thanks.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.</p>
1623	Wagoner, Ann	<p>I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for changes to SW Naito Parkway and the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A2-BH in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
1624	Walker, Mark	<p>Rating 5</p> <p>Excellent! Love that I could take MAX to Brideport or Tigard to connect with the SMART system to get me to Wilsonville and stay off of I-5!!!</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p>
1625	Walling, Alan	<p>i am for the barbur rte. from down town to tigard. my only concern would be where all the traffic comes together at barbur and i-405...messy now really messed if waiting for trains to go through. may need to use the naito rte to get around that area. cannot really comment on tigard to tualatin as i do not live in that area.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative includes an elevated trackway over I-405, the SW Fourth Avenue and SW Broadway intersection, and the SW Fourth Avenue and SW Sheridan Street intersection, resulting in minimal changes to those intersections.</p>
1626	Walter, John	<p>I wish to add the following comments to the Southwest Corridor Plan. I am a retired government worker from California. I spent 18 years at Irvine Ranch Water District, (IRWD), in Southern California from 1980 until 1998. The unique thing about the City of Irvine, when I joined IRWD, is that there were about 20,000 people in the City. When I left the population was close to 100,000. The majority of the land when I first joined IRWD was farm land and owned by the Irvine Company. As they saw the City of Irvine growing, they decided to bring in a world-famous urban planner. He brought many design concepts with him that make the City of Irvine a livable city today. One of his primary design concepts involved transportation. He realized that people who did not live in Irvine still needed to transit through Irvine to get to where they needed to be going. Her was able to convince the Irvine Company, the City of Irvine, and Orange County of this design concept. So if population analysis indicated that some houses would bring in enough people for a single lane road each way, then certain roads were upsized to two lanes each way. If certain two lane each side roads were being</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>NEPA requires FTA, Metro and TriMet to respond to substantive comments related to the content of the Draft EIS. FTA, Metro and TriMet acknowledge receiving nonsubstantive comments such as general comments related to population growth, roadway widening, local development or commuting choices of Metro employees; decision makers also received these comments prior to identifying the Preferred Alternative, as explained in the introduction of Appendix J1, Overview of Draft EIS Comments and Responses, of this Final EIS.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed concerns related to an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>considered, then some of them were upsized to three lanes not based solely on the population of Irvine, but the surrounding population plus Irvine's. In this way traffic moved much more smoothly. Now I realize that here in Oregon, the present planning policy is micro-planning where no one ever transits into or out of their own little neighborhood. It's time to change that philosophy. I note that everyone seems to think that no one will ever move to Oregon. Well there is nothing in the constitution that restricts people from moving into or out of state. So change the mindset that no one is ever moving to Oregon.</p> <p>I have had a little contact with the City of Tigard Planners about 5 years ago. They said at the time that Tigard was approaching a development plan that would increase the City's population by about 20,000 people over the years due to redevelopment of existing pieces of land. These existing pieces of land might have a single home on them now, but when sold to a developer, to meet Metro development standards, the land would have to have 8 to 10 homes on it. Each of these land developments could potentially add 20,000 people in the Tigard triangle. And of course, the underlying metro philosophy is that all residents will merrily abandon their cars and transit in luxury on TRI-MET trains and buses. So because voters were tricked to vote in this system of redevelopment and depend on a train we now get to spend \$2.5 billion dollars on a train that hardly anyone will ride so that developers can over-develop the land which will make the road system even more difficult to commute on. What a stupid concept.</p> <p>I see that the proposed train tracks would run adjacent 1-5 for some length. If this train system ever prevents 1-5 from being widened someday, this would truly be a stupid decision.</p> <p>Someday I would like to know how many planners there are at Metro. Then I would like to know how many of these planners take a train, bus, bike or walk to work every day. My guess is that hardly any of them use alternative forms of transportation, but instead use their cars. Yet they, and their handpicked consultants continue to make commuting around Portland more and more difficult and stressful pretending that TRI-METS system of trains and busses and going to fix everyone's problems. use alternative forms of transportation, but instead use their cars. Yet they continue to make commuting around Portland a stressful situation pretending that TriMet's trains and buses are going to solve every commuting problem. Way to go Metro.</p>	<p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p>
1627	Walter, Nicole	<p>I am a Portland native, and I have lived in Tigard for 15 plus years. I am also an OHSU employee. I support the idea of SW corridor light rail. I would like to make some general comments and comment on some of the proposed route options.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SW corridor is not a walking community. People will not be walking to Max stations. However, driving and parking to take public transportation is a popular option – note how full the Barbur transit center is daily.</li> <li>2. Large park and ride garages will be essential.</li> <li>3. SW corridor is not going to be a tourist destination - 99% will be resident commuters.</li> <li>4. Adding congestion or traffic confusion (ie distracting drivers) along Barbur and/or 99W will be problematic. While some of this is inevitable, I believe that minimizing the impact on these throughways is of utmost importance. There are still going to be lots of drivers from SW corridor, and the two routes are Barbur and I-5.</li> <li>5. SEGMENT A: I support Alternative A1 with design refinement 1 that would send the tracks on the east side of Barbur. In my opinion, this would have much less impact on property and on Barbur traffic.</li> <li>6. SEGEMENT B: I support Alternative B4. This would again reduce impacts on Barbur. We have two primary routes from SW to downtown: Barbur and I-5. If Barbur were to become like North Interstate, with massive traffic impact due to Max tracks and crossings, it would have a negative impact on the entire community. Keeping the impact along I-5, even if it requires property purchase makes more sense in my opinion.</li> <li>7. SEGMENT B: I absolutely do NOT support design refinement 4. I see no reason to send light rail along 99W. While arguably, the businesses impacted by that refinement are not worth saving, sending max along 99W has no benefit and would again snarl traffic where it is already bottlenecked.</li> <li>8. SEGEMENT C: I support Alternative C6 as my first choice. Shooting further south with a spur coming back up to downtown Tigard. Again, I believe this would have the least impact on the community.</li> <li>9. SEGMENT C: My second choice would be C1 or C2, but ONLY with refinement 6 (variation 2). Property #6827 is the new Just Compassion day center for the homeless. Countless volunteer hours and donations have gone into opening this new facility for the homeless in our area. No solution is perfect, but Tigard is trying. It would be rather ironic if light rail were to take out this new facility when many people in Tigard fear that light rail will bring more homeless people and crime to our neighborhoods.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for your time to review my opinions. I believe that those of us who live in this community have valuable insight into the future of our neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS regarding park and ride sizes and locations.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as light rail to the east of SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A, which was studied as Refinement 1 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p> <p>In your comment, you also expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to Refinement 4, which would run along the south side of Pacific Highway (99W) in the southern portion of Segment B (Outer Portland) and the northern portion of Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin) and would add a station at SW 68th Avenue, as well as support for a branched alignment south of downtown Tigard in Segment C, which was studied as Alternative C6 in the Draft EIS. You also expressed support for an Ash alignment in Segment C, which was studied as Alternatives C1 and C2 in the Draft EIS, in combination with an alignment east of SW Hall Boulevard in Segment C, which was studied as Refinement 6 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concern about property acquisitions.</p>
1628	Warner, Harold	<p>I am writing as a concerned Tigard, citizen, and trying to express concerns for ANY plan as a Bad idea!</p> <p>From previous experience with sending messages like this , I know that my comments carry no weight!</p> <p>We lived on little Bull Mt in Tigard for about 10 yrs ~ 1984, and the trip to Fred Meyers was just under 10 min about 2 miles , and when we left, it took nearly 55 min .</p> <p>Traffic in all directions has taken a turn for the worse: I -5 , 217, 405, I 205, Scholl's Ferry Road, Murray blvd, etc. has pretty much been a parking lot.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period.</p> <p>NEPA requires FTA, Metro and TriMet to respond to substantive comments related to the content of the Draft EIS. Comments limited to public policy decisions, such as expansion of the urban growth boundary, are not considered</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>I relate the traffic to BAD decisions by Government in letting more business build and expanding Growth boundaries, which allows more housing and development. In time, that will be metro's vane, because resources will be depleting for water,, power, sewer, fire ,police etc.</p> <p>In fact, with development, and expanding the boundaries, could lead to large developments being destroyed like we currently see in Redding Calif.</p> <p>So, the traffic patterns and consequences should really be attributed to governments and the mess we are in !</p> <p>I thought , past Tigard voting did not to allow mass transit though our communities. Maybe I missed something, and I see this plan is a draft and we get a vote. What happens if it is again voted down?</p> <p>You people NEED TO GET REAL.</p> <p>What you really need to understand is this: when you expanded Mass transit to Gresham, Hillsboro, Clackamus, and airport, that seemed the right thing to do, at the time. The problem it has created security problems at stations , car parking , downtown, where it really is not safe to be on the transit systems at all. It also has allowed freer movement to those locations for increased crime, an undesirables to move freely.</p> <p>Some how your statistics do not match what is really happening on the ground!</p> <p>What I am really annoyed at is trying to take Village inn. What are you thinking . You have limited park and ride now that doesn't accomplish a goal of parking for commuters. You almost need a garage system and higher (4 floors) than the Sunset parking, but it HAS TO BE SAFE.</p> <p>Taking Village Inn solves NOTHING. IN fact, trying to have that as a terminus will be a night mare!</p> <p>Already, any movement by car in the area, is pretty much a parking lot, in all directions. Making a terminus in Bridgeport, with limits on parking , access and egress from it, is ludicrous!</p> <p>I foresee another parking lot on freeways, roads in all directions, night mares for EMS, and increased costs for deliveries.Our friends come to Clubsports for exercise and it takes them 1.5 hours from Wilsonville, OR</p> <p>When Village INN is just getting back on their feet, the owner is loosing monies. The compensation is NIL and laughable, and needs evaluation. . This man has , I think a 15 yr lease. He probably will still owe that lease, if his property is "deemed needed".</p> <p>IT is preposterous to see \$2500 for site search, for personal property , reestablishment of \$25000 or lump sum-up to \$40000. What are you thinking. . APPARENTLY, nothing is listed for lost income!</p> <p>This is sorta laughable, but not realistic. The property alone probably has a higher value!</p> <p>The bottom line this property is necessary right where it is and needs to stay. It helps the local economy.</p> <p>You folks need to go back to the drawing board and really SEE the problems in your proposal. Be on the ground at different times of the day, and take a hard look at what you are creating!</p> <p>I haven't had time to dig into it, but my feeling this project is like the first Mass transit in Portland, Federal monies will be offered or lost. I feel this committee needs to take there time, even if cost rise and DO the right thing. Don't let the terminus be at Bridgeport! When the property where Landmark Ford is now, I wrote a letter, I think to Tri met suggesting this a great place for parking for commuters, and I was turned down. Probably, because it would be too costly. That might have been nearly 2 decades ago. It could have been the answer to the local NOW headaches.</p> <p>Can this Mass transmit really be the Answer?</p> <p>I do not write well, but I hope you can glean something from my comments, that this proposal stinks and needs another look!</p>	<p>substantive. FTA, Metro and TriMet acknowledge receiving these comments; decision makers also received these comments before identifying the Preferred Alternative, as explained in the introduction of this appendix.</p> <p>The Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project is under the authority of the Federal Transit Administration, Metro and TriMet; the Tigard charter amendments passed with Ballot Measures 34-255 and 34-210 do not apply to these authorities, only to the City of Tigard. Please contact the City of Tigard directly for how the charter amendments are being applied to their involvement in the Project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 14 regarding your concerns about crime and safety.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.</p>
1629	Warner, Harold	<p>YOU sent me a confirmation of receiving my email yesterday about DEIS comments and Village in. . I also sent a letter in mail yesterday. When received just toss.</p> <p>The problem as Barb pointed out from Tigard LIFE , and I wondered why the emails came back to me is the word PLAN as she pointed out is the incorrect address.</p> <p>If that is the case, then people would not be able to make comments. Should another mailing in Tigard LIFE and other newspaper listings, in case others had the same issues as I did. That means you will have to expand the dates for responding</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 13 regarding the Draft EIS public involvement process.</p>
1630	Wasserman, Marc	<p>Hello - I am a resident of the Metzger Neighborhood, and I would like to express my support for the "refinement 4" option in Appendix E to run the line closer to 99W just after crossing I-5 (I also support any other changes to move a stop closer to 68th and 99W). As someone who lives just to the north of 99W, bringing a max stop closer to 99 will definitely increase walking access for people in my neighborhood. As a part of this refinement, I would strongly request that sidewalks be built on 69th Ave between 99W and Oak St to help people safely access the stop from the neighborhood. Right now 69th is pretty narrow and there is not really a good place to walk out to the road. My only other concerns are with parking and traffic flow (as max park and rides seem to be very</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed support for Refinement 4, which would run along the south side of Pacific Highway (99W) in the southern portion of Segment B (Outer Portland) and the northern portion of Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin) and would add a station at SW 68th Avenue. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support of improved pedestrian access as part of the Project.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		popular once they are built), but as long as enough parking is built and traffic is not impeded by the train line, I think bringing the stops closer to my neighborhood would be very positive. Thank you.	
1631	Wasserman, Marc	Hello - I recently submitted a comment about the refinements to run the Max line closer to 99W as it enters the Tigard Triangle. I would like to clarify that my comment expressing support only applies if the change in route would result in a station being located at or near 68th and 99W. If there will not be a station located closer to 99W as a result of moving the max line closer to the road, then this seems like it would be a disruptive change without improving access for residents and businesses. Thanks.	In your comment, you expressed support for Refinement 4, which would run along the south side of Pacific Highway (99W) in the southern portion of Segment B (Outer Portland) and the northern portion of Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin) and would add a station at SW 68th Avenue. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative.
1632	Wasserman, Marc	Hello - as someone who has relatively recently moved into the Metzger neighborhood, I am very excited for this project and the potential to bring light rail to Tigard. I would like to express my strong support for pedestrian and infrastructure upgrades to Barbur Blvd/99W as a part of this project, but I also want to stress the importance of simplicity when making these upgrades. Some of the newer Max/car/pedestrian/bicycle interchanges are very complicated and difficult to interpret (Tillicum Crossing is a prime example of too many symbols and lights). People at the 68th Blvd/99W intersection already struggle with the turn signal for uphill traffic being at the end of the cycle, and I have witnessed multiple near collisions during the morning commute from people turning left in front of traffic. Please make the interchange upgrades needed for this as simple and intuitive as possible for the safety of everyone involved. Thank you.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support of improved pedestrian access as part of the Project. The Preferred Alternative as studied in the Final EIS assumes that all left-turn movements at the intersection of SW 68th Parkway and Pacific Highway (99W) are protected.
1633	Watkins, Kevin	Thank you. We have been residents of Tigard since 1984. We moved here in March. That means we've been here over a third of a century. And it's been real dramatic for us to see the changes in the past 30 to 40 years to now, specifically with transportation. My wife taught at Fowler Junior High and there used to be a four-way stop there. Now it's a major intersection with turn lanes. We even have eight lanes on 99W going through Tigard just south of McDonald's. It's startling. All those lanes are used. That's necessary. We need this because of increased traffic. So if you look at the present into the future, I think it's in a word, sobering, if you see the transportation challenge that's in front of us. In my view, light rail in general, and the IRP specifically -- now, granted, some fine-tuning needs to be done, I think it'll represent a very, very good solution to the transportation challenges facing the city and the region. I think it is generally well thought out. I think it's well planned. I think there's a lot of fine-tuning that needs to be done. I wasn't aware how passionate these folks were about the Village in, and I hope that a solution can be made for that. I've never been there, but it seems like a nice place to go have breakfast, so we'll probably go. Maybe we'll get a free breakfast. You never know. I think I would urge the Council to proceed with this. I think these -- these long-range, capital intensive, fraught-with-uncertainty infrastructure projects are daunting. And I think the staff has been really very good about involving the community. I've served on the Transportation Advisory Committee for the City of Tigard for the last five years. I don't represent them. I'm just representing myself. But we have seen all the planning, all the analysis that has been done, and that TriMet and Metro have been very good about including us. And they -- I've seen their community outreach. So again, I think that's how you deal with all of this. I think the staff needs to be commended for a very thorough and comprehensive planning process so thank you.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project. Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
1634	Watt, Steve	Hello, I'm Steve Watt. I'm the wife of the owner -- spent 40 years working there. We recently did, last month, meet with TriMet and they did have some overlays of different options for the Village Inn. Our objective here is to save the Village Inn. We're open to the alternatives. Light rail is okay with us. It's saving the Village Inn is what we want to do.  The Village Inn -- Ryan and I didn't compare notes here, but it started 41 years ago when on staff, Robert Bailey and his uncle, went together and purchased that property and built the Village Inn. At that time, there was a vacant rock quarry across the street. For the first 23, 25 years, that's what they were. They built this business. They successfully built the business next to a rock quarry. I think there was a truck repair shop behind it. There was a motel there. All of that is gone. The Village Inn has survived. It was a business where we see the average restaurant that starts up, 80 percent fail in the first five years. She's been there 40. And I think that the proof of that is they were 2016 franchise of the year for the Village Inn. In '17, and even more incredible, they got franchise of the quarter, which what that means is we reset all the percentages against every restaurant and she did that again, Ryan and her did it again. So it's definitely a success story. They have worked hard at that. They -- you know, they've been there for a long time. Also where is the Village Inn located? Is it in Tualatin? Is it in Tigard? That's actually a trick question. The building is in Tualatin, the parking lot is in Tigard, so we do represent both cities. But I think that's long forgotten.  What we've developed there is a culture of this is Bridgeport. The same -- I know it's hard to make comparisons to the Pearl, to Mississippi, to Hawthorne, I realize we're much smaller, but the fact is, that's what we are. The Village Inn is the community meeting gathering location. They meet there. There's people that eat there every day, a lot that are a few times a week. Many groups that come in there and meet all the time. Bridgeport is the Village Inn. I guess for me, it's the gathering place. It's the meeting place for the town.  Lastly, I really would like to invite all of you to come down there and look at the building. Look at the landscaping. It's well taken care of. It's a modern, new building. It fits in. And when you're done, come stand at the front door and turn around, and every building you will see is corporate America except for the one you're standing on right there. That's a family-owned piece of property and business that's been there for 40 years, and no one else has. Thank you. Save the Village Inn.	Please see Master Response 2 regarding your concerns about impacts to the Village Inn restaurant.
1635	Weierman, Joel	As Portland Metro continue to be a destination area from across the US and abroad, we need to make investments and hard choices now about how to move all of us around. The answer is NOT more lanes on the freeway for more cars. I will be looking forward to getting on the SW Max line in the future.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
1636	Weintraub, Dana	None at this time. However, shouldn't emphasis be placed on extending WES all the way down to Salem on weekdays?	Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for WES Commuter Rail improvements instead of light rail.
1637	Welch, Josh	Thank you for requesting my feedback. I agree with the need to increase transportation options to relieve I-5 congestion. I like the plan in general though find there are three serious omissions around the ending of the proposed new line. 1) The Kruseway office complexes employing thousands of workers currently has no bus service and the proposed light rail goes through the near-empty Tigard triangle instead of toward Kruseway. 2) The Bridgeport ending point can be understood as a way to remove 950 cars (size of parking area) from I-5 commuter traffic. Though this high-end mall, and car-focused area around it, is not where the average max/bus rider shops. 3) The growth area of the metro region is along 99W and the Bull Mountain area with the thousands of homes being built. 99W south of Tigard is already one of the most jammed travel corridors in SW. Perhaps I missed this, but didn't see this transportation topic addressed.  I would believe that adding more bus routes in the SW area would be able to handle the expected light-rail total number of riders. While providing the future flexibility light rail cannot.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  Please see Master Response 15 regarding your support for an extended I-5 alignment which would have brought the light rail along I-5 and past Kruse Way.  Please see Master Response 16 regarding your preference for continuing the alignment along Pacific Highway (99W) toward Bull Mountain.  Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail.
1638	Weldon, Laura	I am a student at NUNM. The traffic flow around school is not-affectionately called "The Bermuda Triangle" because it is so difficult for students and patients to find the clinic and safely pull in and out of traffic. I am a safe driver and have nearly been sideswiped multiple times in the past couple of years trying to take the turn out of campus. It is dangerous for bicyclists and pedestrians as well. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM which will only become more pressing as the student body grows. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most importantly to ask for approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur. Thank you!	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
1639	Welsh, Jim	Rating 1  This Light Rail is not needed. Ridership would be below minimums, a boondoggle. It does not matter what kind of comments are received, as it has already been predetermined that this project will be put through. This is just to make it look all above board. This would be the west side version of the Milwaukee Light Rail boondoggle, as in it was not wanted but was shoved upon the people anyway.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.  To learn more about the transportation modeling used to project ridership, please see Attachment A, Transit Impacts and Travel Demand Forecasting Results Report, of this Final EIS.  Please see Master Response 13 to learn more about the Project's public engagement process during the Draft EIS comment period.
1640	Werts, Britni	I got to most the business that would be affected.	Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.
1641	Weston, Donald	Rating 1  I hope this 1.5 billion bond will be paid by west side residents and not poorer east county.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project.  To learn more about how the Project would be funded, see Section 5.3, Cost and Funding Evaluation, of this Final EIS.
1642	Weston, Susan	I'm only temporarily disabled, but it's making me aware of barriers I haven't been aware of until now. Two important considerations for us who live in the SW neighborhood area: Barbur World Foods & A-Boy are vital businesses for us! Please be sure that any planned route won't impact our favorite neighborhood services! A shuttle to PCC is also vital to help more students reach their classes.	Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions.  Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of this Final EIS, particularly Section 2.2.4, Preferred Alternative: Segment B, for a description of the connections to PCC-Sylvania.
1643	Williams, Maia	This line would best serve a large population of the community. Please enact it!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
1644	Williams, Robin	Hello, I attended the open house at Capitol Hill Library last night, and was encouraged to send my questions/comments in. I have two questions/comments related to the proposed route, and one related to impact on the surrounding community. 1) Is Trimet/Metro working in conjunction with the SW Corridor City of Portland project, which will be widening Capitol Highway between Taylor's Ferry and Garden Home Road? It looks like your project overlaps theirs at Taylor's Ferry and Capitol Highway. How will that be handled? Along those same lines, will bike lanes be added to the section on Capitol Highway between Taylor's Ferry and Barbur Blvd. as a result of the light rail construction, or is the City of Portland handling that, or anyone? It's a very small area, but very congested and dangerous for cyclists. There needs to be continuity of the bike lanes established along Capitol Highway through that area and across Barbur Blvd. 2) Given Taylor's Ferry and other areas along the route are around 500+ feet elevation, is consideration being made for handling freezing temperatures on the line, especially the overcrossing? Our area often gets snow, freezing rain, etc. when lower areas do not. 3) Regarding impact to the surrounding community, will Bus#44 continue to run as it has been, originating at PCC and following Capitol Highway into downtown? Those of us who live just off or near Capitol Highway between PCC and Barbur Blvd. need to be able to continue having bus service along that route, since walking to Barbur Transit Center is not an option for many.	Projects assumed under the No-Build Alternative are documented in Appendix A, Detailed Maps and Descriptions of the Alternatives, of the Final EIS.  Please see Master Response 7 regarding improvements to bicycle facilities as part of the Project.  TriMet has existing policies and procedures for inclement weather including plowing, sanding and deicing. The elevations in the Southwest Corridor are not significantly different than elevations elsewhere on the MAX system.  Please see Master Response 10 regarding future bus service changes and opportunities to provide feedback on improving bus connections to the Project.
1645	Williams, Sierra	Rating 4  As someone who lives in Lake Oswego, having to rely on bus to either get to Portland, Tigard, and other locations, swapping bus routes can be long and confusing especially when a bus is late or canceled( and can't drive). Having more options to get into the community is always nice, but not having to transfer buses and lines is amazing. I'm really hoping to hear the results of this plan.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
1646	Williams-Thomas, Tafflyn	I work at NUNM, in the SW Portland Corridor and traffic around our campus is terrible. I have considered biking or walking to work but it does not feel like a safe option due to the congestion and poor traffic control in the area. Campus access is very difficult for vehicles, bikes and pedestrians. I am writing to express my concern and to strongly support, approval of the Naito Parkway and the Bridgehead Reconfiguration projects. Please vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
1647	Willson, Brannan	I would like to voice my support either in favor of this new line or, perhaps more simply, extending the schedule of the WES line. As a resident of Wilsonville who works in downtown Portland, I commute 5 days/week taking the WES to Beaverton and the MAX from Beavertown to downtown Portland.  Currently, it's not possible for me to take public transportation from Portland to Wilsonville between the hours of 9:30 am and 4:30pm. I have had several occasions when I've needed/wanted to get home in the middle of the day, but have been unable to do so. I assume the WES does not run between those hours because of a lack of ridership?  But if that is the case, then would there be enough ridership to justify a new MAX line running down to the same cities that the WES services? Perhaps a good test to determine whether or not the new MAX line would be needed would be to run the WES throughout the day. And if people aren't riding it, then maybe that could help to inform this decision.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.  Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for WES Commuter Rail improvements instead of light rail.
1648	Wilson, Doug	Re C2 + Ref 6 - Intersection of Hunziker + Knoll (Plus L.R. crossing): Knoll drive is a one-way street emptying onto Hunziker. At present exiting Knoll is hazardous. Westbound traffic is moving at speed and represents hazard. Traffic bunching at Hunziker/Hall traffic light obscures eastbound traffic to people making left turn Knoll to Hunziker. Knoll/Hunziker intersection is already challenging to negotiate. Light rail will exacerbate the only exit from Knoll onto Hunziker.	The Preferred Alternative assumes that access to SW Knoll Drive will be removed at SW Hunziker Street. Access to SW Knoll Drive will be provided only from SW Hall Boulevard. Additionally, SW Hunziker Street will be realigned to intersect with SW Hall Boulevard at the existing intersection with SW Scoffins Street, with a left-turn lane and right-turn-and-through lane on SW Hunziker Street approaching SW Hall Boulevard.
1649	Wilson, Douglas	My name is Doug Wilson. I've lived here in Tigard on Knoll Drive. And Metro, Tri-Met and the City of Tigard gave a presentation here last week and they laid out a revised plan for, what, C2 coming south of the Knoll to the north of the Knoll. The only issue I have is that the route goes right through the intersection of Knoll and Hunziker, which is already a difficult intersection. Knoll Avenue, Knoll Drive is one way feeding -- feeding in from Hall and feeding out onto Hunziker. And during rush hour getting on -- getting onto Hunziker is challenging both directions. Westbound traffic on Hunziker is still moving at posted speed so it's coming down on Knoll at speeds. It's real tough to get out. And with -- there's a utility pole there obscuring vision making it more hazardous. But trying to make a left turn gets even tougher because you have all the traffic -- westbound traffic piling up at the light. You can't get through and then you can't -- don't have visibility trying to -- going eastbound off of Hall so you're sitting there astride -- astride the street exposed on both sides and it gets really dicey.  Having the light rail cross at grade would be -- would make a great deal of danger, not even triple intersection, just not a T. Traffic issues aside, there's another aspect to light rail routing, which is gradient. The top of the Knoll is higher than 300 foot elevation and the pond down in the business park is lower than 200 feet elevation. There's 100 foot climb from the wetlands up to the top of the Knoll so running track up there is an engineering challenge. So the point I'd like to make is two proposals, one light rail related and the other about the City of Tigard streets. Considering that with property acquisition Carlson Laboratories is right in the path, and the grading cost, you'd have to dig a big cut to get up through the Knoll. And also there would be a couple houses on Knoll that would be taken out, too. Then I'm -- what I'm proposing, it might be more economical to tunnel under the Knoll and emerge in front of Snyder Roofing. That way you avoid traffic disruption and avoid housing displacement. The second proposal is -- this is for the city, not the light rail -- is widen Hunziker at the intersection and install a left turn refuge lane so people can then get out without having to worry about eastbound traffic hitting them. Thank you.	Please see the response to Comment 1648, above.
1650	Wilson, Heidi	I'm a student at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for light rail on Barbur, but most importantly I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur. Thank you!	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
1651	Winkler, Luella	Thank you for the opportunity to voice our opinion regarding the choice of street the Max light rail will run on. Our house sits right on 70th and, since we've lived there for 47 years, would rather see it on another street, 69th looks good to me as we do use lite rail a lot and would like it close by, but not through our porch. We have raised our four children here and love it, the last two are still at home as they are both mentally challenged, due to this problem of there's, they use tri met services constantly, so would be happy with it close by. The Clinton Crossing is interesting but with all the bridge work that would have to be done, sound's like it may be a little spendy, it's bad enough when it's on flat ground. The 69th prospect sounds good as most of the houses on it have been turned into businesses, or the property already has large buildings on it. What about having the light rail go south on 69th then turn west on Dartmouth then from there go across the wet-lands between Costco and Walmart and crossing 217 there? Maybe not so many bridges. Again, thank you for listening to our point of view.	In your comment, you expressed interest in the Clinton alignment in the northern portion of Segment C (Tigard and Tualatin), which was studied as Alternatives C3 and C4 in the Draft EIS, and suggested an alignment that utilizes SW 69th Avenue and SW Dartmouth Street, which was not studied in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 6 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment C.
1652	Wise, Lindsey	My name is Lindsey Wise, and I am a biodiversity data manager at Portland State University, as well as an alternate member of the SW Corridor Citizen Advisory Committee. I want to call attention to a few items related to Attachment D, Ecosystems Report, prepared by Parametrix. My office, the Oregon Biodiversity Information Center (ORBIC), supplied rare species data that was used in	Western Pond Turtle habitat has been identified at Red Rock Creek, and impacts will be minimized at those sites. Please see Section 4.9, Ecosystems, of this Final EIS for more information regarding impacts to habitats, stormwater impacts and best management practices for invasive species, such as noxious weeds.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>this report. ORBIC also maintains an invasive species database, available through iMapInvasives.org, that can inform mitigation of invasive species impacts from the project.</p> <p>The three items that I would like to call attention to relate to species of interest within the project area:</p> <p>1) There is a documented sighting of western pond turtle using the Fanno Creek backwater ponds behind Tigard City Hall. It's likely these turtles use additional sites within the project area. While there is no federal or state protection for this species, these turtles are considered by ORBIC to be threatened throughout Oregon and impacts to their habitat should be minimized.</p> <p>2) Freshwater mussels are present in the Tualatin River at Fields Bridge, so there is the potential for them to be present in the project area. These include Western ridged mussel (<i>Gonidea angulata</i>), Oregon floater (<i>Anodonta oregonensis</i>), and California floater (<i>Anodonta californiensis</i>). While there are no federal or state protection for these species, they are considered by ORBIC to be threatened or vulnerable throughout Oregon and impacts to their habitat should be minimized. The Xerces Society located in Portland can provide more detail and guidance on mussel habitat and mitigation of impacts.</p> <p>3) Several noxious weeds have been documented along Fanno Creek in downtown Tigard by Metro, including Giant Hogweed (<i>Heracleum mantegazzianum</i>). Giant hogweed is a class A prohibited noxious weed in Oregon, and highly poisonous to people, pets, and livestock. While these sites have been under management by Metro and other agencies, it is very important to take these sites into account during project construction as seeds from this plant could be present in the soils and waters of Fanno Creek. Garlic mustard (<i>Alliaria petiolata</i>) is a highly invasive, class A noxious weed that is spreading through SW Portland and has been found on Fanno Creek, SW Lesser Rd, Pasadena Dr, Taylors Ferry, and other areas in or near the project area. Eggleaf spruce (<i>Euphorbia oblongata</i>), also a class A noxious weed, has been found at the TriMet lightrail turn-around at the South PSU station.</p> <p>Heavy equipment moving between project sites and workers' boots should be cleaned after working in noxious-weed infested areas. Attachment D refers to BMPs (best management practices) related to invasive species and I strongly encourage the project team to take these seriously with regards to mitigating the spread of invasive species. Not only do these species impact human health, they are detrimental to our native habitats which support the protected and sensitive species discussed elsewhere in Attachment D. The management of invasive species costs Oregonians millions of dollars a year in management costs and economic losses (see ODA report, <a href="https://www.oregon.gov/ODA/shared/Documents/Publications/Weeds/ORNnoxiousWeedEconomicImpact.pdf">https://www.oregon.gov/ODA/shared/Documents/Publications/Weeds/ORNnoxiousWeedEconomicImpact.pdf</a>).</p> <p>I would encourage the SWC project team to work closely with the local and regional natural resource management agencies that work with these species of interest, including Metro, Clean Water Services, Tualatin Soil and Water Conservation District, and Oregon Dept. of Agriculture to be aware of known invasive species locations and to coordinate on BMPs and mitigation, as well as habitat restoration after construction. Metro, Tualatin SWCD, and Clean Water Services have extensive experience and expertise in mitigation and rehabilitation of natural landscapes within the Metro area, as well as the use of native plantings in rehabilitation and for storm water management.</p>	
1653	Woerner, Betty	<p>I agree that the route should be next to 1-5. The option to take 99-W and Barbur down to one lane in each direction is patently ridiculous. We're trying to alleviate congestion, not make it worse.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 8 regarding your concerns about removal of travel lanes on SW Barbur Boulevard.</p>
1654	Wojtak, Danielle	<p>I study at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.</p> <p>In addition, I live south of Portland, and Trimet options to get to school are not always the most convenient. This project would be a great aid for me to get to school in a timely and consistent manner.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.</p>
1655	Wonder, Michael	<p>Adding light rail to the gridlock that already occurs on Taylors Ferry and Capitol Hwy during rush hour is insane.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p>
1656	Wong, Mary	<p>I generally support transit plans, however the Design Refinement 2 at Taylors Fery Rd and Capitol Hwy is alarming and I represent many when I outline these objections.</p> <p>The "Refinement" goes right through several BUSINESSES and a NEIGHBORHOOD full of houses that have been there for generations! The map looks as though all of them may be demolished for this "Refinement".</p> <p>Businesses and homes affected: Master Wrench Car Repair, an office building with several independent businesses, an Auto Body shop that is just under new ownership, Thai Orchid Restaurant, a Nail Shop, a Pet supply store, a Mexican Restaurant, and at least eight privately owned , full developed homes on lots</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>The route goes THROUGH an Environmental Overlay Zone that does not even let homeowners cut down trees, let alone build pilings and fill the land to support a train track. Not all maps show the actual "finger" of the zone that carries Woods Creek, the head waters of the Fanno Creek, to the edge of Taylors Ferry before it enters a culvert and is found again immediately on the South side of the road. There is NO property or lot at that point of Taylors Ferry Rd, so what will the track be built on?. There would have to be massive filling of the protected Woods Creek ravine that abuts the road. I do not believe that there is "no viable alternative".</p> <p>The constrained land and current congestion at this intersection is already impressive. Adding a light rail component to this is, dare I say, just plain stupid. To use the the word "Refinement" is also offensive.</p> <p>Why is destroying more businesses and family homes in a prime area of Portland, in an Environmental Zone, requiring massive land modifications, and yes, still another bridge, a better solution?</p> <p>Keeping the route on Barbur Blvd and improving the existing bridge infrastructure is clearly a better solution for the future of Barbur Blvd, anyway. If it is as bad as you say, it will be repaired or replaced in the future after the "Refinement" has been done and all the previously mentioned properties and businesses have already been lost.</p> <p>Please consider this information seriously. I represent many concerned people in this area. Thank you for your time and consideration,</p>	
1657	Wong, Mary	<p>I generally support transit plans, however the Design Refinement 2 at Taylors Fery Rd and Capitol Hwy is alarming and I represent many when I outline these objections.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The "Refinement" goes right through several BUSINESSES and a NEIGHBORHOOD full of houses that have been there for generations! The map looks as though all of them may be demolished for this "Refinement".</li> <li>2. Businesses and homes affected: Master Wrench Car Repair, an office building with several independent businesses, an Auto Body shop that is just under new ownership, Thai Orchid Restaurant, a Nail Shop, a Pet supply store, a Mexican Restaurant, and at least eight privately owned , full developed homes on lots</li> <li>3. The route goes THROUGH an Environmental Overlay Zone that does not even let homeowners cut down trees, let alone build pilings and fill the land to support a train track. Not all maps show the actual "finger" of the zone that carries Woods Creek, the head waters of the Fanno Creek, to the edge of Taylors Ferry before it enters a culvert and is found again immediately on the South side of the road. There is NO property or lot at that point of Taylors Ferry Rd, so what will the track be built on?. There would have to be massive filling of the protected ravine that abuts the road.</li> </ol>	<p>In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p>
1658	Wood, Dan	<p>I am wholeheartedly in favor of the extension proposed by Trimet/METRO for the SW corridor. I was absent from Portland for 10 years and now, upon my return, I find a much improved light rail and bus system. I use MAX and buses on a regular basis and with family in Tigard, I would certainly use the new route. Keep up the good work - I look forward to hearing more good news about the SW Corridor extension.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.</p>
1659	Woodard, Adam	<p>Funding needs to be found to create a protected bike and pedestrian path through Barbur in the Woods. Barbur is simply the only relatively level and direct right of way between the central city and Southwest Portland.</p> <p>Whoever the folks are reviewing these comments and prioritizing the costs related to this project need to understand that lives and limbs are at high risk with the current state of the poor biking and walking infrastructure, not to mention missed opportunities to better connect Southwest Portland to the rest of the city. Isn't better overall connection the main point of this project? What has been proposed so far with the Southwest Corridor plan is simply a reiteration of the dangerous status quo, especially in Barbur in the Woods. Do better please.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support of improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities as part of the Project.</p>
1660	Worley, Matthew	<p>I am writing to implore you to keep the proposed MAX line away from Barbur Blvd. Alternatives that put it next to I-5 are much, much better.</p> <p>Whenever I experience trains impacting the roadway, people in cars are adversely affected. Trains are best used for getting many people from one area of the city to another quickly and not used as inter-neighborhood transport. Buses are great for getting people to train stations.</p> <p>The MAX line on Interstate Avenue ruined it as a viable vehicular alternative to a clogged Interstate 5. The MAX line slowed the time by adding lights, taking away the continuous left turn lane, and made it generally difficult to navigate. Do NOT ruin Barbur Boulevard in the same way.</p> <p>East side MAX running along the freeway is quick and efficient (except for too many stops). I imagine Westside MAX is the same. Please keep Barbur Boulevard primarily for cars; we absolutely need it as an alternative to I-5.</p> <p>Please, keep trains away from roads that cars use. If you want people out of cars and on to trains, don't make it more difficult to drive, make alternatives faster or cheaper. For my use, Tri-Met in general is niether faster nor cheaper. I will have someone drive me downtown, drop me off, and return again to pick me up (down and back twice) because it still costs about half as much as taking Tri-Met.</p>	<p>In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for highway investments instead of light rail.</p>

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		I have lived in Portland for 30 years, and close in SW Portland for two decades. I am very familiar with the impacts of MAX lines on established routes. Please do not remove lanes or add any more stop lights. Please preserve the smooth, fast path that is Barbur. I support more lanes on I-5, and maintain the lanes on Barbur.	
1661	Worley, M	Rating 1 Please, please keep the train off of Barbur Blvd. We absolutely need that route. Whenever trains are added to established routes (like Interstate Ave.) it ruins it as a good driving route. Trains are not good for picking up passengers along the way (like the bus), they are best from one hub to another. Build it next to the freeway. Keep Barbur clear for cars.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for an I-5 alignment in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B.
1662	Wright, Jeff	Southwest light rail is way overdue. Beaverton transit center has no parking!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
1663	Wright, Jennifer	I used to support the SW Corridor Plan, but with ballooning costs, increasing proposed business & residential partial property acquisitions and total displacements, as well as the alarming and unmitigated potential effects on transportation safety for both vehicles and pedestrians alike, I just no longer can. The three biggest issues are this recently added Refinement 2, the choice to run the line down middle Barbur vs. I-5, and generally the cost/benefit analysis of the expected increase of ridership vs. the enormous monetary cost to build this project. This plan, as propose is unfair to both all drivers and pedestrians alike who will not be using the new Max Line ass part of their daily commute (most of us), as well as those businesses and residents who you have proposed to callously and permanently disrupt or displace.  I was shocked to see the major (though well hidden) and ridiculous route modification proposal in the DEIS inconspicuously named "Refinement 2". This "refinement" is just about the most short-sided and irresponsible decision the designers of this project have made thus far. So Metro doesn't want to spend a little extra time and money to redesign and rebuild a failing and dangerous intersection that is long overdue for an update, I get it. BUT IT HAS TO BE DONE! If not now, when? Instead you've decided to randomly turn the train off Barbur, up a crucial (but inadequate) artery used by 1000's of commuters per day, over a beautiful and tranquil wood, through a residential neighborhood (don't mind the screeching), and then back almost where you started. For why? So you can save a few million and a little additional build time on a several billion-dollar project? What a ridiculous and short-sided plan! Refinement 2 makes no sense, none at all.  As for the rest of it, it's a simple matter of cost benefit analysis. it all comes down to how many people is this going to help and what benefits will it have for the environment by getting those extra cars/busses off the road vs. the total costs by way of additional travel time and inconvenience to the remaining commuters, the monetary cost and the general effects on livability to the neighborhoods this new rail line is meant to serve. I will admit when i first heard about this plan I was excited, "I'll have a quick, more comfortable way to get downtown, to school and to the airport, great!!" I thought. But that's when the line was being proposed to run efficiently down the side of I-5, with minimal disruption to any one and at about half the cost that it is now. Looking at the map of proposed displacements, the effects it will have to traffic on Barbur (No left turns, what?) (When I-5 is tolled, where do you think all the traffic is going to go?), the ballooning costs and a total projected annual ridership that will barely put a dent in the traffic or greenhouse gas emissions, I truly believe (after reading the DEIS in it's entirety, including the appendices) that the SW Corridor plan is no longer sensible or viable. As much as it pains me to admit it, and as much as I would have liked a Max line that would run almost to my front door, unless there are some drastic changes I will be voting no on supporting this bond when it goes up for the vote, and at the current time I don't know any friends or neighbors who will support it either.  In conclusion, here's my suggestion, for what it's worth. Save a couple billion, go ahead and build the safety improvements for bicyclists & pedestrians as they are badly needed to access any sort of alternative transportation regardless, and run a few more express busses instead. It's a cheaper and far simpler solution with similar positive outcomes, but most of all, it's a plan that actually makes sense.	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your opposition to the Project. Please see Master Response 17 regarding your concerns about property acquisitions. Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis and transportation safety. In your comment, you expressed opposition to a SW Taylors Ferry Road alignment near the Barbur Transit Center in Segment B (Outer Portland), which was studied as Refinement 2 in the Draft EIS, and a preference for an I-5 alignment, which was studied as Alternatives B3 and B4 in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding selection of design refinements for inclusion in the Preferred Alternative and Master Response 5 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment B. Tolls are not a committed project and therefore not considered as a project alternative. Any tolling program would incorporate its own traffic analysis, including the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project as a committed project. Please see Master Response 7 regarding your support for improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Please see Master Response 10 regarding your preference for bus improvements instead of light rail.
1664	Yarnell, Ellen	I work at NUNM in South Portland. The traffic congestion around NUNM is dangerous and access to our campus is very difficult, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. The SW Corridor project may offer the last opportunity in decades to finally fix the growing transportation and safety problems that surround NUNM. I am writing to voice my concern about this problem and to voice my support for support for light rail on Barbur, but most important I seek your approval of the Bridgehead Reconfiguration and Naito Parkway projects. I encourage a vote in favor of the Bridgehead and Naito improvements as a companion project to the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur.	In your comment, you expressed a preference for light rail on SW Barbur Boulevard in Segment A (Inner Portland), which was studied as Alternative A1 in the Draft EIS, as well as support for the Ross Island Bridgehead Reconfiguration. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the Preferred Alternative in Segment A.
1665	Yoshioka, Craig	All for this new line!	Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
1666	Zeigen, Laura	I think the issue of which color to call this line could be really big! Even if y'all have to narrow it down to 3 choices (that you would be cool with) and have people vote that would bring a lot of attention to and interest in the project. I think having a funky name color like Aquamarine or Chartreuse would help, although just plain Purple would be awesome too. As a SW resident I am excited about the new transit opportunities this new line will present for us. Thank you so much for all your work on this!	Trains on the existing MAX Green Line will continue through Portland to serve the Southwest Corridor. To avoid confusion for current riders, it is TriMet's practice to postpone referring to a new line by its color until about a year before the new service begins, around the start of the public process to discuss potential bus service changes that will complement the new MAX service. Please see Master Response 1 regarding your support for the Project.
1667	Ziehnert, Ziehnert	Rating 1	Please see Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Attachment B, Transportation Impacts Results Report, of this Final EIS to learn more about the Project's traffic analysis.

**Table J2.5-2. Draft EIS Individual Comments (multipage table)**

Comment ID	Commenter Name	Comment Text	Response
		<p>This light rail line is expensive and further congests the already heavily used Barbur BLVD and Hwy 99W. Any light rail would need to be constructed separate from the road way, and not further congest the roads by causing new and/or longer lights. If the light rail is built in it's own alignment, elevated above the roads, or some other way to actually improve the flow of traffic it would be OK. The existing light rail projects in Portland are a disaster! I've been to many cities that make this work nicely- check out what Denver did installing light rail adjacent to freeways with NO negative impact whatsoever. In fact, they improved the freeways in the process. That's a win-win solution that I would support sorely lacking in this proposal. How about eliminating the stop lights in the Terwilliger Curves, Capital Hwy &amp; Junctions with I-5/Hwy99W/Barbur interchange as a key part of this proposal?</p>	<p>It is TriMet's preference to grade separate all light rail crossings. However, this is not always feasible due to budget constraints. Overhead catenary poles are still required on structures, utility relocations are still required everywhere there is a bridge column, and traffic signals will need to be adjusted with due to changed sight distances created by a structure. Typically, elevated guideway is significantly more expensive than guideway that runs at-grade. Where at-grade crossings are proposed, TriMet ensures they are designed and built to the most current safety standards.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 15 regarding your support for an extended I-5 alignment. Please see Master Response 11 regarding your preference for roadway improvements such as eliminating stop lights.</p>