

Southwest Corridor Plan Update

Portland Planning & Sustainability Commission

June 12, 2018





There could be 340,000 residents in the Southwest Corridor by 2035–

Bowl of Soul Mocha

TOTAL TOTAL TOTAL TOTAL TOTAL

people:

STORAG

UHAU

If all the people who work in the Southwest Corridor were their own city, they'd be bigger than Eugene. swcorridorplan.org

hours of congestion a day:

ON

That's how bad traffic will be on Interstate 5 between Portland and Tigard in 2035. swcorridorplan.org



We started with land use to connect to places





More than light rail...

- new walk and bike connector between Barbur and Marquam Hill
- 2-mile **shared transitway** to allow buses to bypass traffic congestion
- shuttle between PCC-Sylvania and nearby stations
- continuous sidewalks and protected
 bike lanes where LRT is in Barbur



Inclusive Growth

Housing

- Portland / Tigard Equitable Housing (funded with Metro grant)
- TriMet's commitment on housing
- Metro bond: \$653M

SW Equitable Development Strategy

- Housing
- Workforce development
- Pilot programs







Project Benefits







Hillsdale / Burlingame

Barbur Transit Center

PCC Sylvania

Tigard Triangle + Downtown

Bridgeport Village







NEPA process

Federal Transit Administration

- Help decision makers understand environmental consequences
- Inform public of potential impacts
- Consult with relevant agencies
- Find ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate adverse effects
- Become eligible for federal funds

TRI

Parametrix





Draft EIS

- Disclosure document, intended to be neutral
- Compares Project to No Project
- Analysis and findings generally at "segment" level
- Identifies potentially significant impacts and ways to mitigate
- Based on frozen 5% designs
- Not a permitting document



DEIS Comment Period

- Public review period June 15 July 30
- Available now
 - swcorridorplan.org
 - swcorridordeis@oregonmetro.gov
 - 11 locations around project area
- Around 300 pages + printed appendices + unprinted attachments
- Executive summary is just 25 pages



Key Findings

Notable variations between alternatives

- Traffic intersection operations
- Residential and commercial displacement
- Effects to parks and historic properties in Portland, especially Lair Hill area
- Noise impacts
- Wetlands and floodplains in Tigard
- Positive and adverse community effects throughout alignment



Transportation Findings

- Substantial increase in corridor mobility
- 43,000 Average Daily riders in 2025
 - Faster and more frequent service
 - New connections
 - Park/ride, bike/walk and connecting buses
 - Plus 8,000 bus riders on shared transitway
- Interlines with Green line
- Highest ridership at Marquam Hill, downtown Tigard and Bridgeport Village







Overall route Initial route proposal



Through route

- Better connectivity between Tigard and Tualatin
- Better transit service for Downtown Tigard
- Lower operating cost
- More cost-effective and reliable operations



South Portland Initial route proposal

Barbur

- Shorter connection to Marquam Hill
- Faster travel time
- Fewer property impacts (historic, residential, business)
- Ross Island Bridgehead improvements necessary





South Portland Suggested modification

Avoid Barbur viaducts

- Reduce construction impacts
- Avoid historic and park impacts
- Reduce cost





Hillsdale to Tigard Triangle



- More accessible
 & visible stations
- More safety
 improvements
 on Barbur
- Fewer residential displacements
- Avoids complex
 I-5 bridge
 reconstruction



Hillsdale to Tigard Triangle Suggested modifications



- Reduce visual impacts
- Reduce construction impacts
- Reduce cost
- Allows for a station on 68th near 99W



What is the Preferred Alternative?

- Single light rail route for further design, study, funding
- Included (option to be defined)
 - Marquam Hill connection
 - PCC Sylvania shuttle
 - Operations & Maintenance facility
- Work to do:
 - Stations and Park and rides
 - Design refinements
 - Station access improvements



Implications

- All other alignments dropped
 - Clarifies adverse effects
- TriMet will begin advanced designs
 - Avoid or minimize impacts
 - Develop detailed cost estimates
- Environmental review
 - Final EIS to evaluate updated designs
 - Commit to mitigations
 - Address DEIS comments



Upcoming decisions

2018 Southwest Corridor light rail project schedule





Long-term timeline





Questions?

DEIS comment period June 15 – July 30 www.swcorridorplan.org

swcorridordeis@oregonmetro.gov

Station access improvements studied in DEIS Segment A



Station access improvements studied in DEIS Segment B





Project Cost

- Full route options studied would cost \$3.27 to \$3.63 billion
- Design refinements could lower cost to \$2.64 to \$2.86 billion
- Needs FTA medium-high cost effectiveness to be competitive
- Minimum operable segment
 - Required by FTA
 - Lower cost but unclear cost effectiveness
 - Not an upcoming decision



Transportation Findings

- 2035 traffic volumes cause extensive traffic congestion/delays with no project
- A mitigated project can reduce but not eliminate congestion
- A Ross Island Bridgehead project has traffic benefit
- Clinton option in Tigard will not work as currently designed (SW Hall)



Transportation Findings

- Project will improve walking and biking
 - New and widened facilities
 - Crosswalks added
- Freight
 - Generally avoids major freight routes
 - Design needs to accommodate typical trucks. Specific businesses require more.
 Project converts driveways and streets to right-turn access.
- Loss of on-street parking



Transportation Issues

Mitigation needed:

- Locations throughout S. Portland (mostly minor)
- At Barbur/Bertha/I-5 off-ramp (minor)
- At most park & rides (add turn lanes and/or signals)

Safety improvements proposed to address existing high crash areas


Displacements

Segment A (PSU to Terwilliger)

	Residential Units	Businesses	Employees
A1 Barbur	41	15	108
A2 Naito Brdghd	53	22	371
A2 Naito Lim Acc.	125	23	231

Segment B (Terwilliger to Tigard)

	Residential Units	Businesses	Employees
B1 Barbur	32	54	500
B2 I-5 / BTC on	32	61	469
B3 I-5 / 26 th on	35	66	565
B4 I-5 / Custer on	78	62	496



Displacements

Segment C (Tigard) *Does not include Design Mods

	Residential Units	Businesses	Employees
C1 Ash / I-5	85	41	734
C2 Ash / RR	85	37	323
C3 Clinton / I-5	5	35	839
C4 Clinton / RR	5	31	428
C5 Ash Branch	85	55	515
C6 Wall Branch	7	47	545

See Appendix F for lists and maps of properties potentially acquired(Does not distinguish full vs. partial)



See Appx F for tables of potentially affected properties

Table F-2. Properties Affected by Acquisitions: Segment B (multi-page table)

• = Parcel affected by alternatives studied in Draft EIS (without design refinements)

o = Parcel potentially added by design refinements to the list of affected properties for Alternative B2

Note: Affected parcels include both full and partial parcel acquisitions. COM = commercial; MFR = multi-family residential; PUB = public; RUR = rural; SFR = single-family residential; VAC = vacant.

	FR = single-family residential; VAC = va				Align Alterr	iment native		Desig inem	Cold Street and	
Map ID	Address	Land Use	Alternative B1	Alternative B2	Alternative B3	Alternative B4	Refinement 2	Refinement 3	Refinement 4	
5352	8201-8205 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00S01.00E21CB000003900	COM	•	•	•	•			
5397	1801 SW EVANS ST	2601.00S01.00E21CA000007500	SFR	•	•	•				
5523	7360 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00501.00E21AD000003700	MFR	•	•	•	•			
5524	7425 SW 5TH AVE	2601.00501.00E21AD000003800	MFR	•	•	•	•			
5720	8655 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00501.00E20DD000008200	COM	•	•	•	•			
6350	7529-7601 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00S01.00E21AC000003100	COM	•	•	•	•			
6508	7350 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00S01.00E21AD000003900	MFR	•	•	•	•			
6672	8124 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00501.00E21CA000009300	COM	•	•	•				
6933	9620 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00501.00E29BD000007400	COM	•	•	•	•			
6934	9620 WI/ SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00501.00E29BD000007500	COM	•	•	•	•			
6950	9803 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00S01.00E29BC000001500	COM	•				0		
7003	8607-8633 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00S01.00E20DD000008100	COM	•	•	•	•			
7315	8360 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00S01.00E21CC000001400	COM	•	•	•	•			
7405	8283 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00501.00E21CB000004100	COM	•	•	•				
7644	11462 SW PACIFIC HWY	3401.00S01W36AD000006504	COM				0			0
7645	Information Unavailable	3401.00S01W36AD000006700	COM							0
8049	6920 SW 2ND AVE	2601.00S01.00E22BB000003600	SFR	•	•	•	•			
8096	7142 SW 2ND AVE	2601.00501.00E22BB000004600	SFR	•	•	•	•			
8132	1430 SW MOSS ST	2601.00501.00E21CA000006200	MFR				•			
8348	8970 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00S01.00E29AA000000700	COM	•	•	•	•			
8363	7904 SW 14TH AVE	2601.00501.00E21CA000006500	SFR				•			
8725	7235 SW 2ND AVE	2601.00S01.00E22BC000006600	SFR	•	•	•	•			
8978	8948-8952 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00S01.00E29AA000001100	COM	•	•		1			
9013	11125 WI/ SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00S01.00E31AB000007700	SFR	•	•	•	•			
9014	5350 SW PASADENA ST	2601.00501.00E31AB000007800	SFR	•	•	•	•			
9015	11125 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00S01.00E31AB000008100	COM	•	•	•	•			
9016	11125 WI/ SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00S01.00E31AB000008200	COM	•	•	•	•			
9017	11125 WI/ SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00S01.00E31AB000008400	COM	•	•	•	•			
9040	8005 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00501.00E21CA000008200	SFR	•	•	•				
9194	8200-8210 SW 19TH AVE	2601.00S01.00E21CA000009500	COM				•			
9434	10800 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00S01.00E31AB000000100	MFR	•						
9493	7635 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00501.00E21AC000002900 0		•	•	•	•			
9494	7641 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00501.00E21AC000003000	COM	•	•	•	•			
9672	8414 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00501.00E21CC000001700	COM	•	•	•				
9848	7850 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00501.00E21CA000003800	COM	•	•	•				
9849	7900 SW BARBUR BLVD	2601.00501.00E21CA000003900	COM	•	•	•	1			
9926	2545 SW SPRING GARDEN ST	2601.00S01.00E20DD000006500	COM	•	•	•				



See Appx F for maps of potentially affected properties





Full acquisitions of potentially eligible historic resources





Historic Impacts

Segment A (PSU to Terwilliger)

	Full Acquisition	Partial	Easement
A1 Barbur	5	18	10
A2 Naito Bridgehead	7	20	25
A2 Naito Limited Access	15	13	8

Segment B (Terwilliger to Tigard)

	Full Acquisition	Partial	Easement
B1 Barbur	5	5	1
B2 I-5 from BTC to Tigard	4	3	1
B3 I-5 from 26 th to Tigard	3	4	0
B4 I-5 from Custer to Tigard	2	3	0



Visual Effects

Little variation in overall effect in Portland

Tigard Triangle

• Ash options create most change

Downtown Tigard

- Low effect from Wall option
- Moderate effect from Clinton options
- High effect from Ash options



















Parks

All options could effect

- Terwilliger Parkway
- George Himes Park
- Fulton Park
- Sylvania Nature Park

A1 affects Duniway and Lair HillA2 options affect two community gardensB1 effects Markham School grounds



Conservation area impacts = 31 acres

Protection area impacts = 2.5 acres





All Tigard options impact wetlands and floodplain





Noise and Vibration

All options create many moderate noise impacts throughout the project area

- Branched route generates more impacts due to more late hours service
- Most impacts in Segment A due to density of existing development
- Few severe noise impacts
 - Most are in southern Tigard Triangle



Evaluation Table

Table 5.2-2. Comparison of Initial Route Proposal to Other Alignment Alternatives

	Initial Route	Base Draft EIS Change from Base Draft EIS IRP Designs to Other Alignment Alternatives										
	Proposal ¹	IRP Designs	Segm	ent A	Segment B			Segment C				
	Alts. A1, B2, C2 with Refs. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6	Alts. A1, B2, C2 (no refinements)	Alt. A2-BH	Alt. A2-LA	Alt. B1	Alt. B3	Alt. B4	Alt. C1	Alt. C3	Alt. C4	Alt. C5	Alt. C6
Transit travel time												
PSU-Tigard TC	24 to 25 min	26min 10sec	+1m	+1m	-1m	+30s	-50s	Similar	-1m10s	-1m10s	Similar	+1m50s
PSU-Bridgeport	30 to 31 min	32min 30sec	+1m	+1m	-1m	+30s	-50s	+30s	-50s	-1m20s	-3m30s	-3m30s
Ridership												
Line riders	43,000 to 44,000	41,200	+300	+300	Similar	Similar	Similar	-600	-600	-800	+1,600	+900
New transit trips	19,000 to 20,000	17,500	-900	-900	Similar	Similar	Similar	-400	-400	-500	+800	+600
Displacements ²						1.						
Residential units	80 to 100	163	+12	+84	Similar	+3	+46	Similar	-80	-80	Similar	-78
Businesses	100 to 120	121	+5	+8	-7	+5	+1	+4	-9	-13	+18	+8
Employees	1,200 to 1,700	1,016	+160	+123	+31	+96	+27	+458	+563	+105	+192	+222
Cost ³												
O&M (annual)	\$22 M	\$22 M	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	+\$8 M	+\$8M
Capital (YOE - 2024)	\$2,600 to \$2,800 M	\$3,300 M	+\$130 M	+\$160 M	+\$10 M	-\$30 M	-\$30 M	+\$70 M	+\$120 M	+\$60 M	+\$30 M	+\$60 M
Other												
Additional trade-offs			Longer walk to Marquam Hill Land use and transp. benefits of Bridgehead Reconfig. Better supports Barbur Concept Plan	barrier	Adds complex reconstruct. of Crossroads bridge Better supports Barbur Concept Plan	of Barbur Concept Plan	Less supportive of Barbur Concept Plan		Critical traffic impact at SW Hall Blvd. near Pacific Hwy. Less supportive of Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan	Critical traffic impact at SW Hall Blvd. near Pacific Hwy. Less supportive of Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan	Less frequent service to downtown Tigard	Less frequent service to downtown Tigard No impact to wetlands

Note: BTC = Barbur Transit Center; IRP = initial route proposal; M = million; O&M = operating and maintenance; TC = Transit Center; YOE = year of expenditure.

Cells are shaded to indicate how other alignment alternatives compare to the base Draft EIS IRP designs for each factor:

¹ 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. Some of the design refinements would also be compatible with other alignment alternatives not included in the initial route proposal, but the change in impacts and benefits would differ.

² Numbers include the Hunziker O&M facility and a Marquam Hill connection. Connection 1A is assumed for the purpose of comparison (Connections 1B and 1C would result in the same displacements, and Connection 2 would result in fewer displacements).

³ Reflects costs displayed in Table 5.1-2



Corridor-Wide Analysis

Not much difference between alternatives or segments

- Air quality
- Geology and Soils
- Energy
- All other issue areas show differences between alternatives within a segment



Footprint-Based Disciplines

Based on assumed construction footprint

- Acquisitions, Displacements and Relocations
- Parks and Recreation
- Land Use
- Economics
- Historic and Archaeological
- Hazardous Materials
- Ecosystems
- Water Quality and Hydrology
- Utilities



Operation-Based Disciplines

Based on modeling of light rail operations

- Transportation
- Noise and Vibration
- Public Services





Location-Based Disciplines

Based on specific location attributes

- Visual Quality
- Safety and Security





Community Impacts

Community quality of life, community cohesion and community facilities

- <u>Cohesion</u>: Sense of community or social interaction
- <u>Quality of life</u>: Aesthetics, noise, vibration and safety and security
- <u>Community facilities</u>: Access to these facilities



Environmental Justice

Is there a disproportionate, high and adverse impact on low-income or minority communities?

- Impacts after mitigation and benefits
- Identify impacts from other disciplines and overlay through environmental justice lens



