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INTRODUCTION

This document presents the record of public comment for the South Corridor Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project. The publication of the project’s Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) on May 9, 2008 initiated a 45-day public comment period that culminated at noon on June 23, 2008. The public comment period provided the opportunity for people to review the SDEIS and give their opinions, concerns, and feedback to project staff and decision-makers.

The SDEIS presents details of the project alternatives and their environmental and transportation performance to decision-makers and the public to help them identify a preferred alternative. The SDEIS examines a proposal to develop light rail transit in the final segment of the South Corridor. The project would construct an extension of the MAX system from downtown Portland to a terminus at Lake Road in Milwaukie or Park Avenue in the Oak Grove neighborhood in Clackamas County, a distance just over 6 miles. Metro is leading the project in partnership with TriMet, the Oregon Department of Transportation, the cities of Milwaukie, Portland and Oregon City, and Clackamas and Multnomah counties.

The South Corridor is part of a larger high capacity transit corridor known as the South/North Corridor, which extends from Clackamas County to downtown Portland and north to the Columbia River and Vancouver, Washington. The current SDEIS augments past studies—the South/North Corridor Draft Environmental Impact Statement (1998) and South Corridor Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (2002)—by updating information on the purpose and need, alternatives considered, affected environment, and anticipated environmental impacts for the Portland-Milwaukie Corridor to reflect the changed conditions since the South/North DEIS was published.

Metro and project partners created numerous opportunities for people to engage in the issues included in the SDEIS and learn about the tradeoffs of the various project decision points. What follows is a description of the outreach activities undertaken during the course of the project study and public comment period, a synopsis of the comments received during the public comment period and copies of outreach materials and the actual comments received.
SUMMARY OF OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

This section outlines the goals and means of outreach and public involvement conducted throughout the project study and public comment period by project staff and project consultants. The outreach and public involvement plan for the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project included several important goals.

- First and foremost, project staff sought to elicit widespread public involvement.
- The project set up mechanisms to assure two-way communication with citizens, and provided a forum for citizens to play a critical role in the planning process.
- Additionally, efforts were made to translate technical information and findings in a straightforward and understandable way, highlighting the tradeoffs at the various decision points.

Activities are divided into the following sections: project committees, project events and meetings, community presentations and outreach products.

Project committees

The Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) was formed in the summer 2007 and met regularly to follow the project. An open recruitment process was announced on the project website, at project meetings and through local jurisdictions, via e-mail and word-of-mouth recruitment and at community presentations. A total of 50 applications were received. The twenty-one CAC members were appointed by the project Steering Committee including local residents, business leaders and representatives from public institutions and community groups. Over the course of the year they met 14 times, learned about and toured the proposed alignment, participated in public meetings and met with project staff to review the technical findings on such things as cost, acquisitions and displacements, safety and security, traffic impacts, ridership, project finance, the river crossing and station areas. They provided feedback and local knowledge to project staff. On June 12, 2008, the CAC made a recommendation on the river crossing, the alignment and terminus and stations that was presented to the project’s Steering Committee.

In response to community members’ concerns regarding safety and security on the proposed light rail line, Metro formed the Safety and Security Task Force. The Task Force was composed of eighteen community member volunteers from neighborhoods in Portland and Milwaukie. Participants provided input on how to ensure the safety and security of passengers and the public. The group met five times between September 2007 and January 2008, and produced a report. They identified concerns and brainstormed possible design ideas and policies to address them. Their recommendations provided insight for not only for this light rail project but for current MAX operations as well.

The Willamette River Crossing Partnership included property owners and neighborhood representatives from both sides of the river to study possible locations for the new bridge. The group was convened by Portland’s Mayor Tom Potter and Commissioner Sam Adams, and was chaired by former Mayor Vera Katz. Together they reviewed the benefits and impacts of each river crossing location and shared their unique perspectives. The met four times in a 9-month period and presented a written recommendation on the river crossing.
The **Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement**, a volunteer group of citizens that meets monthly to advise Metro on its approach to citizen involvement, reviewed the project public involvement plan early in the project study and strategies for outreach during the public involvement process. The group made recommendations that enhanced the project’s outreach efforts.

**Project events and meetings**
Throughout the course of the project, Metro staff and project partners hosted events and meetings along the alignment, including workshops for specific areas. Section 3 contains a complete list of dates and events.

Seven open houses, three “segment meetings” and two community workshops were held from March 2007 to May 2008 to share project updates and solicit input.

Two open houses, one in Milwaukie and one in Portland, kicked off the project in March and April 2007. Three segment meetings were held in Milwaukie in April 2007 to focus on specific alignment issues of light rail in the north, central and south portions of the city. Two community workshops in July 2007 focused on a discussion of alignment options related to downtown Milwaukie. An open house focused on Oak Grove was held in October 2007.

Tour open houses were held in May 2008 to present results from the SDEIS and collect feedback for the public comment period. Attendance at the May 2008 open houses totaled approximately 220. Comment cards collected during the open house are included in this report. These open houses featured:

- Illustrated stations explaining the project history and timeline, options considered and findings of the study. Metro staff and project partners were available to answer questions and explain details.
- A video simulation and architectural renderings of transit and trail alternatives in various locations through the corridor.
- Fact sheets and comment cards that offered a variety of ways for interested parties to provide feedback on the alternatives presented and which should advance for further study.

The project hosted several station area planning workshops along the alignment over the course of the study period. In October 2007, the project hosted two workshops, one at Cleveland High School focused on the Clinton Street, Rhine Street and Holgate Street stations and the other, at Sellwood Middle School, focused on the Harold Street, Bybee Street and Tacoma Street stations. The purpose of the workshops was to share the locations under study and guiding principles for station area development and to gather community input. In November 2007, the project held two open houses, one at Sellwood Middle School and the other at OMSI, to report back to the community about what the team learned at the October station planning workshops and gather input about priorities for station area improvements.

In the spring of 2008, the project hosted station area planning workshops for the southern end of the alignment. Those took place on March 12 and 19 in Oak Grove and Milwaukie,
respectively. Both meetings were well attended with approximately 130 participants in Oak Grove and around 100 in Milwaukie. Each meeting began with a presentation about the conditions, opportunities, and challenges around the proposed stations, followed by time for group table work. In Oak Grove, participants shared their perceptions about opportunities and challenges of the station locations and the project as a whole and reconvened as one group to share those thoughts through a community dialog. In Milwaukie, the table work focused on prioritizing station locations. A written report detailing the meetings and public comments was published and posted on the project web site.

A public hearing before the project Steering Committee was held Monday, June 9 at Metro Regional Center council chambers. Testimony from the hearing is included in the appendix to this report.

Through the course of the study, project staff identified property owners likely affected by light rail should the project be constructed as studied. Metro, TriMet and city staff sent letters to and met with affected owners to provide early notice of potential impacts due to light rail operations, to answer questions and to inform them of what to expect should the project move forward.

Community presentations
Throughout the course of the project, Metro staff and project partners made 123 presentations to community groups, neighborhood associations, business organizations, interested advisory committees and local governments. The presentations explained the project status and provided information on upcoming opportunities for public involvement. Section 3 contains a complete list of dates and events.

Outreach products
In September 2007, Metro sent a project newsletter to approximately 11,000 residents, which contained a project overview and invited participation in the decision-making process. Another newsletter was mailed in May 2008 to approximately 12,000 residents, which summarized the SDEIS findings and invited participation in the public events and comment opportunities.

Three Metro Councilor newsletters were sent to a total of approximately 1,400 constituents, and three Metro e-newsletters were each sent to approximately 4,700 residents of the region. Both contained articles about the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project and invited participation in project events and presented avenues for public comment.

Ten fact sheets were produced by Metro throughout the course of the project to provide information and encourage participation in the process.

Metro’s web site contained regularly updated project information for review and download.

Postcards were mailed to business and property owners along the proposed alignments in Milwaukie as well as interested persons, advocacy groups, neighborhood groups and elected officials. Approximately 8,600 residents of Oak Grove received postcard invitations
to a station area planning workshop held in March 2008. Following the publication of the SDEIS, a postcard was sent to approximately 13,000 residents in April 2008 to invite participation in two project open houses, the public hearing and comment period.

In May 2008, targeted **door-to-door canvassing** was done to ensure that property owners were aware of the project and upcoming project events. In advance of project events, many retailers agreed to post and distribute **project flyers**. In June 2008, fliers were also distributed in local schools in the Oak Grove area to approximately 3,000 students and their families.

**Media advisories** were distributed in December 2007 to inform local communities about the Safety and Security Task Force and in May 2008 to notify local media of the publication of the SDEIS, the public comment period and a series of events and comment opportunities.

**Newspaper advertisements** In May 2008, advertisements were placed in the Oregonian, the Clackamas Review, the Oregon City News, El Hispanic News, and the Asian Reporter to announce the publication of the SDEIS and invite participation in the subsequent public comment period.

Throughout the process, more than **115 local news stories** focused on the project or mentioned it as part of a story on a related effort such as development in the South Waterfront area, safety and security on light rail and long-term transit planning.

**Project partners** played a major role in outreach. Project partners, including the cities of Milwaukie and Portland, Clackamas County and TriMet, provided a link from their web site to the project web site throughout the process and announced the release of the SDEIS in May 2008. All project partners provided updates and background information on the project in their publications and invited participation in project events and meetings.

Throughout the process the City of Milwaukie hosted several local meetings related to the light rail project. The city sent media advisories or placed newspaper ads in the Clackamas Review (May, July 2007) to announce meetings or events, sent postcards and emails to constituents and included stories in multiple city newsletter sent to residents. The city also devoted a special link on their website to answers questions and providing technical information focused on community questions and concerns related to the light rail project.

Clackamas County sent media advisories (February, April 2007), placed ads in the Clackamas Review and sent e-newsletters, mailings and postcards to residents to announce events, invite participation and share information.

The City of Portland included project information in two daily e-newsletters and sent a media advisory in May 2008 regarding the release of the SDEIS.
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

A total of 339 comments were submitted in the form of 150 emails, 11 public testimonies at the public hearing, 123 comment cards, 52 letters, and 3 telephone messages during the 45-day public comment period. The majority of these comments came from individuals, largely residents living adjacent to or near the proposed facility.

The project also received over 51 comments from government agencies, public institutions, businesses and organizations.

Of the comments received, the majority supported the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project, although a solid minority had major concerns about key elements or opposed the project as a whole. A substantial number of people were neither clearly in favor of or opposed to the project, but expressed preferences regarding specific issues, ranging from station choice to bridge location. Project supporters were more regionally focused and included mobility and environmental benefits as key reasons for their support. Most people voicing concerns cited the alignment through Milwaukie as their primary issue. Others questioned the overall project on the basis of cost, benefits, impacts, or the underlying need for a transit improvement.

Comments supportive of the project
Project supporters looked forward to accessing places around the region using light rail, having a quicker commute and easier access to downtown Portland and Milwaukie, as well as to regional destinations like the Oregon Museum of Science and Industry and the Oregon Zoo.

A number of people mentioned a desire to reduce dependence on automobiles. Many cited the project’s potential to reduce emissions, others looked forward to lowering their gas expenses, and those without cars anticipated more complete transit options. Others focused on light rail’s ability to provide another transportation choice in light of ever-increasing traffic congestion.

Many people highlighted the value of development and business opportunities associated with light rail and encouraged specific alignment and station location alternatives. Others welcomed light rail as a community-building enhancement to neighborhoods. Some people also believed proximity to light rail stations would increase property values. Others described the benefit for visitors and regional tourism.

Some supported the project because they believed light rail to be an acceptable way to manage regional growth while addressing pollution and congestion. Finally, a number of individuals simply expressed support of the project, noting that it should be built as soon as possible.

People expressing support for the project were mostly individuals. However, a sizeable group of organizations or businesses also expressed clear support for the project:

- Portland neighborhood associations or association members: HAND (Hosford Abernathy), SMILE (Sellwood Moreland), Buckman, Brooklyn, and Reed
Milwaukie Neighborhood District Associations or association members: Hector-Campbell and Island Station

Businesses or business organizations: Central Eastside Industrial District, Clackamas County Business Alliance, Dark Horse Comics, Balzer Pacific, Mason Supply

Educational institutions: Oregon Health and Sciences University, Portland State University, Reed College and Portland Community College, three people associated with St. John’s the Baptist School and Church

Community organizations: Oregon Museum of Science and Industry, REACH Community Development Corporation, Willamette Watershed, Willamette Pedestrian Coalition

Governmental or semi-governmental organizations: Oregon Department of Transportation, North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District, Oregon City Transportation Advisory Committee

Comments focused on the breadth and depth of the SDEIS or project scope
Some people did not clearly indicate support or opposition to the project as a whole, but focused their comments on the analysis or improvements to the project. Others asked questions about the SDEIS document or specific environmental issues. A few people commented on the new light rail line’s influence on other transit connections.

People whose comments focused on project scope were primarily individuals though a sizeable number of businesses and other organizations also commented:

- Portland neighborhood associations or association members: SMILE (Sellwood Moreland)
- Milwaukie Neighborhood District Associations or association members: Island Station
- Businesses or business associations: Portland Spirit, Portland Futsal
- Educational institutions: Portland Waldorf School, about 25 people associated with St. John’s the Baptist Catholic School and Church
- Governmental or semi-governmental organizations: Oak Lodge Sanitary District, US Environmental Protection Agency, US Army Corps of Engineers, Port of Portland, Columbia Region Harbor Safety Committee

In addition, several businesses in the North Industrial area of Milwaukie provided comments in support of the Tillamook Branch and expressing concerns about the Main Street route and its impacts on their operations.

Comments expressing major concerns about or opposition to the project
Most concerns about the project came from the southern portion of the alignment and were focused on light rail operations in downtown Milwaukie and the possible extension to Oak Grove. People were concerned about light rail negatively impacting downtown Milwaukie and the nearby schools and residences. Many felt that light rail would not be consistent with the character of downtown Milwaukie. A significant number mentioned safety and security for the four nearby schools, as well as potential noise, congestion and construction impacts.

Some people suggested other alignments or stations for light rail, such as a terminus north of Milwaukie. Several commenters felt that the range of alternatives being considered was
too narrow and that they were being given only one choice – either for light rail or against it.

Project and operating costs provided the basis for another set of issues. Concern about costs included personal costs and benefits related to fares. Others said a nearly $1 billion in investment would be better spent on other projects like roads and buses.

Some people voiced apprehension about reduced parking in neighborhoods around the stations. Others believed that operation of the light rail would lead to congestion of local roads. The fact that the project will displace businesses caused some people to oppose the project for fear of its detrimental effect on local economies.

People expressing concerns were primarily individuals, most associated with St. John’s the Baptist Catholic School and Church. In addition, the Linwood Neighborhood District Association and representatives of the CATO Institute, the Cascade Policy Institute and AORTA also supplied comments.

Summary organization
This summary provides a description of the predominant issues of public concern, organized into three sections:
1. Comments relating to design options, things like alignment and station choices
2. Comments relating to other issues such as environmental concerns or cost
3. Comments focus on the project scope
4. Comments focused on breadth and depth of SDEIS

All comments received are included in Section 2 of this report and will be included in the Final Environmental Impact Statement, along with responses from the project.

1. Comments related to design options
This section presents a summary of the comments that focused on specific design elements or decision points. The preferences relayed here illustrate the range of comments received.

River crossing
The SDEIS studied four new locations for a river crossing of the Willamette, in addition to the alignment favored in 2003. Three issues were raised pertaining to the river crossing: 1) the location of the crossing, 2) the type of bridge selected for the crossing, and 3) the height and width of the crossing.

The location of the proposed river crossing generated about twelve comments with ten in favor of a Porter-Sherman alignment over the other choices. The Oregon Health Sciences University identified a variation of Sherman-Porter as a promising option, and stated its interests in developing its properties in partnership with the light rail project.

A few people suggested avoiding the construction of the new bridge by connecting to the light rail alignment in the Rose Quarter rather than beginning in downtown Portland.
Four people expressed a preference for a cable-stayed bridge because it was considered more aesthetically pleasing. Four comments were received regarding the bridge height. These comments included oral testimony from the owner of the Portland Spirit, a letter from the Central Eastside Industrial District, an email from the US Army Corps of Engineers and a letter from the Columbia Region Harbor Safety Committee suggesting that the bridge be constructed with river traffic in mind. These commenters recommended either a bridge higher than 75 feet, or the installation of a draw, lift, or swing bridge. The Port of Portland provided a letter stating a preference for a two-pier cable-stayed design because of its ability to provide greater navigational clearances.

Several commenters, including ODOT and a coalition of bicycle users, suggested wider multi-uses paths on the bridge. Some suggested that a lower bridge could be easier for more people to use for walking and biking. The US Army Corps provided a comment from its local permitting office that requested more information on alternatives that would use an existing bridge.

Alignment through Central Eastside industrial district and SE Portland neighborhoods
Several comments identified the importance of industrial businesses in areas along the light rail alignment. A letter from Mason Supply, a business owner in the Central Eastside industrial district, cited concerns about maintaining access, parking and loading areas for its business. Other comments by organizations, businesses and individuals raised concerns about displacing businesses along SE 17th Avenue. Several comments also mentioned impacts to nearby residential areas, including impacts from the loss of business uses that buffer the neighborhood from traffic, as well as potential loss of parking. Portland Community College wrote to express its support for the project, and noted that the Central Eastside industrial district was important both for training and future employment for its students. The letter urged that business impacts and the loss of industrially zoned lands be minimized.

The Central Eastside Industrial Council (CEIC) wrote to express support for the project, but asked that work continue to address specific design concerns, particularly a transit-only traffic signal at SE 8th and SE Powell Boulevard. The CEIC urged efforts to minimize potential loss of living wage jobs currently provided in the area.

Alignment through North Milwaukie industrial area
The light rail alignment through the North Milwaukie industrial area could follow Main Street (2003 LPA alignment) or an existing railroad line called the Tillamook Branch. Most of the comments were from businesses and a law firm representing business and property interests in the north industrial area. All of these letters supported the Tillamook alignment because it reduced or avoided impacts to the industrial area compared to the 2003 LPA alignment, particularly traffic and property impacts. Several of these letters provided background information on their businesses, including a 2006 economic study that identified more than $300 million in economic benefits generated by business activities in this area. Many of these letters reinforced the findings that the 2003 LPA alignment along Main Street would involve acquisitions, street and intersection modifications, increased traffic, and a park and ride site that would make it difficult or impossible for some properties to continue viable business operations. ODOT also
supported the Tillamook alignment because it would have fewer traffic impacts on McLoughlin Boulevard.

**Terminus options**
The SDEIS studied two terminus options at the southern portion of the alignment. The most southern terminus option is at Park Avenue in the unincorporated area of north Clackamas County. This terminus would also include a 1,000-space park and ride facility. The other option for a terminus is in downtown Milwaukie at Lake Road. This terminus could include a 275-space park and ride facility.

Of those commenting on the terminus option, more than five times as many people supported a Park Avenue terminus compared to a terminus at Lake Road. Thirty-three people supported the line’s terminus at Park Avenue with many also supporting a park and ride facility there. People liked Park Avenue’s central location, accessible by Oatfield and Lake Roads as well as McLoughlin Boulevard, as it would draw potential riders from Oak Grove, Gladstone, and Oregon City. People felt this location would allow the greatest redevelopment opportunities.

In contrast, eight people preferred Lake Road as the line’s terminus, believing that it would cost less than a terminus at Park Avenue, produce less noise and vibration, and have fewer impacts on parks. Others questioned if there would be sufficient ridership south of Milwaukie extension of the line and a station in that location. Some suggested that if a station is built at Lake Road, it ought to be the only station in Milwaukie, in order to reduce the light rail’s impacts on traffic and downtown businesses.

**Station options**
The SDEIS evaluated station options along the alignment. Those in the southern portion of the alignment generated the most comments. The Harold station option in SE Portland also elicited significant support. Comments on the stations are presented from north to south along the alignment.

A few people expressed support for the RiverPlace station, suggesting it provides good connectivity to RiverPlace and OHSU and because South Waterfront is already being served by the Portland Streetcar.

Thirty-two people supported the station option at Harold Street. Some Sellwood-Moreland residents argued that the Bybee and Holgate station locations would be a further and more difficult walk and that a station at Harold would provide more feasible access to the light rail. Some residents believed a number of benefits would follow a station at Harold: increased property values, more stable schools, local business opportunities, and greater community cohesion. Also, several people noted that students and staff at Reed would be able to access
the light rail from the Harold Station. Concerned with hazards to pedestrians crossing at SE McLoughlin Boulevard, some people urged the construction of a pedestrian over-crossing to the station. As the neighborhood’s population grows and gas prices rise, supporters argued that more and more residents will wish to utilize car-free transportation alternatives, such as light rail.

Four people opposed the station at Harold Street. One believed that the stop would be redundant, with nearby stops at Bybee and Holgate. One person felt that the crossing at McLoughlin was dangerous, but found a pedestrian overpass too costly. Another argued that a station at Harold Street would makes sense only if it were surrounded by high-density development, which it currently is not.

Four people supported the proposed Milwaukie/Southgate station and park and ride, believing it will help alleviate congestion in downtown Milwaukie.

The station option at Harrison received no supportive comments. Four people opposed the station, concerned that it would be too close to the Portland Waldorf School.

Two comments expressed support for a station at Monroe Street, while six people opposed the station. Apprehensive about traffic congestion, some suggested that the alignment follow McLoughlin Boulevard instead.

The proposed station at Washington Street received four supportive comments. Twelve people opposed the station, concerned that its proximity to St. John the Baptist Catholic School would endanger the students and cause congestion and noise.

Five people supported the proposed Bluebird station, arguing it would prevent congestion in downtown Milwaukie by allowing bus riders headed north to transfer to light rail before entering town. Three people opposed the proposed station on the grounds that its inclusion would create more traffic congestion.

2. Comments relating to other issues
This section presents a summary of the comments that focused on other issues, such as general community and environmental concerns. The preferences relayed here are meant to be illustrative of the comments received. The full record of public comments follows in Section 2.

Safety and security
Safety and security issues were mentioned by 99 commenters. Some people referred to security problems on MAX in Gresham and Hillsboro and were apprehensive about how these problems would be prevented on the Portland-Milwaukie line. Some did not believe that security would be addressed on the line and, on these grounds, opposed the project in its entirety. People expressed concern about security on the train and urged increased surveillance by more staff and conductors. People were also concerned about security off the train, worried that more foot traffic would bring an increase in theft and threaten neighborhood security.

In downtown Milwaukie there are four schools within close proximity of the proposed alignment. Sixty-two people objected to the proximity of the alignment to schools and
churches, concerned that children would be put at risk due to increased traffic, more passing trains, and potential crime in station areas. Eighty comments were received from people associated with St. John the Baptist Catholic School and Church, many following a similar format. The Portland Waldorf School wrote a letter expressing specific concerns regarding their school and said that the SDEIS should discuss impacts in addition to those required under federal environmental regulations.

Traffic
Sixty-six people referred to traffic with seven people believing traffic will improve in the corridor as a result of light rail and 59 noting traffic as a concern. About eight people believed that the alignment would create traffic congestion that would impact their business, school or church. Fifty-one felt light rail would create traffic that would clog local roads. Some commenters requested that the project not result in any reductions in travel lanes for vehicles along the alignment. A specific concern mentioned by the Central Eastside Industrial Council was the intersection of SE 8th Street and Powell Boulevard, which they said is critical for their transportation needs. The group recommended routing buses to a different intersection, which would avoid the need to install a stoplight at that location.

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) provided a detailed letter stating their opinions on design features and alignments they felt had the potential to affect operations on transportation facilities under their jurisdiction. ODOT stated support for the Porter-Sherman River Crossing option, a Tillamook Branch alignment, the downtown Milwaukie alignment, and the extension to a Park Avenue terminus. ODOT is opposed to an at-grade crossing of SE McLoughlin Boulevard. ODOT is also opposed a design with a signalized transit-only left turn at SE 8th Avenue and Powell Boulevard. Other concerns included the width of at-grade rail crossings adjacent to the Union Pacific Railroad corridor, and potential issues involving traffic control devices.

Noise
Fifty-two people, all but one from the southern end of the alignment, were concerned about the noise generated by the light rail. Some Milwaukie residents were afraid that the noise from the light rail would distract students in the schools or churches adjacent to the alignment and of, those, many suggested using a different alignment. One person asked what could be done to mitigate noise and vibration. Another questioned the methods used to evaluate noise impacts.

Cost
The project’s predicted cost was an issue for about twenty-seven people. Some opposed the entire project because they believed that it could not be implemented at a reasonable cost. Others, while supportive of the idea of light rail, found fares too expensive to make a new light rail line convenient, or felt the line would not be cost effective given projected ridership. Others argued that the project should focus on buses rather than light rail, believing that it had lower capital and operating costs. A few people thought the project’s funding could be better spent on upgrading roads, as they believed that the majority of commuters drive alone, rather than on public transit. These concerns led some to voice a desire to not contribute their tax dollars to the project.
Some people referred to cost to explain a preference for a particular alternative. For example, one person suggested that building a new bridge would be too expensive and that the alignment should cross the Steel Bridge.

**Parking**
Twenty-three people voiced concern about the light rail’s impact on neighborhood parking while others suggested that the light rail project would create more parking given that fewer people would be driving. Especially in proposed station areas where no park and ride facility was planned, residents were fearful that commuters would drive to the station and park in spots normally dedicated to neighborhood use. Several people asked that measures would be taken to ease parking impacts in neighborhoods.

**Bicycle and pedestrian issues**
Twenty-one people addressed bike and pedestrian issues with many urging that each station be guaranteed adequate bicycle and pedestrian access. Comments focused particularly on the crossing over McLoughlin Boulevard south to the Harold station option and the crossing over Powell Boulevard near the proposed Clinton station. People also urged that more attention be paid to enhance the track crossings at 14th, 15th, and 16th Avenues near the Clinton station. Additionally there were requests for secure bicycle parking at the Tacoma and Harold stations.

**Natural environment**
Fourteen commenters supported the project, attracted to its potential to reduce dependence on cars. One person felt light rail would not reduce energy use compared to autos.

The Oak Grove Sanitary District provided a letter focused on the need to coordinate design to avoid impacts to a facility they own near the Park Avenue park and ride station. They also provided comments about water quality and environmental issues related to potential crossings of Courtney Springs Creek and Kellogg Lake/Creek, both of which are tributaries to the Willamette River.

**Parks and recreation facilities**
Some commented on the light rail’s proximity to the planned Trolley Trail in Clackamas County. A letter from the Trolley Trail planner for North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District raised a few questions and concerns about impacts to the trail, but stated that with close coordination and thoughtful mitigation some of these issues could be resolved. They stated that if the final decision is to extend the light rail project to Park Avenue, Metro and TriMet will coordinate design, phasing, and mitigation strategies with us to ensure the successful completion of both projects.

Other comments took issue with the displacement of parks or open space required by certain alignments, encouraging the study of alternative alignments with less of an impact. One commenter noted that the past, present, and future impacts to Kellogg Lake were not sufficiently analyzed in the SDEIS.

**Citizen involvement**
Seventeen people were dissatisfied with role of citizen involvement in the project, expressing the feeling that public opinion played an insignificant role in important
decisions or that they had voted against funding a similar project in the past and were frustrated to see it up for discussion again.

3. Project scope
Approximately forty people voiced objections to the alignments studied and preferred to see the alignment follow another route. Nine individuals encouraged the extension of the light rail to Oregon City. In a similar sentiment, others encouraged the line’s extension as far as possible. Conversely, some people were adamantly opposed to the line continuing south to Oregon City. In Milwaukie, people suggested an alignment down McLoughlin Boulevard and Highway 224. Other people suggested a terminus north of Milwaukie’s downtown. In Portland, a few people suggested an alignment that did not cross the Willamette River with a north/south connection to the Yellow Line.

Some people expressed specific concerns about the project’s compliance with National Environmental Policy Act guidelines related to the analysis of all reasonable alternatives. Others questioned the SDEIS section, which explained how alternatives were eliminated during previous processes.

4. Breadth and depth of SDEIS
About twenty voiced concerns about the breadth and depth of the SDEIS. These comments included, but were not limited to, the following issues:

- Requests to study different alignments in downtown Milwaukie
- Questions about or requests for more definition about cost calculations
- Incomplete or inadequate description of pedestrian and bicycle overpasses, or light rail overpasses (e.g., at Powell)
- Concern about adequate attention to mitigation of impacts along SE 17th Avenue
- Incomplete or inaccurate depiction of Trolley Trail and McLoughlin

The US Environmental Protection Agency requested additional information be provided as part of the Final Environmental Impact Statement to address avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures, primarily focused on impacts to waterways including the Willamette River. For instance, EPA recommended design options that would involve the fewest number of piers in the water for a new Willamette River Bridge.
COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Open house comments
May 21 at Cleveland High School, Portland
May 22 at Marriott Residence Inn, Portland
May 27 at Putnam High School, Oak Grove
May 28 at Milwaukie High School, Milwaukie

Public hearing comments
Other comment cards
May 14 at Moreland farmers market
May 18 and May 25 at Milwaukie farmers market
June 4 at St. John the Baptist Church and School
Other

Email comments
Letters
Hotline comments
Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

---

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

---

Name: JEREMY LEFSTO  
E-mail: JEREMY.LEFSTO@CIS.COM  
Address: 4128 SE 16TH AVE  
City/state/ZIP: PORTLAND OR 97202  
Phone number: 971-207-1436

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.  

---

Name: PAUL LOMANDO  
E-mail: PauLe.PortlandFutsal.com  
Address: 2503 SE 47TH AVE  
City/state/ZIP: PDX OR 97206  
Business Address: 3401 SE 17TH AVE, PDX OR 97206  
Phone number: 503-238-8795

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.  
I am extremely concerned about the potential removal of parking (street) at SE 47TH AVE. Particularly in the 3300+ square blocks of SE 17TH AVE. Both Northbound and Southbound are currently used by my customers at Portland Futsal.  
Also, the construction phase is of concern due to the impact of my customers reaching my business.


Thank you -  
Paul Lomando
## Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

### YOUR OPINION COUNTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City/state/ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone number</th>
<th>503-777-6422</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

1. Like the Tilikum Crossing, 2. Utility locations: water, sewer, natural gas, electrically run through cables. 3. SE 117th Ave - will there be auto traffic on light rail? 4. The same right of way (40 foot debri) wide cavern. How will you divert river debris? from bridges? 5. I would prefer a map of the colored bridge alignments see the gray dotted line map to be shown on a "take home" document. 6. At grade crossings preferred vs. (land overpasses) 7. Looking at CP Division St. (green St) Main St. Plan for Division St w/ 112 St. Ave.


---

### Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

### YOUR OPINION COUNTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City/state/ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone number</th>
<th>503-286-5037</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

### Terminology - preferred

- Locally preferred to Park most ridership provided max # of park & ride

- [Redacted]

### Bridge preference

- [Redacted]

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: LEE ORTON

Address: 3363 SE 14th AV

City/state/ZIP: PDX 97202

Phone number: 503-236-8037

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? Yes ☐ No ☐

Comments: (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

1. Over-Corvallis Alignment
2. LPA Option
3. Cable-Stayed Bridge
4. Segment D

Elevated

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: David Parsons
Address: 7107 S6 
Phone number: S63 235 5867
E-mail: 
City/state/ZIP: Portland 97202

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? Yes ☐ No ☐

Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.


---

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: Susan Tipton
Address: 7525 SE 50th
E-mail: sa@tipton@gmail.com
Phone number: 503-314-8360
City/state/ZIP: Portland 97202

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? Yes ☐ No ☐

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff:
I like the option that includes more park and ride in Milwaukie, not just Portland. I live in Milwaukie and my concern is increased crime as a result of insufficient staff monitoring ticket purchases. I believe that placing E/W route to Gresham is insufficient to meet the needs of riders.

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

I doubt that the people near Harold St would truly walk 1/2 mi to Beaverton or Holgate - and if people do walk 1/2 mi then surely a Harold St station would bring new riders from Eastmoreland Heights. Bus service near Harold is not that great (#19 is on Beaverton & #32 would prob. decrease w/ light rail), so I think Harold St strn. would be useful.

Whether it is worth $12 million I couldn't really say.

---

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

Ride bikes they never... Would love to accommodate 37th and 37th Bus College and adequately placed crossing and stop, respectively. Continue describing the federal matching funding so people understand the financing mechanisms and how they benefit us all.

Great work! Thank you!

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

Name: Kathleen Nielsen  
Address: 2419 SE 78th Ave.  
City/state/ZIP: Portland, OR 97206-1447  
Phone number: (503) 777-6422

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments (please print): Turn in completed card to project staff.

1) I attended a meeting at 4 pm on 7/19/10 at OHSU's Center for Health & Healing which was cancelled due to an electrical power outage just before 3 pm & the building was evacuated. The meeting wasn't re-scheduled. Yet, 2 days later, the Willamette River bridge committee announced a decision without public input about two South Waterfront land-use preferences. Former mayor D. Neff is chairing that committee, I think. The next public meeting wasn't re-scheduled, too. Was this announcement a mistake before this announcement? Why?
YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: William Danneman  E-mail: 
Address: 623 S.W. Caruthers St.  City/state/ZIP: Portland, OR 97201 
Phone number: 503-228-9868

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

Comments (please print): Turn in completed card to project staff.

This is a needed project if it can go as far south as possible. If cost becomes an issue you could revisit the bridge and go closer to the original crossing and improve an intersection for the North Macadam Area.


--

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: Reggie Thompson  E-mail: reggie.thompson@beaverg.com
Address: 603 SE 23rd Ave  City/state/ZIP: Portland, OR 97202
Phone number: 503-236-1692

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

Comments (please print): Turn in completed card to project staff.

I am pleased to see the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project proceed (yes!), and... if thought any consideration... a professional ball stadium in the open space (by the Willamette River) between the Ross Island Bridge and the Morrison Bridge, perhaps, could and the stadium could have a joint function facility served by Tri-Met & Light Rail.

Metro | People places. Open spaces.  www.oregonmetro.gov  Its Worth Considering...
### Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

**YOUR OPINION COUNTS**

Your comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

#### Name: John M. Betts  
#### E-mail: jmbett5@hotmail.com  
#### Address: 3317 South Shore Blvd, Lake Oswego, OR  
#### Phone number: 971-341-5635  
#### Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

When the time comes please bring ALL information to the Accessible Transportation Committee for TriMet - for our input.

---

**Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.**

**Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?**

- [ ] Yes  
- [x] No

**Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.**

---

Metro | People places. Open spaces.  
www.oregonmetro.gov

---

**Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report.**

**Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?**

- [ ] Yes  
- [x] No

---

Metro | People places. Open spaces.  
www.oregonmetro.gov
Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

Name: Susan Davis  
E-mail: susanhdavis@gmail.com
Address: PO Box 8642  
City/state/ZIP: Portland, OR 97207

Comments (please print): Turn in completed card to project staff.

I live downtown and love the project of light rail to Milwaukie. I don't have a car, but have a gift at Eastmoreland - so this would be a real plus. And of course it would be good for the community.


---

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

Name: Tim Moffat
E-mail:
Address:  
City/state/ZIP:
Phone number:

Comments (please print): Turn in completed card to project staff.

Too expensive! I use the money to buy busses instead. I don't care where the money comes from federal, state, or whatever. But busses will go where the people want to go - not just where you put the tracks.

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

Name: Dave, Melanie Phillips
Email: mphillips159@comcast.net
Address: 13230 SE Where Else Rd
City/State/ZIP: Milwaukie, OR 97222
Phone number:

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  □ Yes  □ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

Concerns:
- Milwaukee High School - Open Campus
- Highest crime rate in Milwaukie is the Milwaukee Transit Site
- Traffic on Lake Rd is horrible. Now and not safe for walkers/bikers
- Including Rowe Middle School students who do not receive bus transportation
- We don't want the Metro People places. Open spaces. www.oregonmetro.gov
- Who will police this line? Problems that Hillsboro does not have.
- Like the Park Ave, Park & Ride stop
- Move the transit mall out of Milwaukie
- Move Park & rides out of downtown Milwaukie
- We are a city, not a Park & ride.
Portland–Milwaukie Light Rail Project

Your written comments will be included in the Portland–Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

Name: Linda M Hedges
E-mail: linda@hammy.org
Address: 5185 SE Elk St
City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie 97222
Phone number: 503-342-0022

Do you want to be placed on the Portland–Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff:

I would prefer to see only one station in downtown Milwaukie at Lake Road with terminus at Park and no station at Bluebird. Realize this is not the recommendation by city staff and do not understand the reasoning but still prefer above. Good luck and thanks for your hard work.


Portand–Milwaukie Light Rail Project

Your written comments will be included in the Portland–Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

Name: Mary Leath
E-mail: N/A
Address: 3437 SE Lake Rd
City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie OR 97222
Phone number: 503-659-5601

Do you want to be placed on the Portland–Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff:

Thank you for the information.

I prefer the PARK AVE, WASHINGTON STOP, and the TILLAMUK BRANCH OPTIONS.

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name PHIL HISHIE E-mail
Address 4651 S.E. Pinehurst City/state/ZIP Milwaukie 97267
Phone number 503-654-5748
Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? ☒ Yes ☐ No
Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

STAY OUT OF THE DOWNTOWN MILWAUKIE
NO STOPS OR PLAYOUTIONS IN THE SCHOOL AREAS - HELL THREE OF THEM

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: Sarah Pierzchala  E-mail: sarah.pierzchala@msn.com
Address: 2515 SE Harrison  City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie
Phone number: 503-693-6827

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

We own home DIRECTLY adjacent to RR line and are DEEPLY concerned about vibration, noise and loss of property. Please keep us informed of what resources we have to mitigate these concerns. Thank you!


SDEIS Public Comment Report 13
Portland–Milwaukie
LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Your written comments will be included in the Portland–Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

Name: Colleen Schacht
E-mail: 
Address: 4300 SE Somewhere Drive, Milwaukie 97262
Phone number: 503-656-4801

Do you want to be placed on the Portland–Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

Extend the line to Park Avenue, please.

PORTLAND-MILWAUKIE
LIGHT RAIL PROJECT
STEERING COMMITTEE

PUBLIC HEARING

JUNE 9, 2008
BE IT REMEMBERED THAT, the Public Hearing of
the PORTLAND-MILWAUKEE LIGHT RAIL PROJECT was taken
before Charlotte A. Powers, Certified Shorthand
Reporter and Registered Merit Reporter, on Monday,
June 9, 2008, commencing at the hour of 5:30 p.m.,
the proceedings being reported in the offices of
METRO OFFICE GENERAL COUNSEL, 600 NE Grand Avenue,
Portland, Oregon.

APPEARANCES
ROBERT LIBERTY, Deputy Council President, District 6
NEIL MCFARLANCE, Tri-Met
DANIEL B. COOPER, Metro Attorney
MICHAEL JORDAN, Chief Operating Officer
JIM BERNARD, City of Milwaukee
CAROLLOTTA COLLETTE, District 2
MARTHA SCHANDLER, Clackamas County
SUSAN KEIL, City of Portland
RICK WILLIAMS, Portland-Milwaukee Citizen Advisory
Committee Chair
JEFF TUERK, Administrative Specialist
ALSO PRESENT: General Public

COUNCIL LIBERTY: Good evening.
I am going to open this public hearing in
the South Quarter Light Rail Project.
My name is Robert Liberty, I'm a member of
the Metro Council and chair of the steering
committee.
With me tonight -- are you joining us,
Rick?
Tonight I'm going to ask my colleagues on
the steering committee to introduce themselves
briefly, and then we'll describe how the
evening will proceed.
JIM BERNARD: I'm Jim Bernard, and I have
the honor of serving as mayor of the city of
Milwaukee.
RICK WILLIAMS: Rick Williams, Chairman
of the Citizens Advisory Committee.
CAROLLOTTA COLLETTE: Carollotta Collette,
District 2.
NEIL MCFARLANCE: Neil McFarlane, Tri-Met.
SUSAN KEIL: I'm Susan Keil, director of
transportation for the city of Portland.
COUNCIL LIBERTY: I'll mention to my
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colleagues here, there is a little button that
you press at the base of the microphone.
COUNCIL LIBERTY: The orange button, and
that will cue it up on the sound system.
Here is how we'll proceed tonight. First
I want to thank you for attending, taking time
out of your busy day to help us with making
this important decision.
I'll mention that there is a concurrent
open house going on in room 370 just around the
other side on this same floor.
We're going to begin with a brief review
of the project, about 10-minute PowerPoint
presentation by -- Bridget? Are you going to
do that?
Bridget Wiegart will do that.
And we'll take your testimony. You need
to complete a testimony card. There's some in
back, and we will take them in the order
received.
Because the turnout is light tonight, we
will not have a customary three-minute limit,
but I'll ask you to be respectful of everyone's
time and try to keep your comments succinct.
In terms of scope of your testimony, this is part of the 45-day comment period on the supplemental draft environmental impact statement. You ought to feel free to comment on any aspect of the project you think is important, and we welcome your criticisms, insights, information and suggestions for improvement. I don't know, but some of the steering committee members may ask you some questions, if that is agreeable to you.

So why don't we begin -- oh, one other item is that when you come forward to testify, I'll turn on the mike and we can take four at a time. And I'll let you know before you begin the order in which we'll take the testimony. With light attendance, it's probably less important tonight than it would be otherwise.

Any questions?

Bridget

BRIDGET WIEGHART: So, is that turned on?

COUNCIL LIBRARY: You're on now.

BRIDGET WIEGHART: Okay. Great. Thank you.

I'm going to make a brief presentation about a little bit of history and background on the project, and the key findings in the environmental impact statement. And this is to provide background to the citizens that might be wanting to learn more about the project, as well as testify.

So there are a number of project partners on this project. It's Metro, Tri-Met, city of Portland, city of Milwaukee, Clackamas County, Multnomah County and ODOT. Again, I'm going to provide a little bit of project history and overview, provide some information about the Willamette River Crossing partnership recommendation, and information about the tradeoffs of the southern alignment and terminus options, as well as the locally preferred alternative decision process.

The project, as well as many of the other high-capacity transit projects in the region, stems originally from a desire to serve the key centers in the region with high capacity transit.

So it stems from the Metro 2040 Growth Concept. And all the purple dots, as you may know, are centers or regional centers downtown and the town centers in the region.

The purpose of this particular project is stated there, to implement a major transit program in the south corridor that maintains liveability in the region, supports land use goals, optimizes the transportation system, is environmentally sensitive, reflects community values and is fiscally responsible. And I won't go into all of the need, but the need does stem from historic and projected population and employment growth in this corridor, and the need for transit choices.

The project has a long history. Again, I won't go into all the details here, but suffice it to say that there was system planning in the 1980s, and a series of different corridor planning projects in the 1990s and 2000s, starting with the south/north transit corridor project from 1993 to 1998 that went all the way from Oregon City to Vancouver. The corridor was subsequently broken up into smaller projects. Interstate piece was the first to be constructed.

In the early 2000 -- 1999 and 2000, there was a look at -- sort of revisitation of all those except for light rail because of a loss on a funding measure. And so a variety of different transit alternatives were looked at, including bus rapid transit, commuter rail, busway, river transit. And in 2003, after completion of a supplemental draft environmental impact statement, the Portland to Milwaukee Light Rail Project was identified as phase 2 of the Locally Preferred Alternative.

But with phase 1 being under construction now, That's the I-205 and Portland mall project.

So this is that two-phase Locally Preferred Alternative that was adopted in 2003, phase 1 being I-205 and phase 2 being Portland to Milwaukee. And the commitment was -- at that time was to come back to pursue the Portland and Milwaukee project once phase 1 was under construction, which is now.

So this project is shown on the -- on the map. In white, the white line, is the 2003 Locally Preferred Alternative route. But you can see two boxes, one at the north end and one at the south end. So this is just to orient you to downtown Portland. The southern end of the new transit mall that's under construction by PSU, and then connecting across the river in...
the area of OMSI through the central east side, along 17th Avenue and then along McLoughlin. That's the 2003 Locally Preferred Alternative. And then there's two alignment choices in the north industrial area of Milwaukee. This is Milwaukee Town Center, several stations here, and then another box represents a terminus option as to whether the alignment would terminate on Lake Road in downtown Milwaukee or go down to Park. So there are some station and alignment options being studied now, even though there was a Locally Preferred Alternative in 2003, and a number of different alignments have been studied in the past.

So this supplemental draft environmental impact statement evaluated social, environmental, economic, traffic impacts, ridership, capital operating costs and funding cost effectiveness. The public comment period, in order to advertise it, started May 9th. Postcards and newsletters were sent to over 12,000 people; four open houses were held in May. Prior to that, there were over 50 public meetings to advertise the upcoming comment period, staff consultants have been at farmer's markets and retail establishments throughout the corridor, and have gone door-to-door in a number of neighborhoods. The Citizen Advisory Committee and steering committee recommendations are anticipated in late June as a result of the public comment period and review of the technical work.

Some key findings of this supplemental draft environmental impact statement, depending on the alignment, it's anticipated in 2030 that there would be 22,000 to 26,000 riders daily. And of those riders, nine to 12,000 are new system riders, which means that they're not just current anticipated bus riders that are transferring to light rail, but new riders to the transit system. The Light Rail Project would also serve 22,000 households and 89,000 jobs within one-half mile of the stations.

In terms of the transportation — the project effects, it would allow more people to take transit. The mode share of transit would increase from Milwaukee to the central business district by — for all trips, nine to 17 percent, even greater percentage for work trips. The vehicle miles traveled, which is VMT, would be reduced through this transfer from current auto trips to transit trips. And vehicle hours of delay would be reduced, as well, during the peak period.

In terms of major environmental impact findings, there were up to, depending on the alignment again, two existing and two planned parks would be impacted, and we'll talk a little bit more about all of these. Up to 62 potential full acquisitions. Some threatened and endangered fish would be -- rivers, our Oregon rivers, and those rivers might be affected. Three or four historic resources would be affected, and up to 25 noise and 38 vibration impacts, depending on the alignment. And then localized traffic impacts.

So to talk a little bit more about the parks impacts. They're referred to -- and this is specifically advertised in this comment period -- as section 4(f), and those are significant parks or other resources that are potentially affected. Two existing and two planned recreation resources with potential impacts have been identified, and those are South Waterfront Park under the locally -- 2003 Locally Preferred Alternative of less than 6 feet of an acre would be affected; Eastmoreland Golf Course, less than .2 of an acre for a bus pull-out. Robert Kronberg Park, less than a tenth of an acre, depending on the alignment, whether it's elevated or upgraded. If it's elevated, it would be even less than that. Trolley Trail south of Robert Kronberg Park in Oak Grove, about .87 of an acre would be affected.

Now, the preliminary findings of this analysis indicate that a de minimis impact would occur on these facilities, which would mean that they would continue to provide the recreation need that they currently do, but it would just be a slight effect, essentially. And we're asking for comments on these findings. Willamette River crossing options. I want to go into those in a little bit more detail. There are four options to the south of the two — this is the 2003 Locally Preferred Alternative.
Alternative that would connect from Riverplace to OMSI, right by the Marquam Bridge here. This is north. And there are four options to the south of that, connecting either from Sherman or Canarthers and Meade or Porter in South Waterfront area. The purpose of this was to provide better connection to the high, fast-growth South Waterfront area and a better connection to the new tram that goes up to serve about 10,000 jobs on -- on Marquam Hill. And here is another view of those options. And the city of Portland convened a group called the Willamette River Crossing Partnership. They included major property owners, as well as jurisdictions with interests in that area. And they found a number of benefits to the further south crossings, both on the west side and on the east side and identified a refined alignment. But before I get to that, they found generally the big differences were between the 2003 LPA and the South Waterfront options. The South Waterfront options have similar benefits and impacts. They tend to serve more residents and jobs; 3,000 more residents, 4,000 more jobs. And add 1,200 to 1,400 light rail trips.

The Willamette River Partnership was also convened to just bring together a whole bunch of issues in terms of the infrastructure and the street system in the South Waterfront area. Key issues are the Bond alignment, Moody alignment, street car, elevations in the area and the property impacts. And that group found that, not only that the south -- more southerly crossings compared to the LPA were preferable, but in particular they identified a refined alignment that seemed to sort of capture some of the benefits of the best-performing options on the west and the east side. They identified one that went on Sherman on the east side, rather than Canarthers, which has greater impacts to the industrial businesses and the Portland Spirit on Canarthers, and identified a crossing that came in between Meade and Porter, and then headed a little bit south towards other trams. So there is good connection to the tram. It works well with the master plans of OHSU and OMSI.

COUNCIL LIBERTY: Ms. Wieghart, remind you, we need you to keep moving through.
1.2 to $1.4 billion, and this pie chart shows
the intended funding sources. We're
anticipating about 750 million, or potentially
60 percent of the project, to come from the
federal government in yellow, and then the
$250 million from the state lottery funds, and
then the green here, which isn't green for you
all, this piece, 250 to $400 million would be
local match, and we're working with the various
jurisdictions to secure those funds over the
next several months.
So this is the Locally Preferred
Alternative process. The Citizen Advisory
Committee is expected to make its
recommendation at its next meeting on
June 12th, steering committee on June 26th.
Jurisdictional partners would then review that
Locally Preferred Alternative at their various
councils and commissions. And then Metro
Council would act on those recommendations on
July 24th.
And then the overall time frame for the
project is, it could go to construction --
after it goes to preliminary engineering, final
design, it could go to construction as early as
2011 and completion around 2015.
I want to mention -- thank you, Bridget.
I want to mention two specific dates. The
city of Milwaukee is having its public hearing
on July 15th; city of Portland, July 1st.
All right. Thank you.
All right. If you've come in and you wish
to testify, we need you to complete one of
these cards. Turnout is still relatively
modest, so you won't be limited to three
minutes. But if you could make it succinct,
that would be helpful.

MAYOR BERNARD: I just wanted to declare a
potential conflict of interest. We will be
voting on this in the future. I do own
property, not at a particular location that
this project would impact, but across the
tracks from it. I don't -- we don't see any
reason to abstain from voting at this time, or
in the future, because this project does not
actually touch my property, nor does -- has
there been any discussions with Tri-Met or
Metro to buy my property. So I will be voting
new bridge over the Willamette. Be it the
redefined alternative or otherwise, it must be
no less than the height of the Marquam Bridge.
How the river will be used for transportation
corridor in the future, 20 years, 40 years, 60
years, is uncertain and unknown at this time.
Therefore, constructing a bridge with any less
clearance over the water is nothing less than
being short-sighted of the future. Standard
Coast Guard regulations must be followed, and
you're just going to have to deal with the
ramps to get it up there.
The second issue I have, which is one that
I bring up on a lot of things, is the funding
issue. With energy prices rising as fast as
they are, and the predictions that they're
going to stay that way, a change, a shakeup,
whatever you want to call it, must be made in
the way that transit and bicycle constructure
are funded. No incentives are needed,
including the tax dollars wasted on those
cutesy little drive less/save more TV
commercials. The money could be better spent
on providing infrastructure. The capital costs
for specialized transit and bicycle
not increasing VMTs, then Metro must start by looking at the bigger picture of reducing regional population growth, rather than confining roadway infrastructure.

Thank you.

COUNCIL LIBERTY: Thank you.

Any questions?

All right. Thank you, Mr. Parker.

Mr. Polani.

RAY POLANI: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Ray Polani. I live at 6110 Southeast Anchorage Street in Portland. But I've also lived two years in Milwaukee, in Lake Grove, 1989 to 1991. So I can speak on both sides of my mouth.

What is the overriding purpose of public transit? Well, it seems to me that it is to attract riders, primarily from automobiles.

With this in mind, all efforts and projects must maximize this paramount aim and purpose.

Unfortunately, Tri-Met and other transit systems in the United States too often do not act accordingly.

Let me be specific. Tri-Met is finishing the transit mall Light Rail Project which will work against the primary goal of the system, riders. It will be slow-running the length of the mall in both directions, and it will be limited to two-car trains because of the length of the blocks, 200 feet. Three regional lines will be subjected to that, and now Tri-Met will add one more regional line to their problem.

This line will also cross the Steel Bridge, then go to Union Station and slowly up the mall to Portland State University, and then down to the South Waterfront to cross another bridge to be built at the cost of 300 to $400 million.

What should be done instead to cut running time and attract many more riders from automobiles primarily? Obviously, stay on the east side and continue south on Portland's east side where most of the population lives and works, and proceed past OMSI to Milwaukee. Have a straight, fast, north/south line from Vancouver, eventually to Oregon City. Much faster and much more appealing to the bulk of North, Northeast and Southeast Portland residents and workers, and also to the regional east side, would be riders.

and the bridge itself be solely born by the users. In other words, up to $400 million from Tri-Met, street car fares, bicyclists, for the local match for the project -- for bicyclists being going onto the bridge, of course.

And one final note I want to throw out, the construction of a new MAX line must not displace or replace roadway capacity such as was done when MAX was put in on Interstate Avenue where the motor vehicle travel lanes were reduced from four to two, making Interstate Avenue a parking lot of idling cars and everything that comes with them during the evening rush hours. If there is concern about
Remember it is time that matters to people, but now also costs and environment. And in the process, spend less, save the cost of a new bridge, and get more riders. Show on this project concern for both ridership and fiscal responsibility. This, I would call win/win.

Thank you for your attention, and I hope that the fatal effort will be changed before it gets down on the ground like the rail.

COUNCIL LIBERTY: Thank you.

Any questions of Mr. Polani?

Mr. Charles?

JOHN CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is John Charles, president of Cascade Policy Institute, a non-profit, non-partisan research center in Portland, and I have both a professional interest in this as well as a personal interest because I'm a homeowner in Clackamas County, and I happen to live trains. Not this particular proposal, but I have ridden the east side MAX probably 15,000 times in the last 12 years. I am familiar with how rail works as a practical project, not as a theoretical construct.

I will be filing more extensive comments on the EIS by the deadline. I'm still plowing my way through the voluminous attachments, so these are my preliminary comments.

First, I wish Metro would try to stop referring to this and other lines as part of the, quote, high-capacity transit strategy. A light rail, by definition, is not high capacity. It's low capacity, high cost. What we need is high capacity, low cost. This is exactly the reverse of what we need. And when I say that, high capacity compared to what?

Well, if you can light rail at 20 trains per hour, which is probably as many trips as you could get, and you had every seat taken, plus 100 percent of that in standing, you would still only get about 5,000 people per hour.

Compared to a high-performing busway, that's nothing. Busway, or a high-performing hot train is going to run 30, 40, 50,000 passengers per hour, assuming you had a need for that, which you don't in Clackamas County.

So this -- this -- if there is a need, the EIS says there's a need here for high-capacity transit. This is not high-capacity transit.

The Achilles heel of light rail is that you can only run two cars at a time because of the downtown Portland short block problem. And you can't -- you can't run eight or nine like you can with the New York City subway, and you don't have separated right-of-way. You have to run them on the streets. So you don't have high speed. It's low speed, low capacity, high cost. Those, to me, are really deal breakers on any kind of public vessel.

But it wouldn't matter because Clackamas County is the most -- it's predominantly rural. It's road-based, about 88 percent of commute trips, are by private automobile, and this project is simply irrelevant to the county.

The cost is astronomical. 1.2 to $1.4 billion for 6, 7 miles. I mean, that's probably more than triple for Interstate Light Rail. That is a staggering amount of money for riders that is projected to be maybe 1.8 percent gain for the system-wide private ridership by 2030. If you're trying to increase ridership for Tri-Met, this is the way you want to spend $1.4 billion? I don't see the logic.
address that problem without spending a billion
dollars for something when the market is moving
to other modes of travel.

Driving alone, meanwhile, in that same
period for all of Portland, has remained
comparatively constant. 70 percent of all
commute trips in 1998 per -- by
single-occupancy vehicle and in 2007 by S.O.
So, I mean, you're putting money into something
that's becoming obsolete.

Construction of the new bridge is a
gigantic waste of money when you're putting the
money into something that most people are
taking -- traveling by motorized vehicle.
You're not going to allow them on there.
There's no viable financing plan. You're
looking at a billion dollars from non-users.
750 million from other taxpayers around the
country that you hope you can rip off through
the federal process. Well, it seems to me that
if Portland wants to be a leader in, quote,
sustainable development, then we should rely on
local sources. But it seems to be quite the
trend. In agriculture, we have the whole new
word called "localvore," people wanting to eat
from local sources. I think it would be great
if local transportation projects of all modes
were paid for predominantly from local users.
That's sustainable development.

My final point on a more positive mode is
that to me, the only way to address the
objective of congestion relief and sustainable
development in this context is -- first of all,
the only solution to congestion pricing is to address
-- to congestion is to address the
mispricing of the current road system, which
means you have to start looking at congestion
pricing not just for new facilities -- and I'm
glad it's being looked at in the context of the
CRC. You have to start looking at the
mispricing of existing roads, and then get
those traffic speeds up to 45, 50, on major
freeways and highways through congestion
pricing, and allow deregulated transit to
invite all forms of transit -- buses, shuttles,
 jitneys, as well as whatever Tri-Met offers.

That's the way to not only slightly
decrease VMT, but by increased traffic speeds,
you're interested in reducing greenhouse gases.
It's not mileage, it's the speed. When you get
cars out of stop-and-go traffic up to 40,
45 miles per hour, you're reducing the per mile
CO2 emissions by 70, 80, 90 percent. That's
the solution. You have to have a pricing
solution to any of these congestion problems;
that the train investment is simply irrelevant
to most motorists stuck in traffic who are not
going to switch modes, no matter even if you
get bullet trains. It wouldn't matter. It's
not taking them from where they are to where
they want to go, especially in a county like
Clackamas County.

Thank you.

COUNCIL LIBERTY: Thank you.

Any questions?

SUSAN KEIL: Yeah.

COUNCIL LIBERTY: Sue?

SUSAN KEIL: John, that figure that you
gave on Tri-Met losing market share, what were
you referencing specifically?

JOHN CHARLES: The annual auditor's
reports from the Portland City Auditor's Office
that come out in the service accomplishment
reports. They do surveys every year. So I
just went back and looked through the last 10
years of reports. You can also look just for
the closer-in, look at the Portland Business
Alliance. They do very in-depth surveys of
people working just in city center. And the
same trend to a lesser degree is happening
there, and that's the most transit-oriented
part of the whole region.

COUNCIL LIBERTY: Thank you.

Mr. Howell?

JIM HOWELL: Mr. Chairman, members of the
committee. My name is Jim Howell. 3325
Northeast 45th Avenue.

I might mention that I, too, have served
on the first Citizen Advisory Committee to
light rail with Terry Parker here. We don't
always agree on what we should be doing now,
but we -- we did spend time on that committee
back in 1975.

In any event, I -- I support the
Tri-Met -- the Metro Tri-Met for filing a
supplemental draft environmental impact
statement to the FTA in order to construct a
light rail line to Milwaukie and McLoughlin
corridor. And I might add that I am in favor
of the Tillamook option with extension to Park.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 34</th>
<th>Page 35</th>
<th>Page 36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 as a great step without actually costs to save money. I don't think the impact on traffic will be that great, in that great, crossing it with the money it would save. Unfortunately, the sole purpose of the DIS is to obtain federal funds to build a narrowly defined project, a project primarily focused on the needs of a small segment of the population that will have to drive to park and ride facilities in order to access a light rail line to their jobs in the CBD. The ridership forecast used to show the FTA that this project meets the cost/benefit threshold is largely dependent on auto-dependent commuters. It may be cheaper and easier to pick the low-hanging fruit, these auto-oriented commuters attracted to free parking rather than car-free commuters making the light rail connection via the network of correct and frequent bus routes. In the long run, a system approach to transit planning will have to be used if transit is expected to become a major player in the region's transportation system. The current approach, focused on one piece at a time, will be too costly and will not shift enough people from cars to transit to achieve a significant reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and oil consumption. I believe in this project there was only a nine to 12,000 increases in system ridership for this project, which I think is pretty small. I'm a realist. A Locally Preferred Alignment will probably be selected from the options identified in this DEIS. But the following suggestions would have made the project more environmentally sustainable, cheaper to build, cheaper to operate, and would have added more ridership to the total transit system. Suggestion 1: Do not build park and ride structures. They are expensive, they encourage auto dependence, and they are a major impediment to transit-oriented development around stations. Nevertheless, low cost surface parking can become a temporary land banking use until an adequate transit network is in place, at which time the parking lot can be converted to a compact, mixed-use development.</td>
<td>1 Suggestion 2: Include in the project a more robust bus feeder system. For example, a frequent-service, crosstown bus route could provide a fast and convenient transfer connection at the Tacoma Station and replace the need for a thousand-stall parking structure. A new route connecting Clackamas Town Center to Washington Square and WES via Johnson Creek Boulevard, Tacoma Street, the Sellwood Bridge and Taylor's Ferry Road would greatly reduce traffic demand in these corridors. It would interconnect with three rail lines and 30 bus routes, providing an exponential increase in transfer opportunities over what is provided today. Suggestion 3, and this is where I agree with Ray: Forego the construction of an expensive new light rail bridge by connecting this line to the MAX yellow line through the east side. And I have four reasons why this would be better. First is that the 3,200 buses and trains now crossing the river every weekday to provide downtown access. During peak hours, shuttle buses or street cars from the OMSI station could provide additional capacity to and from downtown. And incidentally, if these shuttles were timed to meet the MAX trains, the trip to the CBD would be as fast or faster than the trip over the proposed out-of-direction Porter-Sherman alignment. Second one: South Waterfront would actually get better transit service than the Porter-Sherman crossing if the project included a direct bus or street car link to South Waterfront via the Hawthorne Bridge, First and Naito and Harrison Street. This new faster connection to and from North, Northeast, East side -- even Clark County and Gresham -- would attract many new riders, more than would be lost from the south corridor because of a slightly longer trip. And a third one is an east side connection provides redundancy to the system not provided by an additional river crossing. The Steel Bridge will become a major bottleneck in the system when all four MAX lines cross it. The yellow line will become a major problem because of crossing issues at the Rose Quarter junction when the green line is added next year. And I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| am pretty sure it's going to happen. An east side alignment avoids this problem. In the event of a Steel Bridge breakdown, it could also provide access to all the buses that cross the river on the other bridges.

And fourth, an east side connection would allow more frequent service with the same equipment and operating hours because we cut about 25 percent from the total route running time. Frequency of service is a primary factor in attracting ridership.

And in closing, an 11-hour modeling attempt by Metro staff of an east side alternative that did not include the systemic improvements mentioned above still showed it would attract about as many passengers to the system as with the downtown option.

And I would be glad to answer any questions, if you have any.

COUNCIL LIBERTY: Are there questions?

Comments?

All right. Thank you.

JIM HOWELL: Thank you.

COUNCIL LIBERTY: Next we have signed up to testify Daniel Yates, Neal Grandy, Ralph.

Rigdon. And if you would like to testify, please complete a card and submit it to our clerk.

DANIEL YATES: As an introduction, I'm Dan Yates. I'm the president of the Portland Spirit. And I'm also going to be speaking for the Central East Side Industrial Council, of which I'm also the sitting president.

I do want to thank everyone for the hard work in coming up with the Sherman corridor alignment, which the Portland Spirit and the Central East Side both supports. But I do have some concerns relating to the bridge and a couple other elements.

I know bridge height is -- has been discussed in many meetings, but it still has not been vetted completely. And I know there's process later on with the Coast Guard. But I am very concerned that this adherence to the 75-foot height is misplaced. The faith is misplaced that it's going to be approved.

There are several reasons for that.

Predominantly, 75 feet is just inadequate for the current river users. There's -- you are placing a 75-foot tall bridge in between two 120-foot tall bridges, and there the burden is on this -- on Metro and Tri-Met to justify having a lower bridge in between two taller bridges. And you have to take into account the river users, as you're aware.

Data collected on the river user population had some -- has some issues. One, they tended to group tugboats of the same size as just one, and downplaying the number of vessels actually impacted by the lower bridge.

There's also the issue that the bridge -- I'm sorry. I just got in on a flight, and I'm very tired.

COUNCIL LIBERTY: You're doing fine.

DANIEL YATES: But I'm very concerned that through all these processes, a lift bridge, a swing bridge, drawbridge of some sort of variation has never been looked at. Every time I've brought it up in the past, I've always been told, it's too expensive. Granted, there's never been a number presented or any sort of discussion about how expensive it is.

The mere fact that it's an operating cost is good enough for Tri-Met to say it's too expensive.

---

I'm sorry. I think that there's a direct cost relationship to why many of the bridges on the Willamette are at 50, 60, 70 feet, and not at all at 120 feet. And I think that with the pressure from the city of Portland to have the bridge lower so that they can have and make less of a visual impact, views, with pushing the bridge up to -- well, right now, at 75 feet. I think if there is going to be a fixed bridge, it's going to be more in the area of 90 feet. I just don't see any way around that because not only does a fixed bridge have to take into account current users, it also has to take into account future uses.

And I have brought a picture of -- of a -- one of the newest green ships that's been designed, which I can pass out pictures to the council, but the bridges -- boats are now being designed with big, fixed wings or sails so they collect solar and wind. It's not that futuristic. The National Parks Service has put -- has put out a requirement for the Alcatraz run in San Francisco to be an all-solar, wind-powered, 600-passenger boat that has to be in place in the next two to
three years. So the technology is racing ahead in our industry, and the boats are only going to get taller. And knowing how the city of Portland is in its desire to be in a leadership position on sustainability, I can see the city placing this restriction on me to operate from the sea wall. And a 75-foot bridge would effectively put me out of business because this vessel will draw more than that. You have to remember, 75-foot is at the Columbia River dam, which is about a foot and a half to two feet below ordinary low. Today the river is running at plus 18, which would be 20 feet above that level, which means the Columbia Gorge, my sternwheeler, would not be able to pass underneath the 75-foot tall bridge today, just to put it in perspective. The steamer Portland would not be able to pass under that. And that vessel just got certified for carrying passengers for hire. So there are real issues with the bridge, and I encourage you to open up some study quickly on reviewing some sort of swing, lift, draw alternative, if you're determined to keep the bridge low.

The Hawthorne Bridge has operating restrictions on it -- well, which river users agreed to -- and I would think that we could get a similar agreement. It's actually in the code of the federal regulations that the bridge will not open three hours in the morning and three hours in the evening during the commute hours. And that bridge is at 49 feet. We could actually, I'm sure, save a lot of money lowering the bridge from 85 feet down to 50 feet. It's just a lot less concrete and a lot less steel involved. I wish someone would look at that. I'll say it, and I'm -- obviously I'll say it again in our comments in the SDEIS. The bridge, one of the reasons it's at 75 feet is to accommodate a self-imposed restriction of having it be wheelchair accessible, completely wheelchair accessible with no rest stops. Just adding rest areas for wheelchairs, we could easily raise the bridge 10 to 15 feet and still allow wheelchairs to go over it. But it would actually not be a smooth, easy ride. There would actually have to be rest areas. There is no federal requirement for the bridge to be handicap accessible. That is a self-imposed requirement. And I also am very concerned because we don't know what the bridge looks like, that we have no way, as river users, to understand the navigational relationships of the bridge to the other bridges and maneuvering vessels.

Ross Island Sand and Gravel is contracted to build a 400-foot barge, which would be the largest barge in the river system, which would be bringing down aggregate down to its location several times a week. That is a very large barge to be maneuvering in that area. In closing, from the Central East Side perspective, we are very concerned about 8th and Powell, which is a streetlight which presently is a primary way for our trucks and our employees to access I-5 south. Which means that we come out of 8th, do a right turn up and go over the bridge, the Ross Island Bridge, and then loop down onto I-5 for southbound. The only other way we can do it is going back into the center of the central east side, go across the Morrison, loop down onto Front, and then work our way down through downtown onto I-5 south. If we put a bus turn lane on 8th, there will not be enough turn radius for trucks to make the U-turn. Basically, it's a U-turn on Woodrow, onto 8th, and up onto the Ross Island Bridge.

I encourage you to continue to look for ways to run the buses farther down through the district, deeper in 17th, 19th. I'm not sure where. But I can assure you that the Central East Side will fight very hard to maintain its limited ability to maneuver trucks and our employees in and out of our district. The 8th Street light is a very important element for us that should not have a stoplight on it. Thank you.


NEAL GRANDY: Hi, thank you. My name is Neal Grandy. I live in Oak Grove, which is Southeast Milwaukie. I would simply like to present a more personal perspective as an adjunct to the communal impact that has been addressed so far.
I'm about a block and a half south of Park Avenue on the old Trolley Trail. Park Avenue, as you know, is one of the proposed sites for a park and ride. I live in a beautiful 100-year-old house that my wife and I have restored. My neighbors and I have spent an enormous amount of time and money improving the quality of life in our neighborhood. We've cleaned it up; we've improved security. New houses have been built, new families have come in, and many of the older homes have been rehabbed. The crime rate in our neighborhood is less than 25 percent of what it was just five years ago. It's a quiet, safe place to live. All that will change if Light Rail comes through downtown Milwaukee. The goal of minimizing traffic congestion and traffic infiltration will not be met. In fact, at least in my neighborhood, just the opposite will occur as people drive through to the park and ride. It can't be avoided. Our quality of life will change, as will our property values. The ridership projection, as stated in the SDEIS, is maximized to Park Avenue, but that's a little disingenuous. If you take it all the way down to Gladstone, you could triple ridership. It doesn't make any sense. If you terminate north of Milwaukee, those potential riders will get there and they will use it. And the disruption to Milwaukee downtown and my neighborhood, in particular, might be avoided. If this project goes forward, I urge Tri-Met to end the line at southeast, at a site north of downtown.

COUNCIL LIBERTY: Questions, comments?
Mr. Rigdon, thank you for coming.
RALPH RIGDON: I'm Ralph Rigdon. I live at 2417 Southeast Silver Springs in Milwaukee. Been there over 50 years. The wife and I got married there in 1955. And I go to St. John's Catholic Church. All these years, we had a quiet, peaceful town to live in. My biggest concern is to keep Light Rail out of downtown Milwaukee.

There are four schools within one block of this light rail line: Milwaukee High, Milwaukee Elementary, St. John's Catholic and Portland Waldorf. And they have over a thousand kids in all these schools. A person would get off of the light rail and go 50 to 200 feet and be at one of our playgrounds in these schools. We don't think that is a safe thing to do.

Congestion is another issue. When the trains go through town, cross traffic will stop at Harrison, Monroe, Washington and Lake Grove, and the cars will back up. When we have a church organization or school activity, we will not even be able to get on the street to drive home because of the traffic. And St. John's kids cross 25th Street twice a day to go to school or cafeteria or church.

Also, the noise is another issue. When the gates are going down and they're honking their horns, how can be that good for the neighborhood with the kids learning in the schools? The Waldorf school is only, what, 30 feet from the tracks.

Please consider stopping light rail before you get into downtown Milwaukee, and to me that would solve a lot of problems if we stay out of downtown. If Light Rail goes through downtown Milwaukee, it will ruin our city -- quiet town for good.

And to me, I don't think people realize what it's going to be like to have that train go through downtown. Besides building it, what's it going to take, two years to build through town? At least a year. And it will be a big mess. And people -- of course, I -- I take it -- I don't take light rail very much, but I drive through town almost all the time to go to Milwaukee marketplace.

Thanks for your time. That's my thoughts.
COUNCIL LIBERTY: Thank you.
Any questions for Mr. Rigdon?
Comments?
Thank you for your testimony, sir. I think we have two more cards. Mark Williams, Elizabeth Clark -- is it Agosti? Mr. Williams?
MARK WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the committee.
I'm Mark Williams. I'm the vice president of OHSU campus planning, development and real estate.
We are here to support the decision of the Willamette River Partnership, which we
participated in, on the alignment issues that are before you today. In particular, on that piece, we want to commend the public process that we were invited to participate in. Former Mayor Vera Katz did a terrific job chairing that committee. There were a lot of different interests in the room with different ideas, and somehow or another we all wound up more or less in the same place, and that was no small feat. So we appreciate both being invited to participate in that and also the way the process was run.

Just very briefly, you all know who we are, but a few words about OHSU and what our role is in this community.

We’re not a transit agency, we’re not a general purpose government. We have a core mission as a public corporation to provide healthcare, healthcare education, research discoveries and community outreach, not just to Portland, not just to the region, but to the entire state of Oregon and Southwest Washington. We are the only academic medical health center in this whole wide area, and that’s what we do. Like any public university,

and we are a public university, even though we’re not part of the Oregon university system, we’re just like everybody else. We’re struggling through budgets, we’re trying to figure out how to make our mission work in a constrained climate. The fact that Oregon is 46th in the nation at last count on funding of higher education is not a small part in that. Additionally, we’re a major part of the economic fabric of this state and this region

With over 12,000 employees, we are the largest employer in the city of Portland, we’re the fourth largest employer in the entire state of Oregon.

But the future is really what concerns us. We have dramatic healthcare worker shortages coming at us. Many of you have seen this before. I’m not going to bore you with all the details. But those of us who are in that Baby Boomer generation, we’re going to need more healthcare. And our providers are all in that same generation. And they’re leaving the workforce while their healthcare needs go up.

Why do I mention that? Because the Schnitzer campus located in the north of the

South Waterfront is where we hope to meet that demand and we hope to meet that healthcare crisis in the future. That’s what the Schnitzer campus is there for, to help address the healthcare workforce crisis that we see coming and in some professions is here already.

The alignment recommended by the Willamette River Partnership offers, in our view, the greatest benefit to the greatest number in our community. OHSU is one of the community partners. We were asked to participate in this process. We did. We feel that the outcome came to the right place.

There’s a whole lot of things that need to be done yet to make this district work and to enable us to help carry out our mission. But we think that the alignment that’s before you does the best job and we support it.

COUNCIL LIBERTY: Thank you.

Questions? Comments? No?

Thank you for your testimony.

Is it Agosti?

ELIZABETH CLARK AGOSTI: Agosti.

COUNCIL LIBERTY: Agosti.

ELIZABETH CLARK AGOSTI: I’m Elizabeth

Clark Agosti. I’m a director of the Holman Distribution Center of Oregon, originally Holman Transfer Company, which has done business for over 40 years at 2300 Southeast Beta, which is on Main between Milwaukie and Ochoco streets in Milwaukie. It’s a family-owned business that has been headquartered here since the mid ’80s, served hundreds of local, regional and national accounts, and public warehousing storage, handling and freight transport. Operations are based out of its 200,000-square foot warehouse, which is currently leased to a light manufacturing and distribution lessee.

I don’t relish opportunities for public speaking, but I feel irresponsible to pass up a chance to at least briefly address some concerns for the alignment options held by members of the North Milwaukie industrial area.

I’ve tried to follow the Regional Light Rail Planning process, and the Metro, Tri-Met, city of Milwaukie and other jurisdictions have been really helpful in presenting great information, and they’ve shown an interest in acquainting themselves with our operations.
I guess the central principle I conveyed to them I'll reiterate here, which is that a major issue for my company and its industrial neighbors is that the -- is the -- that the under -- an issue that the underlying industrial zoning designation is arguably designed to protect is the need for flexibility in these operations over time to protect flexibility of these warehouse and distribution operations. Even accurate human and traffic analyses may not be able to address the impacts for warehouse and distribution businesses that are characterized by changing accounts, changing inventories, and changing shipping patterns over time.

Our Milwaukee facility has demonstrated these changes. Our truck staging activity can increase or decrease as a function of the accounts and the tenants that occupy our -- our facility. The building function for many years for food storage and handling and the servicing of those accounts often utilized the -- in the course of -- of the same day or the same week all of our 40 truck bays with 100 daily outbound orders regularly shipping at peak hours, as well as inbound freight.

Currently, our -- our Milwaukee facility services a dozen major public warehousing accounts in this building, shipping by truck and receiving by both truck and rail. So my -- my concern is that the 2003 Locally Preferred Alternative that routes lines of the Light Rail down Main would introduce additional Light Rail and increased street traffic associated with park and ride and add yet more burdens and pressures on the freight operations and the access issues that businesses in the north industrial area face. And the -- those issues are -- those problems are avoided with the Tillamook alignment, which aligns the Light Rail along Union Pacific/Tillamook Branch existing rail line on the east side of that industrial area. That alignment also protects what are actively used rail spurs that protects the types of ways in which we can use these warehouse facilities. But my -- my concern is that the congestion and freight disruption is unavoidable under the 2003 LPA. And I just want to emphasize the need to protect flexibility in this industrial area.

Thanks so much.

COUNCIL LIBERTY: Thank you.

Questions, comments?

Thank you.

I received an e-mail from Eileen Murray that I would like to make part of the record of this hearing. Today, this morning, 10:24 a.m. I support the building of the Harold Street station. It will bring property values up and encourage quality development and restoration of this already good neighborhood. Don't exclude the plans for Hill Street, please.

Eileen Murray.

Is there anyone else who would like to testify that has completed a card?

If not, that concludes the public hearing.

Any comments from members of the steering committee? We're adjourned.

Oops, I'm sorry. I wanted to correct something I said earlier, which is the meeting dates for the city of Portland. Let me give you those dates again.

July 1 meeting is a work session; the July 17th session will include a public hearing. And Milwaukee is July 15th; Metro Council, July 24th; steering committee, which will not be conducting another public hearing, is on June 26th.

Thank you for coming.

(Public Hearing ends at 6:37 p.m.)
CERTIFICATE

I, Charlotte A. Powers, CSR No. 90-0050, do hereby certify that, the PORTLAND-MILWAUKIE LIGHT RAIL PROJECT, STEERING COMMITTEE PUBLIC HEARING personally happened before me at the time and place mentioned in the caption herein; that statements made by the General Public was taken down by me in stenotype and thereafter reduced to typewriting; and, that the foregoing transcript, pages 1 to 57, both inclusive, constitutes a full, true and accurate record of said Public Hearing, and all other proceedings, and of the whole thereof, to the best of my ability.
Witness my hand at Portland, Oregon, this 12th day of June, 2008.

Charlotte A. Powers, RMR
CSR No. 90-0050
Testimony to Metro on the South Corridor SDEIS by Jim Howell, 6-6-08

I support Metro and TriMet for filing a Supplemental Draft Environment Impact Statement to the FTA in order to construct a light rail line to Milwaukie in the McLoughlin Corridor.

Unfortunately, the sole purpose of this SDEIS is to obtain federal funds to build a narrowly defined project. A project primarily focused on the needs of a small segment of the population that will have to drive to park-and-ride facilities in order to access a light rail line to their jobs in the CBD and the OSHU South Waterfront campus.

The ridership forecast used to show the FTA that this project meets their cost-benefit threshold is largely dependent on auto dependent commuters.

It may be cheaper and easier to pick the low hanging fruit – these auto oriented commuters, attracted to free parking, rather than car-free commuters making the light rail connection via a network of direct and frequent bus routes.

In the long run, a system approach to transit planning will have to be used if transit is expected to become a major player in the region’s transportation system. The current approach, focusing on one piece at a time, will be too costly and will not shift enough people from cars to transit to achieve a significant reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and oil consumption.

I am a realist. A Locally Preferred Alignment will probably be selected from the options identified in this SDEIS but, the following suggestions would have made the project more environmentally sustainable, cheaper to build, cheaper to operate, and would have added more ridership to the total transit system.

1. Do not build park-and-ride structures.

They are expensive, they encourage auto dependence and they are a major impediment to transit oriented development around stations. Nevertheless, low cost surface parking can become a temporary land-banking use until an adequate transit network is in place, at which time the parking lot can be converted to a compact mixed use development.

2. Include in the project a more robust bus feeder system.

For example, a frequent service cross-town bus route could provide a fast and convenient transfer connection at the Tacoma Station and replace the need for a thousand stall parking structure. A new route connecting Clackamas Town Center to Washington Square and WES via Johnson Creek Blvd., Tacoma Street, the Sellwood Bridge and Taylors Ferry Road would greatly reduce traffic demand in these corridors. It would interconnect three rail lines and 30 bus
routes, providing an exponential increase in transit opportunities over what is provided today.

3. Forego the construction of an expensive new light rail bridge by connecting this line to the MAX Yellow line through the eastside.

- The 3,200 buses and trains now crossing the river every weekday could provide downtown access. During peak hours, shuttle buses or streetcars from the OMSI Station could provide additional capacity to and from downtown. Incidentally, if these shuttles were timed to meet the Max trains, the trip to the CBD would be as fast or faster than the trip over the proposed out-of-direction Porter-Sherman alignment.

- South Waterfront would actually get better transit service than with the Porter-Sherman crossing if the project included a direct bus or streetcar link to South Waterfront via the Hawthorne Bridge, SW First and Naito and Harrison Street. This new faster connection to and from North, Northeast and Eastside Portland would attract many new riders, more than would be lost from the South Corridor because of a slightly longer trip.

- An eastside connection provides redundancy to the system not provided by an additional river crossing. The Steel Bridge will become a major bottleneck in the system when all four Max lines cross it. The Yellow Line will become a major problem because of crossing issues at the Rose Quarter Junction when the Green Line is added next year. An eastside alignment avoids this problem. In the event of a Steel Bridge breakdown, it could also provide access to all the buses that cross the river on the other bridges.

- An eastside connection would allow more frequent service with the same equipment and operating hours because it would cut about 25% from the total route running time. Frequency of service is a primary factor in attracting ridership.

In closing, an eleventh hour modeling attempt by metro staff of an eastside alternative, that did not include the systemic improvements mentioned above, still showed it would attract about as many passengers to the system as would the downtown options.

Jim Howell
3325 NE 45th Avenue
Portland, OR 97213
Jimhowell89@hotmail.com
Jenn Tuerk - Written version of Milwaukie Max Testimony requested

From: Customer Servpro <customerservpro@hotmail.com>
To: <tuerkj@metro.dst.or.us>
Date: 6/9/2008 7:55 PM
Subject: Written version of Milwaukie Max Testimony requested

To Jenn Tuerk
tuerkj@metro.dst.or.us

The following is the written version of my testimony on Milwaukie Light Rail delivered verbally delivered June 9, 2008.

My background includes chairing the Citizens advisory Committee that recommended the region's first light rail line from Portland to Gresham, and widening the Banfield Freeway, a combined project.

I have a couple of issues of concern I want to bring forward.

FIRST: The clearance height of any new bridge over the Willamette River, be it the redefined alternative or otherwise, must be no less than that of the Marquam Bridge. How the river will be used for a transportation corridor in the future - 20 years, 40 years, 60 years out - is uncertain and unknown. Therefore, constructing a bridge with any less clearance over the water is nothing less then being shortsighted. Standard Coast Guard regulations must be followed and the ramps must just be dealt with.

The SECOND issue is the funding. With energy prices rising as fast as they are, and predictions they will stay that way, a change or shake up MUST be made in the way transit and bicycle infrastructure is funded. No incentives are needed including the tax dollars wasted on those cutesy little "drive less save more" TV commercials. That money could be better spent on providing infrastructure.

The capital costs for specialized transit and bicycle infrastructure must become more user based. The cost per passenger mile must be considered as part of it. That requires that transit passengers start paying higher fares or a fare surcharge to help pay for transit expansion which would include any light rail and streetcar infrastructure. Collecting this money from transit passengers should start immediately so a fund can be established and built up that collects interest rather than paying interest. Eliminating Fareless Square would go along way towards reaching this goal.

Additionally, bicyclists need to be directly taxed immediately to pay for their share of any proposed new bridge. If a bicycle tax is not imposed. The bridge needs to have a bicycle toll placed on it. An equitable pricing structure for such bicycle toll would be one that reflects the cost per bicyclist mile of providing the infrastructure and mirrors financial impacts Metro wants to place on motorists using the Columbia Crossing with higher tolls in peak periods.

The financial conclusion must be that sharing the road must also mean sharing the financial responsibility. However since there will be no road on this proposed river crossing, the responsibility of providing local match dollars for any connecting infrastructure and the bridge itself must be solely born by the users. That would be up to the $400 Million from TriMet and streetcar fares for the local match.

And one final note, the construction of a new Max line must NOT displace or replace roadway capacity such as was done when Max was put in on Interstate Avenue where the motor vehicle travel lanes were reduced from four to two making Interstate Avenue a parking lot of idling cars during the evening rush hour. If there is a concern about not increasing VMTs, then Metro must start by looking at the bigger picture of reducing regional population growth rather than confining roadway infrastructure.
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Thank You,

Terry Parker
P.O. Box 13503
Portland, OR 97213

Enjoy 5 GB of free, password-protected online storage. Get Windows Live SkyDrive.
It's not easy being GREEN

But it will become mandatory.

Companies exploring "green" solutions now — such as this solar and wind-powered hybrid electric ferry for Circle Line — will have a leg up on the competition.

Cummings Calling on the Coast Guard

Great Lakes H₂O Levels are Falling
From: Neal Grandy <grandy2511@comcast.net>
To: jenn.tuerk@oregonmetro.gov
Date: 6/12/2008 11:17 AM
Subject: Light Rail

Hi Ms. Tuerk,

I was at the meeting earlier this week and gave testimony. The following is my testimony verbatim:

My name is Neal Grandy and I live in Oak Grove, just south of Milwaukee. I would simply like to present a more personal perspective as an adjunct to the broader communal aspects that have thus far been addressed.
I'm about a block and a half south of Park Avenue on the old Trolley Trail. As you know, Park is one of the proposed sites designated for a Park and Ride. I live in a beautiful, one hundred year old house that my wife and I have restored. My neighbors and I have spent an enormous amount of time and money improving the quality of life in our neighborhood. We have cleaned it up and improved security. New houses have been built and many of the older homes have been rehabbed. New, young families have moved in. The crime rate in our neighborhood is less than 25% of what it was just five years ago. It's a quiet, safe place to live and raise our kids.
We believe that all that will change if light rail is allowed to come through downtown Milwaukee. The goal of minimizing traffic congestion and traffic infiltration will not be met. In fact, at least in my neighborhood, just the opposite will occur as a large number of non-residents will have to drive through to get to the Park and Ride. Our quality of life will most certainly be adversely affected as will our property values. The ridership projection, as stated in the SDEIS, is maximized at Park Avenue, but that projection is a little disingenuous. Obviously, the further you extend the line, the larger your projection! Aside from the fact that those numbers will never be met, if the line is terminated north of downtown Milwaukee, potential riders will get there and they will use it. And the costly disruption to Milwaukee, and my neighborhood, might be avoided.
I strongly urge you to review not only the benefits of this project but the less obvious costs that will impact many in our community. If this project does move forward, I believe that terminating the line north of Milwaukee achieves many of the benefits you hope for with a far less expense. Thank you.
June 1, 2000

I have lived in Milw. area 50 yrs.
Always been quiet peaceful city.
My biggest concern keep light rail out of downtown Milw.
There are 4 schools within 1 block of proposed light rail.
Milw High, Milw. Elementary, St. John the Baptist, Portland Waldorf, with over 1,000 children in schools.
A person get off light rail walk 50-200 ft to be on the playgrds of these schools.
Congestion is another issue. With trains running every 3 to 5 min. The cross traffic will back up on Harrison, Monroe, Wauwatosa Rds.
St. Johns kids cross 25th st 2 times a day between school, cafita, church.
... no Alternatives routes suggested

Train noise is another issue
with gates going up & down &
be honking horns. Can not be
good for the neighborhood and
learning for the school kids.

Please consider stopping light
rail before getting into down-
town Milwaukee.

To me that would stop all the
problems, with safety, congestion
and noise.

If light rail goes through downtown
Milwaukee it will ruin our quiet
peaceful city for good.

Thanks for your time

Ralph Rigdon
Problems with Milwaukie LRT

- It's not HCT, it's low-capacity; not some high project, is even needed; is, cut, cut, cut.

- The cost is astronomical; $1.2 - $1.4 billion for a 6-mile line, for ridership increase projected to be (maybe) 1.8% gain (systemwide) by 2030 over

- It's a one-dimensional project: just LRT

- Over 180 full and partial lots potentially subject to eminent domain; 46 business relocated.

- Bus/MAX use from 1998-2007 for all of Portland has declined from 12% of commute trips to 10%, despite addition of 3 new LRT lines during that time - why spend to keep on a mode that losing market share?

- Driving alone has remained constant at 70% of commute trips

- Construction of new bridge is huge waste of money

- No viable financing plan; "sustainable development" should rely on local sources of revenue. Two previous public votes have gone against this proposal.

- Only way to attain real objective in a sustainable fashion could be: LRT - array transit sky corridor mode, not VMT.

  John Charles
Me Chairman and members of the commerce
1980-1984
P.D.F June 9, 2008
R.P. of 6140 Antony was but also 2 years in Multnomah on Lake Bula
What is the purpose of public transit?
A transit rider, primarily from and for riders;
With this in mind, all efforts and projects
must maximize that are aimed at
and purpose.
Unfortunately, TriMet and other American
bus systems do not act accordingly.
Let us be specific:
1. TriMet is finishing the
   trend towards the LRT project which will work
   against the primary goal: riders;
   it will be slow running the length of the
   well in both directions, and it will be
   limited to 2 car trains because of the
   length of the 3 blocks: 1000 feet.
2. Regional
   lines will be subjected to heat and
   snow in Met will be sold on more regional
   rail to that problem. This line will also
   will cross the Hills, then go to
   Wilson and finally up the Middle
   to P Union and then climb to the S.W. Bridge;
   to cross another S.W. Bridge for 300 feet
   to be built.
What should be done first to cut unnecessary time and attract more riders from auto commuters?

Stay on the East Side and continue south on Freeway 4 to where most of the population lives and proceed past 158th to kilometers and eventually to Centennial Park. Have a straight fast NS line from Vancouver eventually to OR City. Much faster and much more appealing to the bulk of N, NE and SE Portland residents and workers and zeros to the regional East Side corridor

Remember, it is time that matters to people, but now also cost efficiency

Save the cost of a new bridge and get more riders

Show us this project concern for ridership and final responsibility: WIN, WIN

Thank you

Rick Williams  Tim Benedict  Charlotte Collette  Robert Librani
Neil McFarlane  Martha Schroder  (Clark Co)  Sue Kent (City)

Ray Polani
Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

Name: EJ PARECKI
E-mail: ED@PARECKI.COM
Address: 7677 SW 87Th AVE
City/state/ZIP Portland OR 97223
Phone number: (503) 977-4988
Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

CAN THE CITY OF MILWAUKIE TAX ITS CITIZENS IF LIGHT RAIL IS BUILT ON AN ODOT TRANSIT CORRIDOR?
(McLoughlin Blvd vs. Tillamook Branch)


YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: EJ PARECKI
E-mail: ED@PARECKI.COM
Address: 7677 SW 87Th AVE
City/state/ZIP Portland OR 97223
Phone number: (503) 977-4988
Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

WILL THE CITIZENS OF MILWAUKIE HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO VOTE ON THE $5,000,000 CITY CONTRIBUTION TO THE PROJECT?

SDEIS Public Comment Report
Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

**YOUR OPINION COUNTS**

**Portland–Milwaukie**

**LIGHT RAIL PROJECT**

Name: ED PARECKI

E-mail: ED@PARECKI.COM

Address: 7677 SW 87TH AVE

City/state/ZIP: PORTLAND, OR 97223

Phone number: (503) 977-9988

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No

**Comments** (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff:

WHERE DOES METRO PLAN TO MOVE THE DISPLACED PARKING IN DOWNTOWN MILWAUKIE? SPECIFICALLY THE MONROE & WASHINGTON SPACES.

---


---

**Portland–Milwaukie**

**LIGHT RAIL PROJECT**

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

**YOUR OPINION COUNTS**

Name: ED PARECKI

E-mail: ED@PARECKI.COM

Address: 7677 SW 87TH AVE

City/state/ZIP: PORTLAND, OR 97223

Phone number: (503) 977-9988

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No

**Comments** (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff:

IS METRO AWARE THAT ONE OF ITS STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS (JIM Ronomies) HAS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN REGARDS TO LIGHT RAIL ALIGNMENT CHOICES IN MILWAUKIE?

---

Trans System Accounts - KEEP The Harold Street Station!

From: Eileen Murray <berdwmn41@hotmail.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/9/2008 10:31 AM
Subject: KEEP The Harold Street Station!

I support the building of The Harold St. Station; It will bring property values up, and encourage quality development and restoration of this already good neighborhood! Don’t EXCLUDE the plans for Harold St. PLEASE!

Eileen Murray

Now you can invite friends from Facebook and other groups to join you on Windows Live™ Messenger. Add them now!
Dear Steering Committee Members:

I am unable to attend your hearing this evening, but wanted to submit these written comments regarding the proposed light rail line to Milwaukie and Oak Grove. I fear you will hear from dozens of opponents, and be left with the impression that they speak for the Milwaukie majority. Please rest assured that in Milwaukie, like in many communities, there is a “silent majority”. And in this case, the silent majority is generally happy to know that light rail could come our way. I have volunteered numerous times at the City’s information booth at the Sunday farmer’s market, and have heard overwhelming (although not unanimous) support for light rail – lots of “it’s about time” comments by people who have been wanting light rail ever since the discussions of it in the 1990s.

I didn’t live in Milwaukie at that time, but I have lived here for six years, and can attest that the demographics are improving in terms of persons likely to use light rail. There are more 30- and 40-something professionals and families with children in my neighborhood than was the case when I moved in, and I understand this pattern bears out in other parts of Milwaukie. So while there is still a vociferous group opposed to light rail, I do not believe they represent the bulk of Milwaukie residents.

Unfortunately, opponents were given a new argument for their arsenal when Tri-Met recently decided that they would not build the long-promised park & ride at the Southgate Theater site. While that decision might have been logical and fiscally prudent, it is another example of a broken promise to reduce the impact of bus layovers on our downtown, and it will undoubtedly be the subject of some of the comments you hear this evening.

The recurring issue of the burden of transit facilities which impede the development downtown Milwaukie is why it is crucial that Metro and Tri-Met commit to building the new light rail line to the proposed Park Avenue terminus. Anything less than a pledge to do so will draw more people to the side of light rail opponents, as the resulting terminus and park & ride would eliminate a wide swath of the south end of downtown.

Extending the line to Park Avenue (or even further) makes sense from every standpoint. The Park Avenue terminus will be easier (and likely less expensive) to build because there is much more underutilized land available not only for the terminus, but for building adequate road improvements to manage the traffic impacts. The Park Avenue terminus will get more cars off of Highway 99E before the bottleneck at the railroad trestle and through downtown Milwaukie. The Park Avenue terminus also sets the course for eventual extension to Oregon City, should that be considered in the future. Despite the name, the Park Avenue terminus has no waterway or sensitive parkland near it that will require special safeguards. Moreover, an extension to Park Avenue will be an important economic stimulus for redevelopment of an area blighted with rundown residential hotels, strip bars, and lottery establishments. One cannot drive down North Interstate today without acknowledging the economic...
stimulus of the light rail line, and such stimulus is much needed along Highway 99E.

Indeed, I think the need for such stimulus is also an argument for building a station at Bluebird. I will admit here that I have a personal interest, as a Bluebird station would be only a few blocks from my home. But I believe a Bluebird station can stimulate redevelopment of those blocks at the River Road/99E intersection which are already zoned commercial. The three-story buildings allowable with such redevelopment would be more compatible with an above-grade crossing of 99E, which will otherwise result in a mass of towering concrete dwarfing the single-story buildings currently there. Moreover, a Bluebird station would reduce the number of buses needing to enter downtown Milwaukie, as River Road buses could terminate at the Bluebird station.

In sum, I urge you to say yes to a light rail line through Milwaukie to Park Avenue, with a station stop at Bluebird.

Lisa Batey
11912 SE 19th Avenue
Milwaukie, Oregon 97222
From: <charmaine.coleman@comcast.net>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/9/2008 4:05 PM
Subject: Testimony for Portland/Milwaukee light rail project steering committee

I'll get to the point: the Park Avenue light rail stop needs to happen. This, along with a stop at Bluebird (zoned Commercial and for three-story development) invites redevelopment, TOD and otherwise, into a long-depressed stretch of the McLoughlin corridor. It also prevents another public relations catastrophe that would stall the next phase of light rail development.

We all know that if light rail comes to Milwaukee, it will eventually make its way further south. Stopping light rail at Lake Road will place all parking issues for this line squarely upon the shoulders of our city, and will GIVE THOSE OPPOSED TO LIGHT RAIL EVEN MORE TO SINK THEIR TEETH INTO. If track is laid to the south now, Oak Grove residents will add significantly to the ridership, and many cars with headlights that would otherwise be aimed at Southgate or Lake Road park-and-rides will never pass through an already-maxed-out stretch of 99E in downtown Milwaukee. That's a good thing for business and transit. It's a good P.R. move. It's a good thing, period.

WARNING: Without a stop at Bluebird, bus transfers from River Road will enter downtown Milwaukee first. This intensifies the Milwaukee Transit Center controversy that already exists. It also places further burden upon our light parking situation. AVOID THIS SCENARIO, PLEASE. In addition, the redevelopment we hope MAX will draw to the Bluebird stop area can only happen if a stop exists there. To overlook such commercial and residential potential is folly.

I understand that funding is tight, and that stations to the south of Lake Road are a tall order. I also know, though, that this project has been torpedoed time and time again largely, I believe, due to the fact that many mistrust what government says it intends to do. If this project happens and Metro decides to end the line at Lake Road for now, you will never hear the end of it. The foreseeable (above) will happen, and Oak Grove will shudder. “We don't want light rail! Look what it did to Milwaukee!” I can hear it now. Twenty years and several community brawls later, you'll finally get track laid to Oregon City. If you COMMIT to find a way to start the southbound process, adding stops at Bluebird and Park now, then moving further along will be a foregone conclusion.

Save yourself another fight. Do this thing right. It is NOT ENOUGH to approve this Portland/Milwaukee project with intent to find funding for Park. Metro must GUARANTEE to find a way to get there. You can do it. You've gotten this far in the process.

Charmaine Coleman
10392 SE 23rd Avenue
Milwaukee, OR 97222
YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

Name  PAULETTE CARTER  E-mail  pcarter1976@hotmail.com
Address  1424 SELAMBERT  City/state/ZIP  PDX OR 97202
Phone number
Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  Yes  No
Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

[Handwritten comments]

I'm already
(1) I think it would be really great to extend the line to Park and handle more capacity from the south.
(2) Please put safe places to park bikes at Tacoma P&R.

Metro | People places. Open spaces. www.metro-region.org
YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: Pelle Diamond
E-mail: pk.diamond@comcast.net
Address: 1904 SE Lambert
City/state/ZIP: Portland OR 97202
Phone number:
Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? Yes ☑ No □
Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

I like a Light Rail stop by the Broadway Bridge as currently planned.
and I recommend.

Metro 1 People places. Open spaces. www.metro-region.org
YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: Kathy Fors
E-mail: polkadot2spintone.com
Address: 3415 SE 164th
City/state/ZIP: Portland 97220
Phone number: 503-230-7784

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

I live one block from the proposed station at Hays. Few neighbors have driveways. Will you provide nearby park and ride or resident stickers for parking?

I am also concerned with noise, trash handlers, riders etc. Will the station add to this?

I hope pedestrian + bike access across Powell Blvd will improve. Currently it is unsafe. Tunnel is awful. No access to New Seasons + People’s who back-tracking to 124th! If I don’t want to use the tunnel, definitely unsafe for children.

Looking forward to better North/South public transportation!

Hope traffic is not rerouted onto 164th for years!! Please!!
Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

Name: Wendy Hilt
E-mail: luxeygo@gmail.com
Address: 937 SE Lumber St
City/state/ZIP: Portland OR 97202
Phone number: 971-219-3338

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

We need access to the max train. Blocker Bane to down town - guise
Driving, Duh!

Metro | People places. Open spaces. www.metro-region.org

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

Name: Valerie Lyons
E-mail: ValerieKlyons2@gmail.com
Address: 135 SE 302a St
City/state/ZIP: Portland OR 97202
Phone number: 503-260-3842

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

Do Tillamook Br. option
Just build it!
we will use it!

Metro | People places. Open spaces. www.metro-region.org
YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: Donald Rogers & J. Hamilo
E-mail
Address: 5825 SE 19th Ave
City/state/ZIP: Portland 97202
Phone number: 503 382-7372
Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? 
Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

I would never need to drive into the downtown area with this light-rail route in place.

Metro 1 People places. Open spaces. www.metro-region.org

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: Matt Martinson
E-mail: cowmart4@yahoo.com
Address: 5915 SE 32nd Ave
City/state/ZIP: PDX 97202
Phone number
Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?
Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

Harold Street Station should have mitigations to prevent use of 122nd as pedestrian thoroughfare.
Consider consolidating Harold & Holgate @ 17th

Metro 1 People places. Open spaces. www.metro-region.org
**Portland–Milwaukie Light Rail Project**

**YOUR OPINION COUNTS**

Your written comments will be included in the Portland–Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

Name: **Eugene McConnell**  
E-mail: 
Address: 7833 SE 44th Ave  
City/state/ZIP: [Port] OR 97206

Phone number: (503) 775-4271

Do you want to be placed on the Portland–Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  
Yes □ No □

**Comments** (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

It is a great thing to see MAX expanding and I feel safe and secure traveling on MAX. Keep it expanding. Thank you.

---

**Metro: People places. Open spaces. [www.metro-region.org]**

---

**Portland–Milwaukie Light Rail Project**

**YOUR OPINION COUNTS**

Your written comments will be included in the Portland–Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

Name: **Marina Pavlova**  
E-mail: marya.yurievna@yahoo.com
Address: 1611 SE Nehalem St  
City/state/ZIP: [Port] OR 97202

Phone number: 

Do you want to be placed on the Portland–Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  
Yes □ No □

**Comments** (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

Portland is growing fast and light rail is a great option to address transportation needs without adding to congestion and traffic pollution.

---

**Metro: People places. Open spaces. [www.metro-region.org]**
**YOUR OPINION COUNTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City/state/ZIP</th>
<th>Phone number</th>
<th>Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KATIE PRESLEY</td>
<td>KATWHAT-US @ YAHOO</td>
<td>1014 SE REX</td>
<td>PDX, OR 97202</td>
<td>903 267 4703</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDA SHORT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LS@GEOGE.NET">LS@GEOGE.NET</a></td>
<td>2155 AVALON WAY</td>
<td>NOVA, OR 97233</td>
<td>541-386-2038</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments** (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

**SINCE 40-TACOMA LINE WAS ERODINATED, THERE ARE FEWER OPTIONS TO GETTING DOWNTOWN FROM SEATTLE-MOSELAND AREA. I'D LIKE TO SEE MORE OPTIONS - LIGHT RAIL/STREETCAR/FREQUENT BUS LATEN IN THE EVENING & SUNDAYS.**

**Metro | People places. Open spaces. www.metro-region.org**

---
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Portland–Milwaukie
LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: John Watkins  E-mail: jw Watkins @comcast.net
Address
City/state/ZIP

Phone number

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  □ Yes □ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

I'm for a Harvey Milk Station & Reedy Way bridge over the railway. If the station doesn't happen, I'll probably will not buy an annual pass.

Thanks

Metro | People places. Open spaces.  www.metro-region.org
Portland–Milwaukie
LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Your written comments will be included in the Portland–Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

Name MIKE SHEPARD  
Address 2136 SE Lake Rd  
City/state/ZIP Milw, OR 97222  
Phone number 653-6207  

Do you want to be placed on the Portland–Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? ☐ Yes ☑ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

Study an alternative alignment either McLoughlin Blvd or Hwy 224


RECEIVED MAY 22 2008

[Signature]
Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

Name: Annette Madden
E-mail: anne.t.madden@yahoo.com
Address: 12045 S.E. Foster Place
City/state/ZIP: Portland OR 97206
Phone number: 503-701-2588

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  Yes  No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

The walkable bridge is the most attractive and most practical design, with lesser environmental impact.

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

Name: Jackie Scott
E-mail
Address: 3500 Oak Grove Blvd
City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie OR 97267
Phone number: 503-659-5373
Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? Yes
Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.
House the light rail come as far as possible. It is my only means of transportation.

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>CONCERNED CITIZEN</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>NONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>MILWAUKIE AREA</td>
<td>City/state/ZIP</td>
<td>SAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number</td>
<td>NON-PUB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  □ Yes  □ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

Try these two posts down town — it should be a non-issue!

Gay against it — listen to the voters!

---

Portland–Milwaukie LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

@metro | People places. Open spaces. www.oregonmetro.gov

---

RECEIVED

JUN 10 2008

by: [Signature]
Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

Name: [Name]
E-mail: [Email]
Address: [Address]
City/state/ZIP: [City state ZIP]
Phone number: [Phone number]

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? [ ] Yes [X] No

Comments (please print): [Comments]

[Signature]


---

[Name]

[Phone number]

[Comments]

[Signature]
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Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

Name: Al & Carol Caracci
E-mail: None
Address: 14000 SE Matilda Dr., City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie, OR
Phone number: 503-653-8885
We are St. John's Parish Community
Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

We have grave concern over current plan of light rail line in city of Milwaukie. This line is planned for a major residential area and 4 elementary schools right next to or within 1 block of planned line. This situation is especially untenable because of potentially grave safety problems for children of this area. Noise disruption for children during school hours is also a grave concern. We protest in strongest terms the current plan and appeal to you to help find alternative placement of alternate route.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

---

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

Name: BILL LAY
E-mail: None
Address: 4015 S.E. Jackson St., City/state/ZIP: MILWAUKIE, OR.
Phone number: 
Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

They should get rid of light rail if they can't live it back to Portland.
All Portland wants is Portland + Milwaukie for "customers." Otherwise forget light rail.
All Portland wants is Milwaukie's money.

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

Name: Sr. Rita Rae Schneider  E-mail: rrschneider@arch時点.org
Address: 2512 SE Monroe Street  City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie, OR 97222
Phone number: (503) 654-3385

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project mailing list? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

I am not opposed to the light rail project, but I am very concerned about where the light rail will be located. We have 5 schools and private homes along where the rail will run and have its loading stations. I strongly oppose the idea of the light rail running and loading passengers behind the lumberyard off of SE Monroe for many safety reasons! I Support moving the light rail down to Highway 99 or to the other further away location.

Metro 1 People places. Open spaces. www.oregonmetro.gov Thank you!

Name: Dorothy Watson  E-mail: Grammarless@lmsn.com
Address: 16622 SE 27th Ave  City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie, OR 97222
Phone number: 503-766-9336

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project mailing list? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

Please no light rail thru our little city. Nearest rail so close to our schools. Why can't you see how this will jeopardize our children. Disturb the attention with the horn sound. It's a stupid idea we have lived without it all these years but it continues to be so. Milwaukie isn't a metropolis!

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: Joanne Cody
Phone number: (503) 652-8043
Address: 10300 S.E. Waterley Ct
City/State/ZIP: Milwaukie, OR 97222
Comments (please print): I am not opposed to light rail to Milwaukie as we need it. However, your idea of using the existing tracks near 4 schools — I do oppose! Safety factors, congestion on Monroe and Washington Streets, noise is a real factor. Find a better way!!!

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? ☐ Yes ☑ No

SDEIS Public Comment Report
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Name: Bernie Dieringer  
E-mail: Bernie.2033@Comcast.net
Address: 7450 LITTLE CR, LAKEWOOD, WA, 98499
Phone number: 503.454.8068

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  
Yes  No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

Safety is the biggest concern for our kids.
Noise is a second.
Please consider alternative.

---

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.
YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: Ronald Marie Dove  E-mail: 
Address: 16521 Dagmar Rd  City/state/ZIP: Mil, OR 97267 
Phone number: 503-653-8149

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  Yes  No

Comments (please print): Turn in completed card to project staff.

I have safety and noise concerns regarding the favored location of the line, especially because of the recent problems in Gresham and Hillsboro. I am in favor of mass transportation but feel it is much needed in order to deal with costs of transporting ourselves to destinations as well as the effect on the environment. However, safety issues must be addressed.

---

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: John Gaul  E-mail: gaul5613@comcast.net
Address: 4585 SEregon Ct  City/state/ZIP: Portland, OR 97222
Phone number: 503-654-6727

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  Yes  No

Comments (please print): Turn in completed card to project staff.

I am concerned about light rail coming to Milwaukie so close to St. John's Catholic Grade School. My concerns are based on the many problems at other stops on light rail. It is my opinion the location of light rail near this school will cause many additional problems for the school and detract from its primary goal of providing a sound and

Portland–Milwaukie
LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name PAT BAUER E-mail
Address 10222 SE 78Th City/state/ZIP Milwaukie, OR 97222
Phone number (503) 654-765

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

GREAT IDEA. CHILDREN ACCIDENTALLY GET OFF TRAIN AT SCHOOL TIME. HAVE YOU READ ANY OF THE NEWSPAPERS RECENTLY?


---

Portland–Milwaukie
LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name ROBERT L. GIFFORD E-mail
Address 3586 SE N.AVE City/state/ZIP Milwaukie, OR 97222
Phone number (503) 654-5929

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

WE HAVE TOO MANY CONCERNS ABOUT THE SAFETY OF CHILDREN AT SCHOOLS ALONG THE PROPOSED ROUTE. IF THE TRAIN COULD JUST BE PLACED ON MCLAUGHLIN AVE THAT WOULD BE FINE. WE ARE PROGRESSIVE-MINDED BUT WANT TO REMAIN PROACTIVE WHEN IT COMES TO THE SAFETY OF CHILDREN IN THIS AREA. THANK YOU.


SDEIS Public Comment Report
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LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: RICHARD J & ANGELA G
Email: goldenenagdueasecorcoment.net
Address: 8340 SE Mulberry Dr.
City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie, OR, 97267
Phone number: 503-653-7557

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? 

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

We are not in favor of the light rail train station located on Washington Street. There is no good reason for this location. This area is: 1) too close to St. John's Elementary School and the incidents of increased risk to the students would be greatly increased. 2) Why there? The congestion, noise will introduce further unnecessary problems to this area.

Kindly consider another location. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joan Hallquist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmhallquist@gmail.com">jmhallquist@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City/state/ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1490 SE 57th Ave</td>
<td>Milw, OR 97222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503-371-0123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  
Yes ☐ No ☐

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.  
Concerned for the safety of the children at schools located within one block of the proposed stations.  
Congestion on Washington + Monroe, parking in church parking lot at St John the Baptist.  
And also the noise issue.

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: John Hill Rutche E-mail
Address: 5881 SE Hill Pk
Phone number

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

Concerned with the location of train station being close to school. Suggest other locations.

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

Name: Sheryl Ignazio
E-mail: Sheryl@mocrsearch.com
Address: 15219 La Marquina, City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie, OR 97267
Phone number: 503-653-0946

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  Yes  No

Comments (please print): Turn in completed card to project staff.

In all in favor of this project. I hope Metro doesn't let the taxpayers sway their decision to bring Light Rail to Milwaukie. We definitely need more public transportation. I hope this can be resolved soon so that the project can begin. I have an urgent objective no matter where you decide to install Light Rail. In tall it where it will provide the best service and ignore those.


Name: Dorothy Werner Johnson
E-mail:
Address: 9114 SE 29th Ave., City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie, OR 97222
Phone number: 503-654-1306

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  No

Comments (please print): Turn in completed card to project staff.

Please send a route other than right behind St. John Church & Milwaukie High School!
YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: Marie Halsed E-mail: 
Address: 975 1536 Rd City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie Or 97222 
Phone number: 503-654-7956 

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

I am expressing concern over the proposed light rail. Light rail is very costly, I am concerned about the placement of light rail near my house. Thank you.


YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: JOAN BREILICH E-mail: 
Address: 18719 SE River Rd City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie OR 97222 
Phone number: 503-659-7040 

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

The idea of light rail near our school is a very bad idea. I walked my children to school while they were in kindergarten. They did not always stay near the school. They would run ahead not paying attention.

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: Duane Korns
E-mail: Korns1557@comcast.net
Address: 3646 SE Johnson Ct. Block
City/state/ZIP: Portland OR 97222
Phone number: 503 659 6413

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? ☐ Yes ☑ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

I am concerned about the placement of the light rail station near 25th and Washington in Milwaukie. It is too close to Milwaukie Elementary and St. John the Baptist Elementary. It is too close to schools, homes, and commercial area. The resulting traffic, noise, and congestion will be extremely disruptive. There should be an alternative placement in a more commercial setting.
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Email

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 4205 S.E. King Rd.
City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie OR
Phone number: [Redacted]

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

[Redacted]


---

Email

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 8603 S.E. Causen Ave.
City/state/ZIP: Portland, OR 97266
Phone number: 503-650-6667

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

[Redacted]

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: NORMA J. McLEOD  E-mail: N/A
Address: 3120 S.E. CHESTNUT ST  City/state/ZIP: MILWAUKIE, OR 97267
Phone number: (503) 653-7463

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No

Comments (please print): Turn in completed card to project staff.

----------

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: CLAIRE PUTNAM  E-mail: N/A
Address: 2776 S.E. VAN WATERS ST.  City/state/ZIP: MILWAUKIE, OR 97222
Phone number: (503) 653-7451

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No

Comments (please print): Turn in completed card to project staff.

----------

Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name **Ralph Rigdon**  
Address **2417 SE 56th Ave**  
City/state/ZIP **Milwaukie, OR 97222**  
Phone number **503-654-2333**  

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.  

**WE MUST FIND A WAY TO STAY OUT OF DOWNTOWN MILWAUKIE. THIS WILL RUIN THE CITY FOR GOOD. STOP AT SOUTH GATE OR TACOMA ST. THE SCHOOL KIDS WILL BE HURT BY THIS LIGHT RAIL PROJECT. THANKS MUCH!**

**Ralph Rigdon**

---

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.
### Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

#### YOUR OPINION COUNTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ms. Doris Shier</th>
<th>Phone number</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15207 SE La Bonita Way Milwaukie, OR 97267-3057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City/state/ZIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  ☐ Yes ☐ No

**Comments** (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

> I am writing to express my concern over the proposed light rail alignment. The alignment will pass our elementary school within one block of the planned line. This is unacceptable because of the great safety problems for all the children in the area. The noise and disruption is of great concern. Please find alternative placements - consider routes which are not near schools. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

---

### Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

#### YOUR OPINION COUNTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sharon &amp; Larry Spudich</th>
<th>Phone number</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2570 SE Chestnut St.  Milwaukie, OR 97267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City/state/ZIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  ☐ Yes ☐ No

**Comments** (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

> Gentlemen,

> We are gravely concerned about the proposed light rail in the city of Milwaukie. This presents terrible safety and noise problems for children at 4 schools which are very close to the proposed line. Also, parking at my church, St. John the Baptist, would be severely compromised. We beg you to reconsider and place the new light rail in a more safe place. Thank you.

---

Received Jun 10 2008

---
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Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

Name: T. Stucky
Address: 3509 SE Vineyard Rd.
City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie OR 97267
Phone number: ___________

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? 
[ ] Yes [ ] No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

I am writing today to express my grave concern over the current plans for placement by Tri-Met of their new light rail line in the city of Milwaukie. This line is being planned for what is a mixed residential area with schools, parks, and public buildings. I want to protest in the strongest terms and appeal to you to find an alternative route.


Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

Name: ANN TEREZI
Address: 10300 SE Waverly Ct.
City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie OR 97266
Phone number: 503-744-3770

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? 
[ ] Yes [ ] No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

This is my first meeting. I haven't formed an opinion yet. I am concerned about the closeness of the train to schools, environmental noise, and safety.

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: Paul Veichko
Address: 1706 SW Wiley Way
City/state/ZIP: Milw OR 97267
Phone number: 0

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No

Comments (please print): Turn in completed card to project staff.

Please do not put the light rail line in Milw. I am opposed. It needs to be on McLoughlin Blvd. It would not be safe for our children and money for our businesses & schools. Please put it on McLoughlin where it belongs.

Portland-Milwaukie LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

Name: Joan Towner E-mail: 
Address: 3234 SE Harvey St. City/state/ZIP Milwaukie 97222
Phone number: 503-794-3980

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No

Comments (please print): Turn in completed card to project staff.

"If we HAVE to have Light Rail come to Milwaukie, I suggest the terminus on Park Ave."


---

Portland-Milwaukie LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

Name: Mary Vaetz E-mail: 
Address: 5068 S.E. Lake Road Milwaukie
Phone number: 503-659-2422

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No

Comments (please print): Turn in completed card to project staff.

"Keep light rail out of Milwaukie! If you think we need it - consider the interurban rail line from Oregon City to Portland. The line that went by Oaks Park. Light rail costs too much money. You might consider not doing a thing. The light rail will do more harm than good!"
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YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

Name: Beth Wasko
E-mail: bwasko@comcast.com
Address: PO Box 261669
City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie 97269
Phone number: 503-653-5340

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

"Light, we ought to be discussing the details of all of the alternatives — not stations. Light rail — if it goes in — belongs on a transportation corridor."

Thank You!


---

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

Name: John White
E-mail:
Address: 12011 SE 19
City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie 97222
Phone number: 503-513-6809

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

1. Please relocate the light-rail project.
   Keep it out of downtown Milwaukie.
   Protect our schools from noise, extra traffic delays. Keep Milwaukie peaceful and a place where children and young can learn in peace and quiet, also where we can worship at our Church without distraction. — Thank you!

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: Frank Amato
E-mail: Frank@AmatoBooks.com
Address: 3611 S.E. Aldercrest
City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie
Phone number: 503-654-0794

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? Yes ☑ No ☐

Comments (please print): Turn in completed card to project staff.

I STRONGLY OPPOSE THE PLAN TO BRING LIGHT RAIL WITH STATIONS BETWEEN WASHINGTON AND NICOUE STREETS! IT WILL BE A TRAFFIC MESS AND SAFETY THREAT FOR SCHOOL ATTENDING YOUNGSTERS IN THE IMMEDIATE AREA.


YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: Rose Ashby
E-mail:
Address: 2560 SE Beckman Terrace
City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie, OR 97222
Phone number:

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? Yes ☑ No ☐

Comments (please print): Turn in completed card to project staff.

PLEASE rethink the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project. There has got to be a better and more reasonable solution. As it stands now, it is a bad idea. Myself, like many others, voted to not have it at all. I am in agreement. However that I may be needed at some time, but DEFINITEY NOT the route that is proposed or the stops either.

# Portland–Milwaukie Light Rail Project

## Your Opinion Counts

Your written comments will be included in the Portland–Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City/state/ZIP</th>
<th>Phone number</th>
<th>Do you want to be placed on the Portland–Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?</th>
<th>Comments (please print)</th>
<th>Turn in completed card to project staff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candace Houston</td>
<td><a href="mailto:BCHouston2@msn.com">BCHouston2@msn.com</a></td>
<td>13414 SE Walden</td>
<td>Milwaukie, OR</td>
<td>503-786-3906</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>I don’t want a stop at Washington and Railroad. Too many safety issues and lack of parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Lawrence</td>
<td></td>
<td>10920 S.E. 72nd</td>
<td>Milwaukie, OR</td>
<td>503-654-4078</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>This is a very poor place to put a light rail due to schools, children, traffic and most important the number of children from the schools. There is not enough parking. Now I would draw a lot off undesirables that we don’t need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name  Helene Lawrence
E-mail
Address 10280 S.E. 72nd  City/state/ZIP Milwaukie, OR 97222
Phone number 503-4077

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  □ Yes  □ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

I have great concern over the plan for the L.R.L. in the city of Milwaukie. It is to close to 4 schools, a church, and too much traffic. Noise. For children trying to learn and church activities. Since the woman was attacked, who protects the children? Strangers would have access to our playgrounds. The children would be in danger not to mention the increase in traffic.


---

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name  Karen J. Myers
E-mail
Address 3840 SE. Sunset Court  City/state/ZIP Milwaukie, OR 97267-3836
Phone number 503-659-926

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  □ Yes  □ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

A light rail service to Milwaukie is needed, but am genuinely surprised at the proposed site on S.E. 72nd and railroad line. That location would cause a series of safety, congestion and environmental issues. Please reconsider Washington St. as a station site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Debra Sumner</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>13513 SE Oakfield Rd</td>
<td>City/state/ZIP Milwaukie, OR 97222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number</td>
<td>503 656-2678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (please print)</td>
<td>I would like to protest, in the strongest of terms, the current plan for the new light rail line in the city of Milwaukie, and appeal to you to help and find an alternative placement. The safety of all children and the noise disturbance during the school hours is of great concern of mine, as well as thousands of others. How about rebuilding the Portland-Oregon City Line via Milwaukie. Thank you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Martha Talasky</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>622 SE Pinecrest</td>
<td>City/state/ZIP Milwaukie, OR 97267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (please print)</td>
<td>I believe this new line going by our schools is a mistake. With the traffic congestion, limited parking space, and crime, it will turn the city of Milwaukie into a mass transit station only. It would be better to run a bridge over McLoughlin and run it to the west side of Milwaukie. This worked for many years in the past and use park street as the parking garage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Portland–Milwaukie
LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: Shelley Vernon  E-mail: N/A
Address: 13528 SE Rislely Ct. City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie, OR 97267
Phone number: N/A
Do you want to be placed on the Portland–Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No
Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.
No comment at this time would like to know a more about and way is it going?


---

Portland–Milwaukie
LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: Valerie Aschbacker  E-mail: aschbacker@comcast.net
Address: 15141 SE Hickey Ct. City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie, OR 97267
Phone number: 503-659-8259
Do you want to be placed on the Portland–Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No
Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.
I have been told that the opportunity to provide written comments during the 45-day period is “merely a formality” and that giving public testimony is “just like talking to a wall.” City & Metro Council members have indicated it is too late to do anything about determining the route of light rail. Considering this process takes place at the end of the study, it causes me to raise the question — does the general public have a say in determining routes, or is this only an insignificant, yet required step in the process?

Make your voice heard!
May 9 to noon June 23, 2008

The Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Project is nearing the public comment phase and we're looking for your input. Learn about the project choices and what the analysis uncovered. See what the impacts of the project look like. Let decision-makers know what you think. After the 45-day public comment period, the project Steering Committee will use the public comments, along with a recommendation from the Citizen Advisory Committee and technical findings, to make a recommendation. This will go to each local jurisdiction who will forward a recommendation to the Metro Council for a vote in mid-summer.

For a copy of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement or project news and updates, visit www.oregonmetro.gov/southcorridor or call 503-797-1756.

The safety concerns related to children and schools should be addressed in any of the produced printed materials.
Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.

Name: Kenneth Moffele
E-mail: 
Address: 18373 SE 41st
City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie, OR 97222
Phone number: 503-686-9919

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No

Comments (please print): I strongly protest the current plan for placement by the city of new light rail in the city of Milwaukie. There are several grave, enormous, and irrefutable arguments that clearly provide light rail service in the area of new schools and avoiding the problems that the present plan would cause. Thank you for attention to this important issue.


Sincerely,
Kenneth Moffele
Your opinion counts

Name: Virginia Muffenglee
E-mail:
Address: 12345 67th St
City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie, OR 97222
Phone number: 503-654-7919

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes ☒ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

I am writing to express my concern over the plan for placement by Tri-Met of their new light rail in the City of Milwaukie. This line is being planned for what is mixed residential area with four elementary schools. Either right next to or within one block of the planned line. This situation would bring grave safety problems for the children of this area and noise for the children's school hours.


I want to protest in the strongest of terms the current plan and appeal to you to help find alternative placement. There are superior alternate routes to consider that would not bring the huge problems that this plan would. Thank you.

Virginia Muffenglee
Portland–Milwaukie
LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: Robert Cosper
E-mail:
Address: 2560 SE Evergreen
City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie, OR 97222
Phone number: 503-653-7719

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

[Blank space for comments]

[Signature]


---

Portland–Milwaukie
LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: Mary D’Costa
E-mail:
Address: 1895 SE 25th Ave.
City/state/ZIP: OR 97222
Phone number: 503-654-6549

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

I think and I’m encouraged that the light rail should go through NE 19th because Milwaukie and its beautiful quiet downtown which has its own culture should be protected from violence, crime, and environmental noise issues. Secondly, safety and learning of our four neighboring schools and two churches is a huge issue since the


[Signature]
Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

**YOUR OPINION COUNTS**

Name: Erna Nguyen  
E-mail:  
Address:  
City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie, OR 97222  
Phone number: 503-680-2615  

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  
[ ] Yes  [ ] No  

Comments (please print):  
I am going for both of the CPA because I believe that it would beneficial for the people living in Milwaukie, because it would be easier for people since gas prices are higher.

——

Metro | People places. Open spaces.  
www.oregonmetro.gov

——

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

**YOUR OPINION COUNTS**

Name: Ralph Biedron  
E-mail:  
Address:  
City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie, OR 97222  
Phone number: 541-233-5

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  
[ ] Yes  [ ] No  

Comments (please print):  
We must stop light rail before it gets to downtown Milwaukie. Light rail will destroy the quaint downtown atmosphere and be bad for the schools. Please consider not going into downtown Milwaukie.

——

Metro | People places. Open spaces.  
www.oregonmetro.gov

——
Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing today to express my grave concern over the current plan for placement by Tri-met of their new light rail line in the city of Milwaukie. This line is being planned for what is essentially a mixed residential area with four elementary schools either right next to or within one block of the planned line. This situation is especially untenable because of the potentially grave safety problems for the children of this area. Noise disruption for children during school hours is also of great concern. I want to protest in the strongest of terms the current plan and appeal to you to help find alternative placement. TriMet needs to consider alternate routes which are nearby and far superior alternate routes providing light rail service without the huge problems that come with the present plan. Thank you for attention to this important issue.

Maggie (wants)

[Signatures]
Portland–Milwaukie
LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: ROSS SWANSON
E-mail

Address: 5022 SE 21ST
City/state/ZIP

Phone number: 503.233.2828

Do you want to be placed on the Portland–Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff:

PLEASE BUILD HAROLD STOP AT THIS GO-AROUND. THE NEIGHBORHOOD HAS SUPPORTED THIS WITH ACTIONS - i.e., UPONING - DEFERRING THE COST BY DELAYING CONSTRUCTION. A PHASE I - WOULD NOT BE WORTH THE FEE SAVED AT THIS PHASE - INFLATION - MOBILIZATION - DESIGN FEES. THE OMission OF THIS STOP WOULD CREATE A GAP IN THE SYSTEM.

I UNDERSTAND YOUR ASSUMPTIONS CREATE A POOR PERFORMING STOP - BUT THE STOP LOCATION IS A GOOD IDEA. PLEASE DON'T DEVELOP THE ALIGNMENT OR THE NEIGHBORHOOD BY NOT BUILDING HAROLD.
Your opinion counts

Name: H. Wacker
Address: [redacted]
City/state/ZIP: Milwaukee, WI
Phone number: 503-659-7760

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukee Light Rail Project mailing list? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Comments (please print): Turn in completed card to project staff.

Is there any way this light rail line could serve the Riverplace area early, so we could walk easily to Arlene Schnitzer concert hall and other events in summer? Is it feasible to extend it to the Northeast Portland area, or are there other more efficient ways to serve that area? Would it be possible to extend it further to serve the Milwaukie area? What are the possible costs of extending this line to Milwaukie?


More design work needs to be done on the 17th St. design. Too many industrial buildings are ruined with the current design, destroying the vitality of this industrial area and making the light rail itself less useful to the area. Perhaps moving some traffic to another through street is the answer.

The alternative map of 2003 LPA with terminus at Park Avenue permits many people from South and East of Milwaukie to Park & Ride, handle, or take buses to and from stations. How ever, the Washington St. station on this map does not make sense, nor does the Bluebird station. Could stations at Park, Monroe & Milwaukie be the only stations in Milwaukie?

What plans might be possible for extending this light rail line further south in 2030 or beyond? I would like to know these plans before committing to a selection of stations in Milwaukie.

Thanks for this opportunity to comment.
City of Milwaukie Comment Card

Your feedback is important to us!

Name: Beverly Dinhman
Address: 1230 SE 255 Ave, Milwaukie, OR 97262
Phone: 503-653-1230
Email: beverly.dinhman@hot.com

My comment is:

I am in support of Park Ave.

I believe I live very near Park

also, I love the new parks.

I am not sure what support I am.

I still want some support.

I understand the new parks.

I would like to be added to the City's weekly email list.

I would like to receive the City's newsletter, The Pilot, in the mail.
My name is Sean Murray and I live at 2043 SE Ellis which is 1 block south, and 1 block west of the proposed Harold Street Station

I represent a group of 25 neighbors in 13 surrounding homes who all support the Station.

While we know that the light rail, and our station may be years away, the decisions you are making are impacting our neighborhood now.

Our group was first organized in opposition to a developer who has proposed to build a 60 foot tall, 7 unit apartment complex in the center of our residential block. As we learned more about the zoning and the light rail issues driving this development we decided to get more involved.

Of all of the areas bordering the Portland to Milwaukie route, North Moreland is unique in providing high density zoning and relatively affordable property adjacent to an established and popular neighborhood. As we have already seen, development of this end of Sellwood is inevitable. The question remaining to be answered is what type of development we will see.

We believe that the addition of the Harold Street station can be the cornerstone for rebuilding north Moreland into a dynamic neighborhood of affordable, family centered homes.

With light rail access provided by the Harold Street Station, the incentive for investment to renovate existing housing and develop quality multi-family housing is much higher. Besides increasing light rail ridership, this type of development will lead to stability in the local schools, and increased support for local businesses.

Without inclusion of the station, our neighborhood will remain a mis-zoned oddity. With the combination of high density requirements, and “cheap” property due to limited transportation access, I believe that we will see more car centered, single lot developments forced into the neighborhood.

This will lead to reduced property values, lack of cohesive communities, and reduced quality of place. I do not believe that this type of development is in anyone’s best interests.

Please take these factors, and the strong support from the neighborhood into your decision, and include the Harold Street Station in your plan.
YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: Valerie Aschbacher  
E-mail: aschbauv@comcast.net
Address: 15141 SE Hickory Ct.  
City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie, OR 97267
Phone number: 503-657-8259

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  
□ Yes  □ No

Comments (please print): Turn in completed card to project staff.

* Which of these 2 groups does a marketing analysis?

* Do these factors carefully consider?  

* Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project
Your written name will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

Name: Valerie Ascbacher
Address: 15141 SE Hickory Ct.  City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie, OR 97267
Phone number:  
Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No
Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

\[ \text{I would like to feel as proud of my community of Milwaukie, as I do of my greater community of Portland.} \]

\[ \text{I would like a streetcar to connect Sellwood, downtown Milwaukie, Kellogg Lake/Westmore, hospitals/clinics/schools, etc.} \]

\[ \text{Metro | People places. Open spaces. www.oregonmetro.gov} \]

Your written name will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Public Comment Report. The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.

Name: Valerie Ascbacher
Address: 15141 SE Hickory Ct.  City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie, OR 97267
Phone number:  
Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? □ Yes □ No
Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

\[ \text{I would like the peace & serenity of my place of worship to be respected and given serious regard in the placement of stations in Milwaukie.} \]

\[ \text{Do not put a station within 2 blocks of St. John the Baptist Catholic Church.} \]

\[ \text{Metro | People places. Open spaces. www.oregonmetro.gov} \]
YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name Craig Anderson
E-mail Craig.A.Ramberg@PAC.com
Address 2730 SE 15th Ave
City/state/ZIP Portland, OR 97202
Phone number 503-232-1060

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

The report will be provided to project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration.


YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name Jeanette D. Eckman
E-mail
Address 12309 SE 41st
City/state/ZIP Milwaukie, OR 97222
Phone number 503-654-9179

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list? ☐ Yes ☑ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

We live right off of Lake Road and object to the transit station at the end of Lake Rd. (Traffic is bad now) but will be worse.
Milwaukie does not need a Max thru.

Downtown Milwaukie - suggest connect to MAX line by Clackamas Town Center and run to Oregon City will serve more passengers.


SDEIS Public Comment Report
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**Your Opinion Counts**

**Name:** Harold Eckman  
**E-mail:** ——

**Address:** 1330A SE 41ST CT  
City/state/ZIP: Milwaukee, WI 53222

**Phone number:** 523-654-9174

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

**Comments** (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

Milwaukee has enough crime now, bring the light rail to Milwaukee! Who needs more crime.

This light rail will be the end to down town Milwaukee, it will add nothing to our city, but people passing through to go to work and go back home, no station on Lake Road or light rail in Milwaukee.


---

**Your Opinion Counts**

**Name:** Valerie Aschberger  
**E-mail:** aschberger@concast.net

**Address:** 1541 SE Hickey St.  
City/state/ZIP: Milwaukee, WI 53207

**Phone number:** 523-654-6257

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

**Comments** (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

The people of the South Corridor region, including Milwaukee, have waited for over 20 years for the light rail system to serve this area and now it seems, based on the promise and structure of the SDEIS we are being bullied and held hostage to only two choices – to build or not to build. How did we end up with ‘no real options’? We are forced to accept an illegal predetermined path or have the promise of a light rail taken away from us, again.

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Name: Carrie Strader  E-mail: cstrader@amstrong
Address: 3726 SE King Rd  City/state/ZIP: Milwaukie
Phone number: 

Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

Please locate Monroe/Harrison Street Station option at Vaughn Street.  
Not Harrison Street! Should also stay on McLoughlin Blvd.

To Metro Council, the South Corridor Light Rail Steering Committee, and its Citizen Advisory Council:

I would like to take this opportunity to submit an additional statement regarding the proposed Portland-Milwaukie South Corridor light rail project, particularly with respect to possible alignments.

My name is Elizabeth Clark Agosti, and I am a director and shareholder of Holman Distribution Center of Oregon. HDCO occupies approximately 7 acres in the northerly portion North Milwaukie Industrial District, located between SE McCloughlin Blvd. and the Union Pacific Tillamook rail line, south of the Tacoma overpass and north of Highway 224. HDCO borders SE Main at SE Beta, with its headquarters at 2300 SE Beta St. Holman has operated public warehousing activities here for approximately 50 years, currently out of its 200,000 square foot facility. This family-owned company and its lessee at this facility support approximately 60 family-wage jobs and make important contributions to the district's tax base.

I wish to thank Metro, Tri-Met, and City of Milwaukee Planning staff for their thorough and helpful presentations of the planning process for this project over the past year as this planning has unfolded. They have shown interest in the effects of light rail upon our industrial operations, which has required interest in those operations and in our industry. The central principal I have conveyed to them I reiterate to you: the issue for my company and its industrial neighbors that the underlying industrial zoning designation is arguably designed to protect, is the need for flexibility — over time — of these warehouse and distribution operations which, over the years, have been increasingly (if necessarily) impinged upon by regional and local development and regulatory decisionmaking.

Congestion, Traffic and Operational Impacts. Even accurate queuing and traffic analyses do not address impacts to businesses that are characterized by changing accounts, changing inventories, and changing shipping patterns over time. Our truck staging and rail activity can accelerate or relax in a matter of months with changes in warehouse accounts and tenants. We expect this. For example, the building functioned for many years for food storage and handling — and the servicing of those accounts often occupied most of our 40 north-facing truck bays daily... with 100 daily outbound orders regularly shipping at peak hours, not to mention inbound freight. Our nearby Clackamas facility currently services large food storage accounts... with accompanying active truck staging and high traffic patterns. Presently, our Milwaukee account and tenant mix differs and produces different traffic patterns but — I emphasize — this can change, and this business depends on the flexibility to allow for that change.

The underlying industrial zoning designation validates the need for and protects that flexibility — and our main concerns reflect our support of 2004 Working Group Alternative, aligning light rail along the Union Pacific Tillamook Branch rail lines to the east of this industrial district. We are concerned that, under the current LPA's Main Street alignment, any additional traffic on Main will combine with light rail traffic to increasingly constrict freight access to this area. Freight and rail access to and from this district need to be protected. The Tillamook Branch alignment avoids these operational impacts by bypassing Main St., active rail spurs, and industrial business operations in this North Milwaukie Industrial Area. Yet even the Tillamook Branch construction may require Holman to temporarily relocate large rail-served accounts from its Milwaukee facility to its Clackamas warehouse, a substantial expense. But Holman would accommodate disruptions in access to our rail spur during construction of the Tillamook Branch alignment because of the longer term benefits and protections this alignment represents.

Light rail trip estimates have been stated as introducing rail every 7.5 minutes in each direction at peak hours, and every 15 minutes otherwise. This produces peak hour interruption every 3.5 minutes, with a gate at Ochoco and perhaps Milport, with 90-second gate time reducing that 3.5 minute window to 2 minutes... independent of the effect of traffic signaling at Ochoco. Thus, Holman and its industrial neighbors are concerned that the
current LPA introduces unavoidable congestion and freight disruption to this industrial district. Milwaukie Street Surface Maintenance Program Fee relies on freight traffic estimates of 782 trips/day and peak numbers at Ochoco at 255... 100 of these heavy freight. Even at 50% levels, daily trips from our site would pose challenges at Ochoco with these small windows of clearance times.

Even the best estimates of traffic counts rely upon historical trends and observations. Yet I emphasize that our industry is not characterized by trends or snapshots at a given time or period. Our freight activity and traffic demands can change with any major account that we secure... and has. This 200,000 sq ft facility may be operating two years from now fully as public warehousing with different accounts than at any other time, and needing different access and services. It may shift more to rail... this may increase truck shipments in turn. Thus, my now nagging request to protect flexibility for uses in this industrial area.

Parking. Finally, the Draft EIS shows that the LPA requires taking property up to the western walls of our warehouse and office in order to restore some street parking lost by rail placement. This sacrifices all of our management parking at headquarters, which cannot operate efficiently without dedicated parking. If the LPA is approved, we earnestly request dedicated parking abutting the west side of our building to replace lost Holman and management and lessee parking. We lease a large portion of the building for Z-Pro's headquarters, which also leases a modest number of parking spaces. Any future lessee will also require some dedicated parking to serve its operations in the facility because remaining blacktop is joint staging area for large commercial truck trailers, and we have not yet decided to convert this portion of the facility back to public warehousing. Apart from lost parking, HDCO has some concern as to whether vibration damage to our warehouse can be avoided in such close proximity to both motor vehicle and light rail traffic lanes.

Thank you for the ongoing consideration that has been shown Holman by Metro, Tri-Met, and City of Milwaukie planners. I do not envy your challenges. I do ask that you closely consider those faced in the North Milwaukie Industrial District as you move the process forward. I appreciate your efforts and look forward to the outcome.

Respectfully,

Elizabeth Clark Agosti, Chair
Holman Distribution Center of Oregon
Holman Distribution Center of Washington
Hawthorne Investment Company
2300 SE Beta Street
Milwaukie, Oregon 97222
O: 503.652.1912
F: 503.652.1970

-----Original Message-----
From: Campbell, Alexander [mailto:CampbellA@ci.milwaukie.or.us]
Sent: Friday, May 09, 2008 9:08 AM
To: Campbell, Alexander
Cc: Asher, Kenny
Subject: [SPAM] - Portland Milwaukie LRT SDEIS available - Email has different SMTP TO: and MIME TO: fields in the email addresses

The entire SDEIS is now available...
See: http://www.oregonmetro.gov/index.cfm/go/by.web/id=27496

The topics that I think you all are probably most interested in are in Chapter 4, at:
Key pages are:
For parking impacts: see page 4-29
For traffic impacts: see pages 4-38 to 4-40 and the following table.
Freight-specific traffic impacts are on pages 4-45 to 4-47

As you will see, if you care to peruse the documents themselves, the information provided is not very detailed at the level of particular intersections. I've requested a copy of the Traffic Results Report and will share the key
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Trans System Accounts - Objection to Max

From:   <delana3@aol.com>
To:     <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date:   6/23/2008 5:21 PM
Subject: Objection to Max

Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail. We don't need max light rail at all. It's a waste of our money and too dangerous to ride with no police on the train. the biggest waste I've ever heard of. Put the money in our bumpy roads around Milwaukie.
Thank you Delana Alford.

Get the Moviefone Toolbar. Showtimes, theaters, movie news, & more!
Jenn Tuerk - SUPPORT: Light Rail to Milwaukie Oregon

From: Denise Hawley <dhawley@pacificstar.biz>
To: "jenn.tuerk@oregonmetro.gov" <jenn.tuerk@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/19/2008 1:37 PM
Subject: SUPPORT: Light Rail to Milwaukie Oregon

To Whom it may Concern

I am writing to support light rail to Milwaukie Oregon. This line continues the region's transit and rail network. More importantly, it means that people are able to get to work and offers an alternative to cars. This makes perfect sense and this alignment is a good one. Finally, it provides a new and needed crossing over the Willamette that will have a number of beneficial affects including streetcar.

Please fund it and build it.

Sincerely,

Joe Angel

Denise Hawley
On behalf of Joseph Angel
Executive Assistant to Joseph W. Angel
1001 SE Water Avenue, Suite 450
Portland, OR 97214
(503) 525-9100 voice
(503) 296-5996 fax
dhawley@pacificstar.biz

please consider the environment before printing this email
Dear Ladies or Gentlemen

The Oak Lodge Sanitary District provides sanitary and stormwater utility services for the unincorporated area between Milwaukie and Gladstone. The Proposed Park Avenue terminus and parking structure is located in the District adjoining one of our facilities. In regards to the South Corridor SDEIS, the District has the following comments:

Table 3.9-3 and Page 3-97 of the environmental impact statement indicate that crossing Courtney Springs Creek will utilize existing structures. Previously the District informed the Metro engineering consultant that these culvert pipes are privately owned and in poor condition. The proposed plan requires Tri-Met to acquire one of these private culverts and locate the proposed train terminus directly over the pipe.

The condition and capacity of this pipe is highly suspect and definitely not suitable for supporting a critical public facility such as light rail trackage. Additionally the proposed parking structure will be located over another suspect section of culvert pipe. These pipes serve approximately 400 acres of watershed and failure would result in both environmental and property damage.

Table 3.8-4 does not list any water quality parameters for Courtney Springs Creek or Kellogg Lake/Creek. These streams are tributary to the Willamette River and are subject to the established DEQ Willamette River Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) requirements for Temperature, bacteria (e coli or fecal coliform), and Mercury. These streams and parameters are listed on the Oak Lodge Sanitary District Municipal Stormwater permit.

Additionally the DEQ 303D list applies to these water bodies which will include Aldrin, DDT, DDE, Dieldrin, iron, manganese, PCB, PAH, and Pentachlorophenol as water quality limited parameters.

The Oak Lodge Sanitary District requests that the SDEIS respond to the concerns mentioned above.

Sincerely

Brett Arvidson PE
Manager of Planning and Engineering
Oak Lodge Sanitary District
14611 SE River Rd.
Milwaukie, OR 97267
503-653-1653
Hello,

I've recently moved back to Portland after ten years in Spokane, WA. I grew up in Milwaukie/Oak Grove, and remember when I was ~8 years old of the exciting prospect of getting the MAX to run south near where I lived.

Recently, I was alerted to the revival of this project with the proposed expansion of the MAX and Streetcar systems.

I currently live on Park Ave. downtown between the Portland Art Museum and PSU. Since moving here just over two months ago I have not once had to drive my car. A combination of Streetcar, MAX, Tri-Met bus, and bicycling has allowed me to conveniently and quickly reach every corner of the city; except one. I have friends in Northwest, some in North Portland, and still more off East Burnside. Portland has created a way for me to get from the heart of the city to each of these areas with little fuss.

However, most all of my family lives in Milwaukie/Clackamas/Oak Grove. Currently the most convenient way to reach them without resorting to driving has been to ride my bike all the way down along the river using the Springwater Corridor trail. I appreciate it as a cyclist, but as a route for daily commuting or weekend shopping it's hardly a tenable solution.

I've looked over the documentation for this project available at http://www.metro-region.org/index.cfm/go/by.web/id/223

After having done so I'm left with a few questions.

Why is the purpose of the MAX being conflated with the Streetcar? There seems to be a lot of pressure to integrate South Waterfront along the MAX, but there seems to be no recognition that it already is. With the Mall Transit line going in; the existing MAX line running East/West through downtown makes it a single train transfer to go all the way down to the South Waterfront. For that matter, both the existing Streetcar and the Mall Transit provide this function.

So, what do you gain by running a MAX line almost entirely disconnected from the rest of the MAX infrastructure? It seems like what you gain is the expense of a bridge, an inability to use the MAX as a complete sub-urban commuter rail (as you create a disjoint for getting from North and East to South without making at least two train transfers), and an inability to easily shuffle trains between operating lines.

The South Waterfront is a district of Portland, and that's what the Streetcars are designed to connect; Districts and neighborhoods, or at least that's the apparent condition; regardless of the intent. South Waterfront will soon have two such lines running through Portland to service that area. Running the MAX through there seems dubious at best (considering the construction expense and
transit/transfer snafus).

Why not build the MAX line heading south as a continuation of the path taken by the yellow-line that runs north; using the Rose Garden Transit Center as the branch point? This appears to be the idea behind the I-205 corridor line extension from Gateway to Clackamas/Sunnyside. It's a reasonable course. It leverages existing infrastructure, services the growing East Bank restoration, and provides rail access to an area currently only supported by Grand Ave. & MLK Blvd. Not to mention you put OMSI and the Opera House on the line. More importantly it doesn't pervert the role of the MAX system in the overall landscape of Portland's public transit initiatives.

Why is the population growth along Hwy 224 and the economic downturn along south 99E being ignored? McLoughlin Blvd is already serviced well by the Tri-Met system, and most of the population growth and retail expansions have moved away from the Willamette toward 224. Why run the new line through a ghost-town? The time to run the MAX down McLoughlin was 20-years ago. Along 224 you have the industrial parks, local attractions like Bob's Red Mill, and growing retail land use, not to mention ample land for Park-and-Ride centers. The industrial parks alone seemingly drive the conclusion to run the MAX along 224; being that it is a commuter train, yet it is ultimately ignored.

Lastly, I'd like to make a suggestion. Keep the MAX as a long-distance city commuter that is the cardinal direction backbone for mass-transit. Connect neighborhoods with Streetcars. You could connect Hollywood to Downtown Milwaukie Waterfront through a multi-phase Streetcar project that individually serviced the unique districts that stretch along the way (Burnside, Belmont, Hawthorne, Division, Brooklyn, West Moreland, and Sellwood).

It seems like the MAX needs to be the backbone, the Streetcars are the ribs, and the buses ought to be the last-mile service that fills in the gaps.

Thanks so much for your time,

Nathan Aschbacher

Cell Sixty-One | Field Marshal | 503.290.2526 | nathan@cellsixtyone.com

P.S. Thank you for all your hard work making Portland the wonderful place it is. Portland is the most progressive and forward thinking city I've witnessed in the United States, and I appreciate all you have done in playing a part in creating that reality. This city has become a model for others nationwide.
From: Valerie Aschbacher <aschbacv@comcast.net>
To: <trans@metro.dst.or.us>
Date: 6/9/2008 8:26 PM
Subject: Public Hearing June 9 5:30-8:30 p.m.

Dear Metro Portland-Milwaukie Public Hearing Committee

Yesterday, I became increasingly interested in the proposed light rail lines as a result of my parish community being directly impacted by the proposed Washington OR Monroe St. Station stops. I spent all of early afternoon, evening and into the early morning reading and analyzing the downloaded versions of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, including portions of the expanded version, and other prior reports referenced in the document. I printed many chapters to study further and prepared both questions/comments to present to the Public Hearing.

I took enough interest, as a public citizen, to review facts, make notes, and did not retire for rest until about 3 a.m. Then today I worked from 9 - 6 p.m., grabbed a bite to eat and then drove my car into PDX from my home southeast of Milwaukie - consumed high cost fuel, added to pollution, contributed to commuter traffic congestion, until I located the building of the public hearing. Then, I circled the building twice, paid to park, walked up/down the perimeter sidewalks to find the open entrance - only to be greeted by the security guard who told me the meeting had disbanded.

When I stated, the website says the public hearing is from 5:30 - 8:30 p.m., and it is now 7:03... he interrupted by telling me "only 10 people showed up to testify, when they were done, everybody left". This is the first time in my life I have taken such an interest in presenting my concerns, as a citizen in a public hearing, and there is nothing on the website to indicate, the meeting ends after nobody else is left to testify. This is very discouraging and upsetting, and costly to me in time and money.

I guess what I was told is correct - you really don't want to hear what "the people" have to say about it.

Disgusted, and now also angry -

Valerie E. Aschbacher
Trans System Accounts - Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Comments

From: gregory baartz-bowman <baartzbowman@yahoo.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/23/2008 11:52 AM
Subject: Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Comments

Portland to Milwaukie SDEIS

Questions, Comments and Concerns About the Tillamook Alignment Through Historic Milwaukie

Why are other reasonable and viable alternatives not studied in the detailed manner given the Tillamook Alignment? The area between Highway 224 to the north and Lake Road to the south is negligent in the SDEIS and in violation of NEPA regulations in the regard of the study of alternatives, such McLoughlin Blvd., Main St./21st Ave couplet, and Hwy. 224.

The citizens of Milwaukie have TWICE rejected Metro/Trimet plans to bring light rail to Milwaukie, an event which will change the character of this small city forever. NEPA regulations require SDEIS this information be included for study in SDEIS. Why has this information been omitted?

The conflict of interest of Mayor Jim Barnard, a landowner of adjacent property to Light rail tracks and possible LR station in Historic Milwaukie. Mayor Barnard sits on Milwaukie City Council, which charts, directs and implements Milwaukie's Light Rail policy. Mayor Barnard also sits on the South Corridor Steering Committee which recommends to Metro how the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Corridor should be built. The Mayor's participation in his present form is illegal. Why allow the Mayor this conflict of interest?

The close proximity of freight and light rail increases the riders of light rail safety. Incidents in Littleton, Co and San Diego, Ca light rail vehicles highlight the Federal Railroad Administration warning that Light Rail Vehicles are NON-COMPLAINT in crash worthiness with Freight Trains. Light Rail will run within 16.5 feet of Freight in Historic Milwaukie, well within the danger zone for a collision. This reason alone merits the inclusion of viable alternatives in the SDEIS. Why is this danger not studied in the SDEIS.

The impact on schools, churches, and homes will be significant and permanent. Viable alternatives exist that will place the Light Rail line along commuter corridors, such as Hwy. 224 or McLoughlin Blvd. or along the commercial/mixed use area of Main St./21st ave. Again why have viable alternatives been.
omitted or ruled out without significant study?

Thank you for your time.

Stephanie and Gregory Baartz-Bowman
10677 se 28th Avenue
Milwaukie, Oregon 97222
503.654.8141
Trans System Accounts - SE Harold St. stop on South Corridor line

From: rhonda banks <rhondabanx@hotmail.com>
To: <trans@metro-region.org>
Date: 6/2/2008 6:46 PM
Subject: SE Harold St. stop on South Corridor line

I am writing to comment on the usefulness of a South Corridor MAX stop at SE Harold St. When I chose to buy a house in this neighborhood in 2005, one of the main reasons was the close-in location that provided availability of flexible public transportation to areas around Portland as well as south into Clackamas County. Our household has since shifted from two cars to one and we have become frequent public transportation users. We knew of the plan to have a MAX stop at this location and it was part of our decision making process. I will be a user of the new MAX line when it is completed and I urge to keep the Harold St stop in the plan. It keeps the availability of public transportation within reach of this whole neighborhood of people who will otherwise have to walk a significant distance to utilize the line, thus making it less likely that they will choose public transport. Let's get people out of cars and onto the MAX! Make it useable for the people of Westmoreland and keep the stop at SE Harold St.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rhonda Banks
SE 20th Ave
Portland, OR

Change the world with e-mail. Join the I'm Initiative from Microsoft.
From: Jason Barbour <portland@KAQJ.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/22/2008 11:57 PM
Subject: Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Public Comment

Although I have been unable to review the project materials in their entirety, I wish to provide these comments as a public transit user before the end of the public comment period.

First, I'm extremely surprised that some of the light rail stop locations seem to be "set in stone." I believe that eliminating the Rhine St. and Holgate Blvd. stops and replacing them with a stop at Center St. would better serve the Brooklyn Neighborhood (of which I am a former resident) as a whole, not to mention TriMet's main offices, Portland Public Schools' Brooklyn School property (currently the home of Winterhaven School and as I understand a site the district may build a new building on someday), Portland General Electric's offices only a few blocks away (and closer than the stops on Rhine and Holgate).

Additionally, the neighborhood is asking for better bike/pedestrian connections than Holgate Blvd. and a rickety pedestrian overpass over the Union Pacific tracks at Lafayette St.--Center St. would seem like a logical location for future enhancements, especially since it was historically designed to be the "Center" of the Brooklyn neighborhood (hence the name of the street).

Finally, I believe that combining the stops would attract more legitimate transit users to a single location, making it more attractive to those who are riding transit for a legitimate reason, rather than cause problems. In my opinion, additional legitimate users enhances perceived security during the night and during periods of poor weather, making it more ideal for those nervous about transit security issues.

When those who are the type that don't cause problems always outnumber the small amount of those who do, I believe that crime would be less likely to occur.

Development in neighborhoods near transit stops should be done in a way that those who need to use transit have the opportunity to live close by, rather than get pushed out when high-end condos and "affordable housing" (which encourages people to have low-paying jobs because if they make too much money they have to leave). A business owner at an Open House I attended said his employees would probably use light rail service if it existed, yet also said he would probably get an 'offer he couldn't refuse' on the property, and relocate to elsewhere in the area, regardless of the transit service available there.

Care should be taken to ensure that quality and span of transit service is not lost. For example, some TriMet bus lines leave downtown at 1:32 AM as their last outbound run of the night. If the final trip on light rail is several hours before this, it should be made sure that alternate bus service is still available. Trips that take one bus now shouldn't require a transfer in the future. Bus routes should still connect destinations with destinations... not just feed the light rail line.

I feel Jim Howell's suggestion of an Eastside alignment is a worthy one, especially if the system needs additional capacity outside of downtown, and/or the community thinks funds currently allocated to the Willamette River Bridge portion of the project would be better spent elsewhere (Disclosure note: although I'm involved with Multnomah County's Sellwood Bridge Project, I'm not referring to it, nor am I endorsing this viewpoint... only saying that if others in the community think this is a good idea, this should be an option.).
Finally, easier access for OHSU would mean longer travel times for everyone else. South Waterfront already has the streetcar, and OHSU already has the tram. Not everyone is trying to access OHSU, and for that matter, many who are riding transit are going across town beyond Downtown Portland. Increased travel times of only a minute could mean an extended wait for connecting to other transit service, especially if it’s a route that runs less frequently than every 15 minutes (such as every 30 or 60 minutes).

Respectfully submitted,
Jason Barbour
5817 SE Gladstone St.
Portland, OR 97206
Jenn Tuerk - Fwd: Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

From: Lake McTighe
To: Tuerk, Jenn
Date: 6/12/2008 4:34 PM
Subject: Fwd: Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

For the record.

David will be responding

>>> Elizabeth Bartholomew <sportznut1@msn.com> 6/12/2008 10:58 AM >>>
June 12, 2008

To those who are making these decisions:

Before you even consider this project you should address all the safety concerns the rest of light rail faces on every train at all hours, the drugs, the thugs, the predators, the harassment issues etc. that all riders face daily. Safety policies for all trains should be in place and officers hired to perform these duties.

I once used public transportation to travel downtown, to the airport and other destinations but now the $4.00 plus a gallon is a real bargain compared to using public transportation.

Also, considering the location of Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project with the station on the corner of Washington Street in the vicinity of four schools is lunacy. The traffic would be the worst congestion you can even imagine, both for the riders, the students, their parents, the teachers and other workers at these schools. With the frequency of the trains, so many streets would be closed every three or so minutes traffic would be lined up for blocks.

It seems every election we are urged to approve more taxes etc. for the children, well you had better reconsider this action for the children and their safety.

Hope someone who is involved in this has enough common sense to convince the other to really think this thing thru.

Elizabeth Bartholomew, 503-652-2203
a member of St. John the Baptist Catholic Church

file://C:\Documents and Settings\tuerk\Local Settings\Temp\XPgrpwise\48515015MetCen... 6/16/2008
I just wanted to let you know that I favor the Harold Street Station on the proposed Max line via McLaughlin Blvd from Portland to Oregon City eventually.

I agree with the Editor of the Sellwood Bee that your proposal to scrap the station because Clackamas County residents wouldn't ride the max line because of an extra 1 minute delay at this station. Since computer models output is only as good as the input, it begs the question what did you input to your model to get that result?

I agree with the reasons stated in the Bee that your conclusion seems ludicrous because of such realities as: the high price of gasoline, increased traffic on McLaughlin and other feeder routes, increased population over the coming years that will only make traffic worse and light rail more attractive, the Westmoreland neighborhood and its association have approved the project with the Harold Street Station, and virtually eliminate light rail to the Reed College neighborhood for lack of an access to the Harold Street station.

In addition to those reasons I would like to add a couple more: The Westmoreland neighborhood is becoming increasingly more densely populated. Almost all dwellings that have been built in recent years on vacant property or on property where a dwelling was torn down have been multi-resident properties. Secondly, if there is only a station at Bybee and Holgate, those people who would mostly likely be serviced by a Harold Street station could end up driving to the Bybee or Holgate stations. Neither neighborhood can support that kind of increased parking traffic. A third reason is that a Harold Street station would encourage foot and bicycle traffic for nearby residents to catch the Max thereby reducing carbon emissions which is what we need to do more of. Finally, one wonders if your computer model took into account how much longer it would take a bus to travel the same distance on McLaughlin Blvd both northbound and southbound during rush hour as opposed to the Max, even when the extra 60 second delay is included.

Eliminating the Harold Street station, in my view, is short sighted that may or may not save a few bucks today but cost the city, the neighborhood, and its residents considerably more money over the life of its lack of existence. A Harold Street station would also encourage a greener city which I believe is one of our city's short and long term goals.

Finally, as to input on where to end this first leg of the project, I think you should take it as far south as possible. I believe that was somewhere near Oak Grove.

Sincerely,

Axel Bergman
5733 SE 22nd Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97202
Jenn Tuerk - Milwaukie Light Rail

From: "Runnion, Kelly" <RunnionK@trimet.org>
To: "Jenn Tuerk (E-mail)" <Jenn.Tuerk@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/16/2008 8:43 AM
Subject: Milwaukie Light Rail
CC: "Unsworth, David" <UnsworthD@trimet.org>

-----Original Message-----
From: brianpb@comcast.net [mailto:brianpb@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, June 15, 2008 12:22 PM
To: Runnion, Kelly
Subject: Milwaukie Light Rail

Dear Board Members:

I am writing you today concerning my grave concern over TriMet's current plan for placement of their new light rail in the city of Milwaukie. This line is being planned for what is essentially a mixed residential area with four elementary schools either right next to or within one block of the planned line. This situation is especially untenable because of the potentially grave safety problems for the children of this area. Additionally, noise disruption for children during school hours is also of great concern.

I want to protest in the strongest of terms the current plan and appeal you to help find alternative placement. While I am not against light rail, TriMet needs to consider alternative routes which are nearby and far superior that provide light rail service to Milwaukie without the huge problems that come with the present plan.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,

Brian Bergquist
Contact Number: 503-655-4197
Member of St. John the Baptist Parish since 1957
Jenn Tuerk - Fwd: Milwaukie Light Rail Service

From: David Bragdon
To: Tuerk, Jenn
Date: 6/24/2008 4:05 PM
Subject: Fwd: Milwaukie Light Rail Service

>>> <brianph@comcast.net> 6/19/2008 6:46 PM >>>
Dear Mr. Bradgon:

I am writing you today concerning my grave concern over TriMet's current plan for placement of their new light rail in the city of Milwaukie. This line is being planned for what is essentially a mixed residential area with four schools either right next to or within one block of the planned line. This situation is especially untenable because of the potentially grave safety problems for the children of this area. Additionally, noise disruption for children during school hours is also of great concern.

I want to protest in the strongest of terms the current plan and appeal to you to help find alternative placement. While we are not against light rail, TriMet needs to consider alternative routes that are nearby and far superior that provide light rail service to Milwaukie without the huge problems that come with the present plan.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,

Roy & Peggy Bergquist
Contact Number: 503-698-5120
Member of St. John the Baptist Parish since 1954
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I am a supporter of the Portland-Light rail project. I live in the city of Milwaukie and I look forward to the light rail option of transportation as do almost all of my neighbors. I also want to go on record as a supporter of the downtown Milwaukie station on Lake Rd (with the train running down the current Tillamook line). I think stations are safer the more people you have walking around – going to stores, restaurants, pubs, etc. The news media seems only to quote the few people against the project and I want you to know that the majority of Milwaukians are pro-light rail – the silent majority, it seems. The loudest people who live in Oak Grove (they have a Milwaukie address but live outside the city) have always hated anything to do with Milwaukie and always will. It sounds simplistic but if you lived here you would agree and it’s a one-sided feud that started 15 or 20 years ago and makes little sense now; but, there it is.

Anyway, Milwaukie light rail supporter.

Siri Bernard
503-515-4322
From: "Runnion, Kelly" <RunnionK@trimet.org>
To: "Jenn Tuerk (E-mail)" <Jenn.Tuerk@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/6/2008 3:50 PM
Subject: Public Testimony -- Light Rail Project Milwaukie, Oregon
CC: "Unsworth, David" <UnsworthD@trimet.org>, "Clark, Olivia" <ClarkO@trimet.org>

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: dan blue <dantbl938@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Jun 6, 2008 at 3:26 PM
Subject: Light Rail Project Milwaukie, Oregon
To: Sen.KurtSchrader@state.or.us
Cc: Rep.CarolynTomei@state.or.us

To All Concerned:

Having attended the information meeting by Tri-Met and Metro on June 4, 2008, I am appalled to even remotely think that so many educated and influential people who are involved in this process would even have the remotest idea that allowing this rail line to be installed, so close to four schools, right next to a church, and basically through a somewhat residential area of Milwaukie.

By placing a stop station on the end of Lake road, it is almost in the backyard of Milwaukie High School. Not only, is there the situation of student safety at these areas, but has been clearly evident on the existing rail lines, it is impossible to control crime on and along these lines. The idea that cameras will control the situation is almost hilarious, as that is after the fact, someone has been physically abused, robbed, or somehow otherwise violated.

With trains moving through the area as often as predicted, how are the two thousand involved children to concentrate on their studies, not only with the trains running so often, but the traffic backup on these heavily traveled and even now very inadequate side roads, which were plainly not intended for the current traffic volume, but surely not for an increase of this nature.

I would certainly like to strongly protest the current placement plan, and appeal to your sense of safety and education of the local children to locate an alternative route plan that would better suit the area.

Thank you for your consideration:

Sincerely

Dan Blue
A concerned Milwaukie Citizen and taxpayer
dantbl938@gmail.com
503-318-4464
I am writing to support the proposed light rail between Portland and Milwaukie Or. In view of the ever increasing gas prices, air quality issues and congested transportation corridors it makes sense. Also a new bridge crossing between OMSI and South Water Front would greatly benefit that area as well as the entire city. Additionally a proposed streetcar loop for downtown also could take advantage of it. Thank you in advance for your consideration, Sincerely Michael Bolliger
From: "Greg Bond" <greg_bond@balzerpacific.com>
To: <tuerkj@metro.dst.or.us>
Date: 6/19/2008 11:31 AM
Subject: Proposed Light Rail Extension From PSU To Milwaukie

Ms. Jennifer Tuerk:
I am writing in support of the Light Rail extension from PSU to Milwaukie.
Light Rail has been the region's chosen transit system and the proposed line toward Milwaukie
is the obvious next logical step in developing this system.
I would further support the proposed Sherman alignment through the OMSI district which
seems to be the least intrusive to the businesses while serving the needs of OMSI.
I would also support the new bridge as long as the river users' needs are satisfied in the next
phase after the locally preferred option is selected. The bridge needs to connect the east and
west sides and should not be a south to north barrier to river traffic.
Furthermore, I would like to have assurance that when the eastside streetcar is constructed to
the district, the bridge will be available for streetcar traffic.
I believe that this investment will be sustainable and promotes a healthy economy.

Sincerely;

Greg Bond

Territory Manager
Balzer Pacific Equipment Co.
Office: 800-442-0966
Cell: 503-704-4411
E-Mail: greg_bond@balzerpacific.com
Web Address: www.balzerpacific.com

Since 1928 With 80 Years Of Sales & Service To The Aggregate, Asphalt, Concrete And
Recycling Industries
From: Diana Boom <diana@dboom.net>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 5/28/2008 6:51 PM
Subject: Milwaukie Light Rail connection / extension

We are looking forward to having light rail at Clackamas Center this year. Thank you!

We believe the Milwaukie extension is a great idea for the future. We believe "Map B" is best terminus and route: Park Avenue extension is better for several reasons, especially because it provides more pedestrian access to a light rail station.

Darryl and Diana Boom
From: Jules Boykoff <boykoff@thetangentpress.org>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 5/31/2008 1:54 PM
Subject: Harold St. Station.

Thank you for holding an open comment period regarding the inner Southeast light rail line.

I am writing in support of building a Harold St. station, as it would serve numerous neighborhoods in the area. Having such a large gap between Holgate Blvd and Bybee Blvd would not help these neighborhoods, including Reed College.

Thank you for all your hard work,
Jules Boykoff
Brooklyn neighborhood, Portland
From: Rachel Brown <brown.rachel@comcast.net>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/1/2008 8:39 AM
Subject: proposed Harold St station

As a resident of the Reed neighborhood and a member of the Reed Neighborhood Association, I would like to express my support for the proposed Harold St light rail station. This would be the most convenient station for my neighborhood and for the students of Reed College. It would encourage our neighbors to use the new light rail, especially if there is parking available at Harold Street at the East end of the proposed foot bridge. It would serve a large population of elderly residents who might not otherwise use the light rail.

Please consider this station as it would serve a large community and would encourage inner city residents to use the new light rail instead of driving into the city.

Sincerely,

Rachel Brown
Reed Neighborhood Association
I would like to express my support for the southern extension of the light rail to Park Ave as soon as possible, and to include in the planning to extend it to Oregon City as soon as the extension to Park Ave. is complete. This would be an extremely valuable contribution to those living in Clackamas County who either work in Portland, or who have to go into the city on a regular basis. I am very sure that it would be well used.

Kayreen Burns
18321 SE Blanton St.
Oak Grove, OR 97268
Trans System Accounts - Max to Millwaukie

From: <delphine.busch@comcast.net>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/16/2008 3:55 PM
Subject: Max to Millwaukie

We must consider bringing the Max to Millwaukie, but not through Millwaukie. I just doesn't make sense to disrupt traffic, make access to our river complicated, put the cost and strain on taking the tracks into town. We need the Max to stop outside of downtown and we can use a trolley system or other mode of transport within our downtown area. Trains in the downtown area a a safety hazard for the children of our three downtown schools, and will ruin our calm town. We also need to have conductors on our Max trains for added safety. We need to quit running "drug" trains and go back to safe transportation.

Delphine A. Busch
15141 SE La Crescenta Way
Millwaukie, OR 97267
Teacher at St. John the Baptist School
We need to look at our long range plans for Milwaukie and demand that the Max come to Milwaukie, but not through Milwaukie. It just doesn't make sense to tear up our town, congest the traffic already tied up when a train comes through, make the streets unsafe for children and adults.

If the train stops outside the downtown area we can have a shuttle service around town if that is desired. Please consider the noise, traffic, dirt, congestion etc. that the train in our downtown area will bring. Also please consider the children of our three downtown schools. What happened to our plan for access to the water front and a beautiful downtown area. It can hardly be accessed if we are constantly crossing tracks and tied up in traffic at the many stops proposed. I also hope we will push for conductors on our trains for added safety. I am tired of running "drug" trains through our towns. We need to man them so that they can be safe for all "law abiding" citizens.

Delphine Busch
From: Kathy Buss <kbuss@metgroup.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/16/2008 8:17 AM
Subject: Milwaukie Light Rail comment

It is vital to Milwaukie, Trimet and the future plans of light rail south, that the terminus be at Park and McLoughlin. There are legitimate issues with having light rail through Milwaukie, such as traffic stoppages, being so close to the schools, footprint, long term security, etc. But some of the pressure of these can be eased by having the terminus at Park. Also, Milwaukie only needs one station. We are a narrow city and placement of the station is crucial. While I personally prefer the Washington site, I do see the advantages of having the one station be at Lake Road and will strongly support the City's choice.

Kathy Buss
This area is my home and has been for 60+ years. My family and I have lived in the Milwaukie/Oak Grove area for over 25 of those years.

I certainly DO NOT want to see this lite rail go beyond the City of Milwaukie. We (my family and neighbors) do not want the extension out past the Lake terminus per your Map A...we DO NOT want to see you out to Park per your Map B and Map C. Your lite rail ruins the country side and is just another place for criminal activities. We hear the news. You cannot protect riders at these stops and it provides an easy mode of transportation for a lot of those we do not want to see in our neighborhood. If this is your idea of progress then I am in favor of something else.

Mr and Mrs J.O. Bybee
From: "Jim & Amy Carpenter" <carpjam@comcast.net>
To: <trans@metro.dst.or.us>
CC: "A" <james.d.carpenter@providence.org>
Date: 5/6/2008 11:32 AM
Subject: harold station comment

Metro Portland to Milwaukee Light Rail Project:

Hi - I live in the Westmoreland neighborhood and have been following the SE light rail conversation. I like the idea of MAX adding us to the system, but contrary to the editorial opinions of The Sellwood Bee editor, my vote is against the Harold St. station. My thoughts:

1. A Bybee Street station is more centrally-located to Westmoreland/Eastmoreland. Sellwood and Reed College also have pretty easy access to that site, especially by adding bike or bus transportation to the station.

2. A Harold St station in addition to the Bybee station is just redundant and would add an extra stop only 6-7 blocks from the latter, while not enlarging the catchment area. North Westmoreland residents can access Bybee just as easily (if not more easily) than Sellwood and Reed College people.

3. Using a traffic signal to cross McLaughlin is just dangerous - it is now and will continue to be even more so if the foot traffic at that intersection goes up. Cars on that highway are going much faster than on regular neighborhood streets; crossing the road on foot endangers pedestrians and drivers. Unless a pedestrian overpass is added, which at this point would be a waste of money, I firmly believe we would see fatal accidents at that intersection.

4. The only reason to reconsider adding the Harold Street station would be if the original plan to add high-density housing in the railyard area comes back on the table. In the absence of those plans, I suggest we leave it off but with the possibility of a future addition when that area gets built up. Only then would a station with pedestrian overpasses over McLaughlin and any remaining Union Pacific tracks (to access the Reed College area) be reasonable.

Thanks -
Amy C.
From: "Sandy Carter" <sandycarter@wordscount.biz>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 5/19/2008 10:03 PM
Subject: Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail comment

Dear Comment Reader,

I am a firm believer in light rail; a Clackamas County resident who voted for it any chance I got; and a person who has been very disappointed at the years that have passed while we’ve been talking about this. I’m in favor of the Park Extension and the Tillamook Branch option. In fact, I have been in favor of a line from Downtown PDX to downtown Oregon City for 15 years. It is a natural, for demographic and geographic reasons, and I’m not that happy with the first line to the County ending at a mall. That’s not my idea of access for the typical public transportation rider—elderly, young, disabled, not a driver, etc. I’m a bus rider and a big supporter of alternative transportation. I live in West Linn, where we’ll never have access to light rail until and unless it makes it to Oregon City. I’m also, of course, in favor of the Lake Oswego commuter rail project, to ease congestion/traffic delays/carbon emissions along the Highway 43 corridor. Don’t let the rich folks in Riverdale stop that one. It’s for the good of the many, not the few.

Move Heaven and Earth to make these projects happen, PLEASE. Thanks for the chance to comment. I go to too many meetings already, and the mailed booklet does a good job of laying out the project.

Sandy Carter
2555 Dillow Drive
West Linn, OR 97068
503-655-0649
From: Eric Chambers <chambere@hotmail.com>
To: <jenn.tuerk@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/19/2008 11:16 AM
Subject: pdx Milwaukie light rail

As an active member of the Portland Metro region I write to STRONGLY encourage the quick development of the Portland-Milwaukie light rail extension, and the subsequent creation of a crossing across the Willamette in order to get it into downtown Portland. The high price of fuel and increasing traffic congestion - not to mention high costs of living in the urban core - make quick construction of this project an absolute imperative.

Sincerely,

Eric Chambers
Portland, OR

The other season of giving begins 6/24/08. Check out the i'm Talkathon. Check it out!
Dear Bridget,

I am filing the following comments on the SDEIS for the Milwaukie LRT project:

1. In Chapter 1, the Purpose and Need section is inadequate because it fails to define the phrase "high capacity transit" in a meaningful way. The document repeatedly refers to light rail, commuter rail, the Portland streetcar, and even the proposed Lake Oswego trolley as types of "high capacity transit" without quantifying what that means. The most objective measure would be to compare various modes in their respective potential to move a large number of people past a fixed point within a given period of time. Those modes capable of moving the most people past a given point would logically be classified as "high-capacity", while those with the lowest number would be known as "low-capacity".

We already know that if light rail is compared to a busway, HOT lane, or even a simple highway lane, it does not perform well enough to be classified as "high-capacity transit". For example, one of the best-performing transitways in America is the Lincoln Tunnel express busway operated by PANYNJ. This 2.5 mile long facility between the NJ Turnpike and the Lincoln Tunnel carries 1,700 buses and 62,000 passenger each weekday morning, on average, from 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. This means that approximately one bus passes by a fixed point every 8 seconds on the way into Manhattan for a four-hour period.

There is no place in the Portland LRT system, current or planned, that is capable of moving that many passengers, even in theory. The busiest point within the current LRT system is at the Chinatown Station, where passengers can cross the Steel Bridge on 3 different lines. According to the printed schedules of TriMet, there are 61 in-bound trains between 6:00 a.m. and 10:00 a.m. on a typical weekday, or one train every 3.93 minutes. Even if every train car was operating at maximum capacity for the entire 4-hour period, the observed throughput of the Lincoln Tunnel busway today is more than 7 times greater than what that number would be.

Also, peak-period capacity is not the only issue of concern in a very expensive public facility. We also need to see comparisons across modes for 24-hour periods. The Achilles Heel of LRT or any rail transit system is that there are certain hours of the day when no passenger throughput is possible because the facility is shut down. In comparison, a road is open 24 hours per day.

I am aware that in previous phases of the EIS process alternatives such as BRT and HOT lanes were eliminated from further consideration. However, it's not clear to me that the simple alternative of increasing express and local bus service within the corridor, on existing roads, was properly considered. The final EIS should state why a plan to run...
more buses without new roads or a new bridge is infeasible.

This question is especially relevant with regard to the proposed new Willamette River bridge. The final EIS should specifically list the expected passenger throughput of the proposed bridge, and compare that to both the peak and 24-hour counts of existing Willamette river bridges. The public needs to see, in direct comparative terms, how many people this new "high capacity" bridge is likely to carry on a daily basis, in order to assess whether the high cost is worth it.

2. Also in Chapter 1, under the "purpose" section, the draft EIS notes that one of the purposes of the proposal is to implement a major transit improvement that is "fiscally responsive." That is a meaningless phrase. It should be changed to "fiscally responsible", which would imply a much more rigorous consideration of benefits vs. cost for this proposal.

3. Modification of existing bus routes: the draft EIS states that after LRT is opened, the 99x bus would no longer run north of Milwaukie. This would clearly degrade transit service for current riders, both in terms of forcing a transfer to LRT, and then losing express service. The final EIS should explain how this significant step backwards is consistent with the stated purpose of the project to "provide high-quality transit service in the corridor."

4. Park and ride lots: The final EIS should explain how the construction of 1,475-2,600 free parking spaces is consistent with the land-use goals embedded in the 2040 plan. The obvious purpose of LRT park-and-rides is to induce suburban/exurban motorists to ride LRT. As a practical matter, this results in the largest subsidies of the new line flowing to those living the longest distance from Milwaukie or the Portland CBD. In essence, the continued reliance on free parking at LRT stations shows that rail does not help "contain" suburban growth; it actually rewards it, especially at the lowest levels of density. This fact should be central to the discussion about whether LRT is actually supportive of the 2040 plan.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

John A. Charles, Jr.
President
Cascade Policy Institute
4850 SW Scholls Ferry Road, #103
Portland, OR 97225
To policy & decision-makers:

I was sooo much younger when I & other neighbors & business owners were 1st attending meetings to support light rail. And we kept voting for the lines that went thru all the other areas of the region (giving higher voter support than their neighborhoods most often), and trying to be patient when told we’d have to wait our turn.

And then I helped organize SE neighbors & business folks who refused to accept that light rail was “off the table”--cuz some areas voted against any other areas having that option-- and we were successful in getting it back on the political agenda. But yet again, when it was revived the lines went elsewhere!

Well, this is my last shot. I’m not surprised the route is now being redrawn by folks on the west side--when have they ever been refused or told to wait?--but at least there’s hope there will now be a Milwaukie-to-P’d downtown light rail.

I say, please, make it so.

--M’Lou Christ
Buckman, Willamette Watershed
From: Shannon Coady  
To: david.braeger@oregonmetro.gov; carolotta.collette@oregonmetro.gov; runnionk@trimet.org; bernardi@ci.milwaukie.or.us; stones@ci.milwaukie.or.us; barnesd@ci.milwaukie.or.us; loomisj@ci.milwaukie.or.us; chaimovq@ci.milwaukie.or.us; rep.garbyntomei@state.or.us; Sen.KurtSchrader@state.or.us  
Sent: Sunday, June 22, 2008 11:00 AM  
Subject: light rail opposition  

To Those who Serve the Public:

I am writing today to plead that you reconsider the current plan for placement by TriMet of their new light rail line in the city of Milwaukie. As an individual who has never written a public representative before, I can assure you that I strongly object to the current plan and appeal to you to help find alternative placement. This line is being planned to go through a mixed residential area with four elementary schools either right next to or within one block of the planned line. Please re-evaluate the proposed plan to consider placing the line where it will not sacrifice our children's safety. TriMet needs to consider alternate routes which are nearby, are far superior and are without all of the problems (parking, safety, traffic to name a few) of the current plan. Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,
Shannon and John Coady
503.539.2190
Local business owners and members of the St. John's Community.
From: Marianne Colgrove <mcolgrove@gmail.com>
To: <trans@metro.dst.or.us>, Michele Jensen <micholenjensen@comcast.net>, Gr...
Date: 5/20/2008 9:46 PM
Subject: Lightrail feedback and question

Hello,

I just finished reading the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail mailer and have comments and a question:

I support extending the rail line to Park Rd. I think the costs of construction will do nothing but skyrocket. Funds invested in our transportation infrastructure - the sooner the better - will be money well-spent.

I also think it is important to facilitate connections between the Springwater Corridor and the Tacoma P&R. The P&R should offer plenty of safe, secure bike parking for people who commute via the corridor.

I am concerned that both Park Ave. options (pg 5 of the mailer) show the Tacoma P&R as 1000 spaces. The LPA that terminates at Lake Rd shows the Tacoma P&R as 600 spaces. Why the difference? I thought that if more P&R capacity was added to the south, then the Tacoma P&R wouldn't have to provide as much capacity. The space requirements depicted in the maps seems counter-intuitive. Is there an explanation as to why extending the line further south requires the Tacoma P&R to be larger?

Thank you,

Marianne Colgrove
3707 SE Berkeley Way
Portland, OR 97202
503-239-5831
Trans System Accounts - FW: Light Rail

From: "DuVal, Pat" <duvalp@ci.milwaukie.or.us>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/18/2008 7:05 AM
Subject: FW: Light Rail

-----Original Message-----
From: James Bernard [mailto:bgarage@bernardsgarage.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2008 10:46 AM
To: DuVal, Pat
Subject: FW: Light Rail

FYI

From: Aaron Colter [mailto:aaroncolter@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2008 9:10 AM
To: bgarage@bernardsgarage.com; gchalmov@comcast.net; stones@ci.milwaukie.or.us; loomisj@ci.milwaukie.or.us; deborahbarnes@comcast.net
Subject: Light Rail

Dear Council Members,

I was delighted to hear that a possible Light Rail system could be installed in Milwaukie. Recently, however, I've heard there are members of the community that don't want this great public transportation.

I understand their fears, for the school and children. But being a constant public transit rider, I can assure you that refusing to provide adequate transportation channels in Milwaukie is far more damaging than an irrational fear that undesirable persons will infiltrate the community.

As Portland and the surrounding areas grow, Milwaukie must have a way for people to travel quickly and with ease between the two cities. If not, then the town stands to cut itself off from the heart of the metropolitan area, killing economic growth.

Helping Milwaukie become more affluent is the best way to ensure a stable, safe, and thriving community. A light rail system is far more likely to bring business men and women into the town than bringing in predators or dangerous people.

Thank you for reading.

Best,
-Aaron Colter

PUBLIC RECORDS LAW DISCLOSURE:
This e-mail is a public record of the City of Milwaukie and is subject to public disclosure unless exempt from disclosure under Oregon Public Records law. This e-mail is subject to the State Retention Schedule.
Input for the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

Through the entire process of public meetings the requirement is for you to listen to the public or community and we all agree upon the project final plans. No, it won't please everyone on everything but we need a give and take situation so we can all agree. All along, Clackamas County residences have said we don't want light rail. The reason. Clackamas County doesn't really commute downtown each and every day. We don't move north and south except to run small errands on McLoughlin. Some do, commute north and south on McLoughlin but not the majority of us. Most of us move east and west where there is no bus or light rail provided to us and never will be because you have closed your mind to that forever. Milwaukie decided they wanted light rail. So bring light rail to Milwaukie. But don't bring light rail any further than that. Clackamas County residences, including myself, do not want light rail on McLoughlin Boulevard south of Milwaukie. We don't want it to go to Park Avenue. We have made that clear, very clear. Now please listen. It is your responsibility to listen. It is our tax money. It is our community. Don't be forcing it on us. We know what your underlining plans are. Get a foot in the door on McLoughlin to Park Avenue than take it all the way down McLoughlin Boulevard to Oregon City. Remember, we don't travel north and south on a daily basis—the majority of us. Stop the light rail at Milwaukie, not Park Avenue. Don't you take it to Park Avenue.

Very sincerely,

Sue Conachan
1818 SE Parkview Circle
Oak Grove, OR 97267
From: Pat Conrad <palconrad@comcast.net>
To: Jenn Tuerk <Jenn.Tuerk@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/17/2008 4:27 PM
Subject: Re: Milwaukie light rail, Harold St. station

Jenn Tuerk wrote:

> Thank you for your interest in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project. Your comment will be included in the public record that is shared with project decision-makers and the Federal Transit Administration. The public comment period runs from May 9 to noon on June 23.
>
> If you need an immediate response from our technical staff, please call Karen Withrow, Metro public involvement specialist, at 503-797-1932.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Jenn Tuerk

Jenn Tuerk, Administrative Specialist
Planning
Metro
503-797-1756
jenn.tuerk@oregonmetro.gov
www.metro-region.org

I have an addition to my previous comments because I just received your mailed newsletter. In the section regarding the Harold St. Station it states that the community strongly supports this station and the land use plans which call for higher density development in the station area. That may have been true several years ago, but it no longer is, as witnessed by the community members at the last Smile meeting. We are just now starting to see some high density development proposed at 2103 SE Ellis Street. No one expected high density to come into the residential neighborhood such as in this proposal. The developer wants to put a building for 6 families on a regular 50 x 100 foot lot in the middle of the block on Ellis and make it so tall that it will tower over neighboring houses and block sun from yards. High density for Light Rail to most of us meant a few apartments along McLaughlin such as the one at 22nd and Harold. We know we will have disruptions and noise while the Light Rail is being built, but it should not be changing our quiet neighborhood to this extent. Sincerely, Mrs. Bruce Conrad (Patricia)

>>> On 6/15/2008 at 10:40 AM, Pat Conrad <palconrad@comcast.net> wrote:
> I attended the Smile meeting (Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League) this month about the Light Rail to Milwaukie especially about the possible Harold St. Station. My husband and I live on Harold St. two houses in from McLaughlin and feel that a station at Harold would not be valuable for several reasons. Since no Park and Ride area is planned there, people would drive and park on Harold which is already crowded because many houses do not have driveways and residents must park on the street. We have lived here since 1971 and have not seen very many
people use the Harold St. bus stop. It is too difficult to get across
McLaughlin even with a light there. In fact, at one point TriMet removed
our covered wait area because the ridership was so low, but left us an
uncovered bench. 17th and Milwaukie Avenues provide good bus service
for this area. A better place for a Light Rail station, in my opinion,
would be on McLaughlin at 17th or 18th after the sewer work is finished
where a park and ride area could be provided.
Thank you for the chance to comment. Sincerely, Mrs. Bruce Conrad,
2102 SE Harold St., Portland, OR 97202
Thank you for your consideration on reading this message. If light rail has to come south, I would have preferred it to go out Highway 224 to the south. I attended the meeting at St. John's School. I am against light rail going through the middle of downtown Milwaukie. I won't repeat all the concerns we have with the four schools we have near the tracks. If you wanted us to welcome light rail then you would have shown us the impeccable safety record, the efficiency, the enormous customer satisfaction, and the secure and safe park and rides, i.e., Gresham, of the Eastside/Westside system.

I vote to keep any rail stops as far away from schools as possible, especially grade schools. I am afraid with light rail cutting right through the middle of town it will turn Milwaukie into an armpit stop between Portland and Oregon City and ruin the city charm it could have. Thank you,

RD Craytor  Milwaukie OR
From: "Debbie Cronk" <debbyc7@gmail.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/11/2008 9:02 PM
Subject: light rail

Please do not get discouraged with the negative people in Milwaukie. There are plenty of us who are very positive and are anxiously awaiting for it. I believe the light rail should go to Park Ave. I also feel there should be 2 stops in Milwaukie. I realize the city council has already voted on one station but I hope in the future there can be two stops. The city needs to change and the new condos were the beginning.
There is a committee forming to help improve the image of Milwaukie and light rail is going to be a big part of the new image.
Thanks for all your work.

--
Debbie Cronk
P.O. Box 220011
Milwaukie, Oregon 97269
503-807-2160
From: Kimberly Dahlen <k2dahlen@hotmail.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 5/5/2008 9:08 AM
Subject: Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail

I have lived in the Westmoreland area for 5 1/2 years now. I feel lucky to live in such a tight-knit neighborhood that is so close to the river, parks, shops, and transportation links to downtown. The arrival of the light rail will make the neighborhood just that much better! It is our hope that the light rail will reduce some of the traffic on 99E (which is very close to our house) and it will bring more people into our neighborhood to support the local shops and eateries. We also look forward to taking simple, car-free trips downtown via the light rail to enjoy all that the city has to offer without the hassle of driving, parking, etc.

We appreciate all of the work that Metro and all of the neighborhood groups are doing to get the Portland-Milwaukie light rail line off of the drawing boards and made into reality!

Kimberly Dahlen
5225 SE 18th Avenue
Portland, OR 97202

With Windows Live for mobile, your contacts travel with you.
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing today to express my grave concern over the current plan for placement by Tri-met of their new light rail line in the city of Milwaukie. This line is being planned for what is essentially a mixed residential area with four elementary schools and at least three preschools either right next to or within one-three blocks of the planned line. This situation is especially untenable because of the potentially grave safety problems for the many children of this area. Noise disruption for children during school hours is also of great concern. As a parent of a child who attends St. John the Baptist School/Church and the director of St. John's Preschool, I protest in the strongest of terms the current plan and appeal to you to help find alternate placement. Many of the surrounding schools are private and depend on a continued growing enrollment to be in existence. Who would want to pay their hard earned money for their child to attend a school located right next to a dangerous light rail line? Please consider alternate routes for the light rail line. Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,

Mary Danna
(503) 698-2807
St. John the Baptist Parent and Preschool Director
From: "Kay Dannen" <dannen@portlandstreetcar.org>
To: "Jennifer Tuerk" <tuerkj@metro.dst.or.us>
Date: 6/23/2008 8:41 AM
Subject: Portland Milwaukie Light Rail Project

As a residence of the Meriwether in the South Waterfront District, I strongly support the construction of the Portland Milwaukie Light Rail Project. My husband and I are also in support of the recommendation from the Willamette Crossing Steering group for the refined Porter-Sherman Bridge crossing which will support the new OHSU campus in South Waterfront and OMSI development. I do not recommend the Harbor Drive stop location be included as part of the project. Please proceed forward with this very important transit project for the region.

Kay Dannen
3570 SW River Parkway, Unit #1403
Portland, OR 97239

Kay Dannen
Shiels Obletz Johnsen, Inc.
1140 SW 11th Avenue, Suite 500
Portland, OR 97205
phone: (503) 478-6404
fax: (503) 224-6496
pager: (503) 940-7753
dannen@sojpdx.com
dannen@portlandstreetcar.org
Dear Sir,

I live in the north end of Westmoreland. I noted that the current proposal for stops along the route does not have any between Holgate and Bybee. That will probably put the light rail out of the reach of residents in north Westmoreland.

I would like to propose that you folks consider an additional stop in the vicinity of Harold or Reedway Streets. There is already a pedestrian crossing of McLaughlin at Harold St. Also, there is a walk way from 28th along what would be Reedway as far as the railroad. If there were a pedestrian crossing of the railroad there, this additional light rail stations would be pretty accessible to the Reed College campus.

Thanks for your consideration

Dan Davenport
ADP Dealer Services
2525 SW 1st Ave.
Portland, OR 97201
(503) 402-3297

This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain information that is privileged and confidential. If the reader of the message is not the intended recipient or an authorized representative of the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail and delete the message and any attachments from your system.
From: "Heather Decker" <heather@deckerpdx.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 5/9/2008 2:06 PM
Subject: Milwaukie Light Rail project

I live near Rex Putnam High School and commute several times a week to downtown Portland for work and play. If lightrail were available, I would use it as often as I could to make that commute - and it would be fantastic to be able to use it to take my family downtown or to the zoo on the weekends. I also welcome the addition of lightrail to this neck of the woods because we desperately need economic revitalization and the improved business opportunities that light rail would bring. Milwaukie also has a lot to offer the Metro area and is kind of an undiscovered gem in Portland's back yard. The benefits would definitely be mutual.

I will try to attend one of the upcoming open house events, but sent this message in case I cannot make it. Sincerely, Heather Decker

Heather W. Decker
Contract Attornetl503-786-2886lheather@deckerpdx.com

This e-mail may contain confidential and/or privileged information intended only for the addressee. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify me immediately.
Portland-Milwaukie LRT SDEIS
Metro
600 N.E. Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

Dear Metro councilors,

I am writing to express Reed College’s support of the Harold Street station on the proposed Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project, given the following stipulations:

The neighborhoods surrounding the station support it.
A bridge or safe pedestrian crossing is added over the Union Pacific Railway tracks, east of the station. The station is in addition to, not instead of, the Bybee and Holgate stations.

Reed College has more than 1,300 students, plus an additional 450 faculty and staff. Starting this fall, 650 students will live on the northwest side of campus, just blocks from the station, bringing the total student residential population to more than 900 students.

Reed is committed to sustainability, and encourages students, staff and faculty to use alternative transportation methods other than the single-occupancy vehicle. The Harold Street station will be just a few short blocks from campus. Due to its proximity, the station is sure to be used for commuting and leisure trips by students, staff and faculty each day. However, we believe a bridge or safe pedestrian crossing over the railroad tracks is necessary to ensure safety.

Sincerely,

Colin S. Diver
President
Reed College
3203 S.E. Woodstock Blvd.
Portland, OR 97202

This letter was sent on behalf of President Colin S. Diver by,

Jennifer Bates
Interim Director of Public Affairs
Reed College
3203 SE Woodstock Blvd.
Portland, OR 97202
phone: (503) 777-7299
cell: (503) 927-1625
fax: (503) 788-6888
jennifer.bates@reed.edu
http://reedevents.reed.edu
Hello,

My name is Casey and I commute via public transportation from NE Portland every day to work in downtown Milwaukie. I am very supportive of environmentally conscious efforts to solve pollution problems and I would like to voice my personal support of the Light Rail in Milwaukie.

With the harmful emissions caused and the escalating gas prices, I believe it would be in the best interest in the general public, thus positively effecting the community, to extend the Light Rail system to Milwaukie. Please keep in mind that the money saved by taking Light Rail rather than being spent on gas prices goes directly back into the local economy by the average consumer, which helps us all out in the end.

Thank you for your consideration and time to hear my voice.
Casey Dixson
Greetings!

I live in the northern part of Westmoreland. I know that you are currently considering cutting plans for a Harold street Station. I ask that you consider my comments and suggestions. I am aware of the funding issue and the expense of having two foot bridges for Harold St. and that this would be necessary in order to make it safe and usable. I am also aware that some of the West side MAX's stations were added later. I think in our situation that this would be ideal. Please keep the Harold street station in your plans so that the track can be set properly to add in a station later. I saw the circle diagrams on the maps suggesting that the Holgate and Bybee stations would overlap mostly. However, I don't think you have properly considered that people in my area (I live just four blocks south and west of McLoughlin) would not use the Holgate station due to the risk of crossing McLoughlin. Also, with the two foot bridges you would get more ridership from the Reed College community.

Thanks for taking the time to read and consider my comments.

Sincerely,
Teresa Dunbar
Westmoreland resident for 30+ years
From: "Eckman, Jeanette" <Jeanette.Eckman@providence.org>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.govz
Date: 6/23/2008 10:38 AM
Subject: PORTLAND-MILWAUKIE LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

Dear Sirs:

My husband and I have attended several meetings in the past regarding the Light Rail Project. One of our big concerns is that we are retirement age, like a large population in Milwaukie. The City of Milwaukie does not even have the one million dollars that it needs to take care of the railroad issues and roads and now they want to assess us for light rail. We do not want light rail running thru downtown Milwaukie tearing apart our little town.

It is our opinion that if light rail is a necessity, use the expressway as many industries are located in that area. It is our opinion that a majority of riders will be the present bus riders. For the city to even think about placing a park and ride at the end of Lake Road will only increase traffic congestion and criminal activity in the area.

If the people want Light Rail for Oregon City in the future, that connection should be made where it is coming thru the Clackamas Town Center area.

The Max lines to date have not been safe and each week more attacks. The City of Portland has not been able to hire enough police and the City of Milwaukie has limited funds for police, where are the security employees coming from?

Harold and Jeanette Eckman
12309 SE 41st Court (Lake Road Access)
Milwaukie, Oregon

DISCLAIMER:
This message is intended for the sole use of the addressee, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the addressee you are hereby notified that you may not use, copy, disclose, or distribute to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received this message in error, please immediately advise the sender by reply email and delete this message.
On 5/20/2008 at 4:54 AM, "Kate Enroth" <kenroth@spiritone.com> wrote:

I'm in favor of the station at Bluebird with the extension to Park. I am still looking for a more detailed map showing where the station would be.

On 5/20/2008 at 5:59 PM, "Kate Enroth" <kenroth@spiritone.com> wrote:

Option B shows a stop at Bluebird. There are several businesses right there, the Roadhouse tavern, the motorcycle shop (current incarnation) and across 22nd, a secondhand store and a guitar shop and something else? Would any of them be removed? Also, as an aside, I would like to see more stops than are shown on these plans. For example, if option c is preferred with a stop at Lake and one at Park, why not have one at Bluebird if the tracks have the same alignment as option B? If you want people to have the best access, give them the maximum number of options. Thanks for listening. All this will be done after and my spouse (for sure) and I (maybe) have retired so we will not be commuting.
From: <norbu72@comcast.net>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 5/31/2008 8:28 PM
Subject: Portland Milwaukie Light Rail Project - comments

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

I would like to register my strong support for having a light rail station at Harold Street. I think it's needed for the population there, now and in the future, and do not think it will slow down the trips into and out of Portland to the point of losing riders.

I am a resident of inner SE Portland.

Rebecca Eisau
norbu72@comcast.net
Trans System Accounts - Light Rail alignment in Milwaukie

From:  "Bill Nancy FABER" <fabeer1@msn.com>
To:     <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date:   6/23/2008 4:11 PM
Subject: Light Rail alignment in Milwaukie

I wish to express deep concern for any plan to align light-rail and place passenger stops in the city of Milwaukie along the current railroad tracks.

I strongly oppose any alignment other than in the midst of, or alongside, Highway 99E (much like east Burnside), or a stop and turn-to-east at the former Southgate Theater lot near Highway 224. Any track that runs through the city will seriously disrupt foot and vehicle traffic. The rush-hour trains and stops would back-up traffic at nearly every intersection in the town! But far more critical, it will hamper the education and potentially endanger the hundreds of young children who attend the several elementary schools within a block of the tracks and stop(s). Tri-Met light-rail passenger stops are known to draw unsavory people and unsafe, illegal activity; I work at Lloyd Center and see the unsafe and unhealthy element. It took years for Tri-Met and law enforcement to finally take steps to eradicate the problems, and they’re still not gone, it’s just another generation. The noise of frequent stops will be a constant disruption to the learning environment of the future adults who will someday take my job and yours. We need to build good citizens NOW, in a healthy and undisrupted educational environment.

I don’t know where any of you live or if you have kids in school, but I’m sure you can understand my desire to maintain a healthy, sustainable, safe neighborhood where my son attends school and where we worship as a family. Please remember, we vote with our hearts and minds, and I vote for kids, always.

Thanks for your attention and positive consideration.

Signed,
Mom of 8 y/o Peter at St. John’s Catholic School

Nancy Faber
14805 SE Laurie Avenue
Milwaukie, OR 97267
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Trans System Accounts - My Comments on the SDEIS

From: Craig Flynn <ortem@comcast.net>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/19/2008 7:29 PM
Subject: My Comments on the SDEIS

From the SDEIS

S.4 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

This SDEIS examines a No-Build Alternative and a Light Rail Alternative for the Portland-Milwaukie Corridor. The No-Build Alternative is required under NEPA and represents future conditions without the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project.

My question is?
Why wasn't adding capacity or extra lanes along with synchronizing traffic lights in the corridor NOT considered in the SDEIS?

Adding capacity to the corridor would improve transit, by allowing buses to travel faster and improve congestion for freight, school buses and auto use. It would benefit all modes of transportation.

Reducing congestion would also benefit our neighborhoods by giving commuter more choices that may not be shortcuts through our neighborhoods.

Adding capacity could also help our neighborhoods to become more walkable and bike friendly by removing the cars that would rather drive in less congested corridors instead of taking short cuts through our neighborhoods because of congestion.

Adding capacity would benefit all forms of transportation. Building light rail will benefit far less.

Craig Flynn
cf80@comcast.net
From: Chris Forney <chris@brightworks.net>
To: "trans@oregonmetro.gov" <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 5/5/2008 9:17 PM
Subject: Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project: Comment

Metro,

I am a huge proponent for the Portland-Milwaukie light rail project. The inner east side light rail has been long over due and I am eager to see the project finally move forward. As a bus rider on the #33 I catch the bus downtown on the north side of 99/LcLaughlin which I dread crossing. A woman died crossing that intersection last year and I think it is time for the city to take responsible action to improve transit user safety near that intersection. I will be very disappointed if Metro doesn't seize this opportunity to create a safe and convenient transit access for the north end of Moreland either at the 17th and McLaughlin location or Harold Street location.

Onward!

Chris Forney
Resident
5225 SE 18th ave
Portland, OR 97202

Chris Forney
sustainable buildings group, director
LEED2.2 accredited professional
503.290.3904 www.brightworks.net

Intelligent Strategies for Sustainability
I am writing to support the proposed light rail line to Milwaukie in Oregon. The alignment makes sense and with gas prices finally going higher, people need an alternative to cars. A new bridge over the Willamette River is needed for transit to the OMSI district and South Waterfront and that will eventually support a streetcar connection around Portland's inner core. This bridge further unites Portland economically and socially. Please build this light rail alignment right away.

Sincerely,

Peter Finley Fry

Peter Finley Fry AICP PhD
2153 SW Main Street #105
Portland, Oregon 97205

503-274-2744
503-274-1415 FAX

Gas prices getting you down? Search AOL Autos for fuel-efficient used cars.
From: <gadda@comcast.net>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 5/25/2008 12:19 PM
Subject: Harold Station

I am writing in support of the Harold Street Station and the Light rail alignment on McLoughlin blvd. This plan has strong support from my neighborhood and from the Reed neighborhood. Please include this important station and pedestrian bridge to your transit plan.

Regards,
Dean and Jenny Gadda
5815 SE 18th Ave
Portland, OR 97202
503-234-4989
Trans System Accounts - Milwaukie Light Rail

From:  Tiffany Gates
To:    trans@oregonmetro.gov
Date:  5/29/2008 1:30 PM
Subject: Milwaukie Light Rail

I live in Oak Grove and work at Metro. I’m thrilled that light rail will be coming to the Milwaukie area and look forward to riding it to work each day. I like both the Map B & C option because they extend farther south, and of the two I like Map B more.

Thanks

Tiffany S. Gates, Assistant Solid Waste Planner
Solid Waste & Recycling
Metro
office 503-797-1867
fax 503-813-7544
Tiffany.Gates@OregonMetro.gov

www.oregonmetro.gov
Metro | People places. Open Spaces.
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Trans System Accounts - Portland Milwaukie Light Rail Project comment:

From: "Arlene Glueck" <gluecka@ohsu.edu>
To: ~trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/16/2008 11:36 AM
Subject: Portland Milwaukie Light Rail Project comment:

I am distraught over the design of the Portland Milwaukie Light Rail Project where it addresses the stop at Harold Street. I do not know how you came to the conclusion that this was not a necessary stop! I do not know how you reached the conclusion that this stop would decrease rider ship from those catching the MAX in Milwaukie as it would add a minute to their commute. Come on now! A minute would really make a difference? Who are you trying to convince...maybe yourselves? People who I have asked (who this would affect) can't figure out how you came up with this either. I would be very interested to know how you arrived at these conclusions and the hard data that lead to these conclusions.

Harold Street connection is NECESSARY. It will not only connected the northern part of West Moreland, but will tie in with the pedestrian bridge crossing over the railroad from Reed College. I for one, would be willing to stop driving and take the MAX, but only if there is a connection at Harold Street connection...as I can walk there. Walking to the Bybee or Holgate station is beyond walking distance for a lot of this part of West Moreland. High density housing has been going in around the area of Harold Street with the belief that there would be a MAX station there also.

I request that the Harold Street Station be included. I can speak for my neighbors that this station will be used more than you believe it will. We have been talking about leaving our cars behind and taking the Max and were thrown by your statements in the newsletter.

Arlene Glueck
5845 SE 23rd Ave
Portland OR 97202
From: feedback
To: Trans Systems Accounts
Date: 6/17/2008 6:55 AM
Subject: Fwd: LIGHT RAIL PROJECT - PUBLIC COMMENTS

Forwarding to Metro transportation planning.

>>> "JOHN E GOCHE" <gocheoraz@msn.com> 06/13/08 8:30 PM >>>
As the owner of commercial property consisting of 6 tax lots bordered by s.e. 14th and 15th Clinton and Taggart, I am vitally concerned about increased traffic flow and parking in an already congested area. My tenant, Rapid Bind, Inc. employs approximately 40 people on a 2 shift basis. Trucks and vans are always on the move in and out. Without any parking designated for the Clinton Station, "PARK AND HIDE" is going to become a major problem for my tenant. Currently SE 14th dead ends at the railroad tracks with no pedestrian fences. People are constantly crossing here on foot. This is a major safety issue.

John Goche'
12455 SE 143rd Pl.
Happy Valley, Or 97086
(503) 329-7090

E-MAIL: GOCHEORAZ@MSN.COM
From: John Goff <johngoff@alum.pomona.edu>
To: Metro <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/22/2008 1:18 PM
Subject: Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project comment

I strongly object to the routing of light rail behind the Portland Waldorf School in Milwaukie. Surely a comprehensive environmental impact study will show serious adverse effects of placing this public utility adjacent to a school with young children in close proximity. I urge that the use of McLoughlin Boulevard be preferred to such a disruptive strategy.

John Goff
Portland, OR
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing today to express my grave concern over the current plan for placement by Tri-met of their new light rail line in the city of Milwaukie. This line is being planned for what is essentially a mixed residential area with four elementary school either right next to or within one block of the planned line. This situation is especially untenable because of the potentially grave safety problems for the children of this area. Noise disruption for children during school hours is also of great concern as is the increase of crime in the downtown Milwaukie area. I want to protest in the strongest of terms the current plan and appeal to you to help find alternative placement. TriMet needs to consider alternate routes which are nearby and far superior alternate routes providing light rail service without the huge problems with the present plan. Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,

Kim Guasco  
cell  503.348.8941  
St. John the Baptist Catholic Church parishioner, Milwaukie resident and mother of 2 children at St. John the Baptist Catholic School

---Original Message---
From: kim guasco [mailto:kguasco@hotmail.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2008 12:18 PM  
To: Runnion, Kelly  
Subject: Light Rail plan for Milwaukie

Earn cashback on your purchases with Live Search - the search that pays you back! Learn More
From: "Margaret Gunn" <gunnm@nwrel.org>
To: <Trans@metro.dst.or.us>, <Robert.Liberty@oregonmetro.gov>, <planningcomm...
Date: 6/20/2008 2:32 PM
Subject: East side Light Rail and the Harold Station

I am writing to support the Milwaukee-Portland Eastside Light Rail and a stop at Harold Street. Rapid transit has been a long time in coming to the eastside of Portland and we have waited patiently.

My neighborhood is the Reed Neighborhood and I would like to see project designers retain the plan to build a station at Harold Street between the Bybee and Holgate Stations. A location of a station there, with access to the Reed Neighborhood by way of a footbridge over the rail tracks at the south end of the yard, will give our whole neighborhood access to an easy and economical commute.

The Bybee and Holgate Stations are really just too far to walk in order to catch a train. The Harold station, via a bridge over the rail yard, would make light rail conveniently accessible to Reed College students, residents, elders, and those with bicycles. It is particularly exciting for me, as I choose not to have a car and do all my travel by public transit.

The light rail would be more frequent and efficient for commuters than the buses currently serving Steele Street (the line which runs through our neighborhood and has only limited service on Saturday and none on Sunday). If there were a station at Harold, I believe ridership on light rail would increase and more people would forgo driving downtown to work or recreation. But access must be close and inviting.

Bicyclists would have a safer route via Reedway and a bridge to the Harold stop than riding down Holgate to load their bikes at the Holgate station. There are areas between the Reed Neighborhood and downtown which are still not safe for the bicycle commute.

Congestion via McLoughlin (the chosen route from town to this area) would be lightened. There would probably be less traffic via the Sellwood Bridge from our neighborhood as well.

Residents would have a more direct commute to the airport without having to take a bus and transfer.

With the emphasis on infill in the city, we are aware that the infrastructure for transportation is not keeping up. If light rail is to take up the load, please put as many stations in as will serve each and every neighborhood safely and conveniently.

Please include the Harold Street station and make those residing in the Reed Neighborhood able to enjoy fast, safe, and easy access to your system. Don't pass us by!

Thank you for considering this request.

Margaret Gunn
Reed Neighborhood resident
503-774-1661
To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing today to express my grave concern over the current plan for placement by Tri-Met of their new light rail line in the city of Milwaukie. This line is being planned for what is essentially a mixed residential area with four elementary schools either right next to or within one block of the planned line. This situation is especially untenable because of the potentially grave safety problems for the children of this area. Noise disruption for children during school hours is also of great concern. I want to protest in the strongest of terms the current plan and appeal to you to help find alternative placement.

As an example of the possible problems, the construction at the high school caused intermittent traffic delays during the last week of school. Traffic was backed up and down Washington Street continuously. It was very difficult to get to the school to pick up our children. Not to mention the increased noise and number of vehicles in the area. This would become a daily occurrence with the proposed light rail line, not just on Washington Street but all streets around these schools.

Tri-Met needs to consider alternate routes which are nearby and far superior alternate routes providing light rail service without the huge problems that come with the present plan. Thank you for attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,
Lisa Hamaoka
503-653-6132
St. John's Parish Member and School Parent
Good morning. I am writing you to let you know my concerns and thoughts regarding light rail in Milwaukie and in our neighborhood (Island Station Neighborhood Assoc.).

I am extremely concerned about two big issues; safety and livability.

Our small neighborhood is currently flanked by a RR track, and 2 very busy collector streets (22nd Avenue and River Road)....this is a lot for a neighborhood that encompasses a radius of 6 streets by 6 streets (approx.). To consider putting a new overpass into and over our neighborhood will only isolate our neighborhood more, detract from it's many facets (nesting bald eagles, a close-knit community-feel, and easy access to and from Milwaukie's downtown), and create an environment that will completely overwhelm (by scale, traffic, and noise) our neighborhood.

Aside from the livability factors, I am unconvinced that the safety of our neighborhood and town will not be affected by the arrival of light rail and/or a stop in our area. TriMet's track record is appalling. We know this, they know this, and yet, it continues to be a problem. Why will Milwaukie be any different. If you put a stop in our neighborhood you are allowing people to quickly come and go with ease.....I envision crime increasing significantly because of this. An above grade stop would be difficult to police and encourage crime while an at-grade station will impact our access to our homes.

Please, please, please do not put a stop in our neighborhood. Please, please, please be aware and considerate of VARIOUS AND UNIQUE natural features that abound. Please, please, please don't take away from our neighborhood, our 2 parks that surround us and the river that is vital to Milwaukie's future by creating a structure that doesn't fit it's surroundings.

Many thanks for your time and consideration.
Sincerely,
Alicia Hamilton
Island Station Secretary
Ledding Library Board Member
Arts Committee Member
and Mother of 2 small children

Introducing Live Search cashback. It's search that pays you back! Try it Now
From: Neil <neilh@darkhorse.com>
To: <jenn.tuerk@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/17/2008 10:04 PM
Subject: In support of Light Rail from Portland to Milwaukie

I am writing to support the light rail line from Portland to Milwaukie. Dark Horse Comics has been located on Main St. in Milwaukie since 1988. Over this period, I have watched the gradual erosion of retail in the downtown core. I do not want to see downtown become an urban blight.

Milwaukie City Council has heard expert testimony detailing the access problems for the downtown and why a thriving retail downtown core will be difficult without mass transit. Natural and man-made barriers - the river, Kellogg Lake, and Hwy 224 make it inconvenient to go to downtown Milwaukie. As people move to the area, we will see more and more cars on McLoughlin and 224, making it harder for cars and buses to navigate these roads. Light rail will be immune to the congestion of the streets. A Park Avenue park and ride station would intercept many of the cars destined to travel down McLoughlin through Milwaukie to Portland. A downtown light rail stop would make it much easier for customers to reach downtown Milwaukie. Customers have choices. Convenience is one of them.

Since downtown Milwaukie is a small area without parking buildings, parking for both consumer and employee is difficult. A light rail line will provide a convenient solution for both groups. There currently are many retail spaces for rent in Milwaukie. Retailers do not have enough confidence in the downtown area to make the required investment to open a shop. Retailers are looking for locations with consumer traffic to ensure their success. Milwaukie cannot offer that today.

Many people are feeling the pinch at the pump. The news repeatedly mentions how rising ridership of mass transit correlates with the rising price of gas. Dark Horse's 120 employees are part of this trend. We have had increasing numbers of our employees take advantage of the subsidy provided to them by Dark Horse for Tri-Met passes as gas prices rise. Now that the weather is better, we also are having increasing numbers riding bikes to work in addition to the usual several year around riders. I have employees asking each week about when light rail will be coming to Milwaukie. When I tell them that it is still a few years away, I get comments ranging from "I wish they would hurry up" to "I can't wait - I use it in Portland all the time" to "I always take it to the airport for trips."

The June 15, Sunday Oregonian, had a major article about the expected metro region population explosion. If the population doubles in the next fifty years, I wonder how people will be able to get around in Portland/Milwaukie without a substantial investment in light rail and other mass transit options. The particular beauty of the Milwaukie alignment is that it has a major portion of the line following an underutilized existing railroad track. The light rail will not have to compete with cars for travel lanes.
Neil Hankerson
Executive Vice President
Dark Horse Comics, Inc.
Direct Line 503-905-2320
From: "DuVal, Pat" <duvalp@ci.milwaukie.or.us>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/18/2008 7:06 AM
Subject: FW: In support of Light Rail

-----Original Message-----
From: James Bernard [mailto:bgarage@bernardsgarage.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2008 9:03 AM
To: DuVal, Pat
Subject: FW: In support of Light Rail

FYI

-----Original Message-----
From: Neil [mailto:neilh@darkhorse.com]
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2008 8:23 PM
To: James Bernard; gchaimov@comcast.net; Susan Stone; Joe Loomis; Deborah Barnes
Subject: In support of Light Rail

Dear Mayor and Councilors,

The Sunday Oregonian this week had several articles that caused me to think about light rail. There seemed to be two basic notes ringing over and over. First, was the price of gasoline. Second was the forecast of a huge population boom in the metro area over the next 50 years. The traffic is coming. There is no stopping it. We need to prepare for it.

Many people are feeling the pinch at the pump. The news repeatedly mentions how rising ridership of mass transit correlates with the rising price of gas. Dark Horse's 120 employees are part of this trend. We have had increasing numbers of our employees take advantage of the subsidy provided to them for Tri-Met passes as gas prices rise. Now that the weather is better, we also are having increasing numbers riding bikes to work in addition to the usual several years around riders. I have employees asking each week about when light rail will be coming to Milwaukie. When I tell them that it is still a few years away, I get comments ranging from "I wish they would hurry up" to "I can't wait - I use it in Portland all the time" to "I always take it to the airport for trips."

You previously have heard expert testimony detailing the access problems for the downtown and why a thriving retail downtown core will be difficult. Natural and man-made barriers - the river, Kellogg Lake, and Hwy 224 make it inconvenient to go to downtown Milwaukie. As people move to the area, we will see more and more cars on McLoughlin and 224, making it harder for cars and buses to navigate these roads. Light rail will be immune to the congestion of the streets. A Park Avenue park and ride would intercept many of the cars destined to travel down McLoughlin through Milwaukie to Portland. A downtown light rail stop would make it much easier for customers to reach downtown Milwaukie. Customers have choices. Convenience is one of them.
Lastly, we all know that downtown has a parking problem. Light rail would help to eliminate some of the parking needed to support a vibrant downtown community.

Please continue your support of Light Rail.

Thank you.

Neil Hankerson
Executive Vice President
Dark Horse Comics, Inc.
Direct Line 503-905-2320
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From: "Runnion, Kelly" <RunnionK@trimet.org>
To: <tuerkj@metro.doe.or.us>
Date: 6/2/2008 2:22 PM
Subject: FW: Light Rail - Milwaukie

-----Original Message-----
From: Ron & Sue Hanks [mailto:rshanks@iinet.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 01, 2008 3:10 PM
To: Runnion, Kelly
Subject: Light Rail - Milwaukie

Dear Sir/Madam:

I am writing today to express my grave concern over the current plan for placement by Tri-Met of their new light rail line in the city of Milwaukie. This line is being planned for what is essentially a mixed residential area with four elementary schools either right next to or within one block of the planned line. This situation is especially untenable because of the potentially grave safety problems for the children of this area. Noise disruption for children during school hours is also of great concern. I want to protest in the strongest of terms the current plan appeal to you to find alternative placement. TriMet needs to consider alternate routes which are nearby and far superior alternate routes providing light rail service without the huge problems that come with the present plan. Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,

Susan Hanks
(503) 657-5369
Parishioner of St. John's Parish Community
To Whom it may concern:

The Historical city of Milwaukie is bordered by Portland on the North and a major waterway, the Willamette River, on the west. Transportation needs are accommodated by a four lane North/South state highway.

From an engineering standpoint, constructing a passenger car light rail line into the city where the elevation is 54', is certainly possible. However, the terrain changes dramatically outside of the downtown core. At Park Avenue, 3/4 mile south, the elevation is 110'. Over the next 1/4 mile, the ground rises to El. 189'. This is not a problem for bicycle, automobile or bus traffic.

The P & W rail line carries freight through Milwaukie before shifting westward across the Willamette River. It would be easier to justify the construction cost of a potential project when new technology allows light rail to overcome a wider range of local terra firma.

Thank you,
Paul Hawkins

If you are not the intended addressee, please inform us immediately that you have received this e-mail in error, and delete it. We thank you for your cooperation.
Hi,

I strongly support extending the MAX line from Portland to Milwaukie and I would use this line daily. Also, I think the Harold street station is necessary for people living in northern Westmoreland and Reed College students.

Thank you,
Jussi Heikkola
Trans System Accounts - Light Rail South Corridor - Harold St Station

From: Martin Heim <mheim1@yahoo.com>
To: <trans@metro.dst.or.us>
Date: 6/22/2008 2:36 PM
Subject: Light Rail South Corridor - Harold St Station

Greetings!

I'm reading in newspapers, newsletters, online about how the Harold Street station is likely to be dropped from the plan for the Light Rail South Corridor Project. I will be greatly disappointed if this comes to pass. This station would be ideally situated in that it will serve the neighborhood communities of Westmoreland and Reed College and therefore garner much higher ridership in these locations. If left to travel either north or south to the next nearest station, we may decide not to take advantage of this new branch of light rail at all.

Several years ago we bought our house in Westmoreland in part because of the promise of the Harold Street Station's location to our home, as indicated in earlier plans for the south corridor. Our family strongly supports public transit and while we are very pleased with our city's bus system, the thought of having a light rail station nearby would be that much greater incentive to keep the car at home and rely almost entirely on rail and bus.

I would love to see the Harold Street light rail station become a reality.

Thank you,
Martin Heim
Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing today to express my grave concern over the current plan for placement by Tri-Met of their new light rail line in the city of Milwaukie. This line is being planned for what is essentially a mixed residential area with four elementary schools either right next to or within one block of the planned line. This situation is especially untenable because of the potentially grave safety problems for the children of this area. Noise disruption for children during school hours is also of great concern. I want to protest in the strongest of terms the current plan and appeal to you to help find alternative placement. TriMet needs to consider alternate routes which are nearby and far superior alternate routes providing light rail service without the huge problems that come with the present plan. Thank you for attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,
Margaret Hibbard
Contact Number and connection to St. John's Parish Community
From: "Yballe, Dominic P NWP" <Dominic.P.Yballe@usace.army.mil>
To: "Bridget Wiegardt <wiegardt@metro.dst.or.us>, "Mark Turpel" <turpelm@m...>
CC: "Carrubba, Sheryl A NWP" <Sheryl.A.Carrubba@usace.army.mil>
Date: 6/23/2008 3:34 PM
Subject: FW: Comments for South Corridor of Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

Good Afternoon,

Comments from Corps regulatory included in this e-mail. Thank you!

Dominic Yballe
CENWP-OD-G
P.O. Box 2946
Portland, Oregon 97208-2946
Office: 503-808-4392
fax: 503-808-4375

----Original Message----
From: Holm, James A NWP
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2008 3:29 PM
To: Yballe, Dominic P NWP
Subject: Comments for South Corridor of Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

Mr. Yballe,

I am interested in this project because I am the Corps Regulatory Project Manager for Multnomah and Clackamas Counties and this project includes both of those counties. My first comment has to do with the justification for another bridge across this section of the Willamette River. This would result in a fourth major river crossing in less than one river mile. Surely, it is feasible to tie into one of the existing three bridges to cross this water body.

My second comment is the height restriction on navigation of the Willamette River. Any new crossing (or bridge retro-fit) should not lower the height of vessels using the river. The new bridge clearance should be 120 feet or greater, just like the Ross Island and Marquam Bridges.

Please feel free to contact me regarding clarification of the two comments.

James A. Holm
Project Manager, Regulatory Branch
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - Portland District
333 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97204
Tel: 503-808-4385
Fax: 503-808-4375
james.a.holm@usace.army.mil
Trans System Accounts - FW: Light Rail Support

From: "DuVal, Pat" <duvalp@ci.milwaukie.or.us>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/18/2008 7:04 AM
Subject: FW: Light Rail Support

-----Original Message-----
From: James Bernard [mailto:bgarage@bernardsgarage.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2008 3:01 PM
To: DuVal, Pat
Subject: FW: Light Rail Support

I commend you for your patience in dealing with an issue that from my perception was already decided.

I think bringing light rail to Milwaukie is a "no brainer". When you consider the expected population growth, the expense of gasoline which should unfortunately only increase, the lack of parking available in downtown Milwaukie, and the harmful effects to our environment from automobile exhaust, it seems illogical to dispute the desire to bring light rail to Milwaukie.

Please continue to support light rail for Milwaukie.

Lee Holzman
Reliable Credit Association, Inc.
503-462-3073
503-462-3040 (Fax)

Confidentiality Notice: The information in this e-mail is for the intended recipient and should not be read by or distributed to anyone else. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me via e-mail, delete this e-mail and destroy any hard copies.

PUBLIC RECORDS LAW DISCLOSURE:
This e-mail is a public record of the City of Milwaukie and is subject to public disclosure unless exempt from disclosure under Oregon Public Records law. This email is subject to the State Retention Schedule.
June 23, 2008

To Whom It May Concern:

Please enter into the Record this e-mail and attachments. I am concerned that all reasonable alternatives were not adequately analyzed as part of the SDEIS process.

An Eastside route rather than one through the Central Business District was proposed for the South Corridor Light Rail Line but was not considered as an alternative in the analysis. As proposed, both routes would interline with the Interstate Yellow Line.

☐ This alignment has the potential to carry more passengers while costing less to build and operate.

☐ This alignment has the potential, with minor bus service modifications, to provide as good or better service to the CBD.

☐ This alignment has the potential, with a direct streetcar or bus connection to South Waterfront, to provide superior transit access to and from this area.

☐ This alignment has the potential to mitigate future light rail congestion at the junctions located at each end of the Steel Bridge.

☐ This alignment has a greater potential to provide the new service necessary to meet the growing demand from traditional auto commuters as gas prices continue to escalate.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jim Howell
3325 NE 45th Avenue
Portland, OR 97213
503-284-7182
jimhowell89@hotmail.com

The other season of giving begins 6/24/08. Check out the i'm Talkathon.
http://www.imtalkathon.com/?source=TXT_EM1_WLH_SeaSonOGiving
East Side North/South light Rail Line

Serious flaws with light rail on the mall have been identified. Consideration of other options should be analyzed before further assumptions about the alignment of the Milwaukie Light Rail Line are written in stone.

An old idea proposing an eastside north/south Water Avenue route should be reconsidered. Slow downtown operation now discourages regional east-west commuters from using light rail; the downtown mall operation should not do the same for north-south commuters. Light rail must do a better job of attracting non-downtown trips if it is to have a significant impact on reducing freeway congestion. This more direct route, mostly on a separated right-of-way, would be faster, cheaper and less costly to operate than diverting the Yellow Line downtown over two Willamette River bridges and it would eliminate the train delaying interlock at the Rose Quarter.

Given the serious traffic congestion in the McLoughlin Blvd./I-5 corridor, this faster Yellow Line alignment is needed as soon as possible, along with an extension north to Hayden Island. In the future, the line should be extended north to Clark County and south to Oregon City, providing a north-south and east-west high capacity rail system as an effective alternative to freeways.

Transfers would not be a significant deterrent to downtown-bound commuters if frequent service, a quality transfer environment and sufficient capacity were provided. Rail systems throughout the world require many passengers to transfer to reach their destinations. As an example, in Toronto, passengers on the heavily used Bloor-Danforth cross-town line must transfer to the Younge-University-Spadina Lines to go to or from downtown.

The Rose Quarter Station should be modified to provide a better environment for high levels of transferring passengers. Platform-to-platform escalator connections could provide safe indoor access between trains if an elevated Yellow Line station was located immediately west of the existing platforms. A similar covered station would be needed at the Hawthorne Bridge ramps to provide direct platform-to-platform connections to all of the Hawthorne Bridge bus routes and a streetcar or trolleybus line.
March 3, 2007

**Reasons to Keep the Yellow Line on the Eastside**

The current plan to connect the future McLoughlin light rail line to downtown Portland via a new "Caruthers Bridge" should be reevaluated.

Many regional commuters currently clogging north-south corridors (McLoughlin, MLK/Grand and I-5) would opt for a fast and reliable transit mode if one existed. Light rail must do a better job of attracting non-downtown trips if it is to have a significant impact on reducing freeway congestion.

If large numbers of auto commuters are going to switch to transit, light rail will have to operate more like a metro system with faster trains and fewer stops.

One way to provide this service is to connect the future McLoughlin line to the Interstate line through the inner eastside. If the McLoughlin line is diverted to downtown, north-south, east-south and east-north transit trips will continue to be too slow to lure many non-downtown bound commuters from their cars.

Water Avenue is the logical corridor for this line because it is the most direct route between OMSI and the Rose Quarter and would require little land acquisition. Trains operated on an exclusive right of way, making stops only at stations under the Hawthorne, Morrison and Burnside bridgeheads, could travel between OMSI and the Rose Quarter in seven or eight minutes. Dual-level covered stations with elevators or escalators would provide easy transfers to and from buses and streetcars on the bridges. These stations could also provide access to new eastside developments such as the Burnside Bridgehead Project.

The Yellow Line could connect with the 1,100 buses that cross these bridges every weekday, greatly enhancing transit access to the eastside. These buses, on eight different routes, currently carry one-quarter of TriMet's bus riders.
The Yellow Line in this corridor would not compete with an eastside streetcar circulator proposed to serve the Lloyd District, the MLK/Grand Corridor and OMSI. Conversely, it would compliment and feed that system.

Transfers between north-south and east-west trains would not be a serious deterrent to downtown-bound commuters. Both lines, if connected with a high capacity station at the Rose Quarter, could accommodate more downtown commuters than the current system. This would eliminate the Yellow Line junction now causing operational delays at the Rose Quarter. These delays will become more frequent when another junction is added at the west end of the Steel Bridge to accommodate mall trains.

The Interstate Line could extend south of the Rose Garden on an elevated track avoiding traffic, buses and pedestrians. It could cross the existing east-west tracks immediately west of the freeway. The station, with escalator access between train platforms, could be completely covered or developed in conjunction with a high-rise transit oriented project on the site.

A covered station at the Hawthorne Bridge ramps would provide a direct connection with the 590 buses that cross this bridge every day. The proposed eastside streetcar, if routed from OMSI over the Hawthorne Bridge instead of a new bridge, could provide additional capacity for Yellow Line passengers traveling to or from downtown during peak hours.

Given the serious traffic congestion in the McLoughlin Blvd/I-5 corridor, this faster Yellow Line alignment, along with an extension north to Hayden Island, is needed as soon as possible. This direct eastside north-south light rail route would be cheaper to build and operate and would attract more passengers than one that is detoured through downtown.

Jim Howell 503 284-7182
3325 NE 45th Avenue
Portland, OR 97213
Jimhowell89@hotmail.com
MEMORANDUM

July, 9, 2007

To: South Corridor Phase II Steering Committee
From: Jim Howell
Re: Potential Yellow Line ridership - CBD vs. Eastside routing

The purpose of this memo is to begin to assess the ridership potential of routing the Yellow LRT Line (Expo to Milwaukie) through Southeast Portland rather than through downtown. It is my understanding that this route will be modeled as one of the South Corridor Phase II options.

The information on the attached maps is from Metro’s 2025 origin and destination forecast aggregated into 26 metropolitan area zones. Zone 26, Clark County, is not included. Yellow indicates zones of origin, orange, westside destinations and blue, eastside destinations.

Figures #1 and #2 show the relative number of trips from the Interstate and McLoughlin Corridors to the CBD and the Central East Side. The Central Eastside attracts almost 9,000 (27%) more trips from the Interstate Corridor than the Central Business District (40,876 vs. 32,133). The relative number of trips to the CES or the CBD from the McLoughlin Corridor is roughly equal (29,246 vs. 28,877).

However, if the Interstate and McLoughlin corridors can be interconnected directly through the eastside with light rail (Figures #3 and #4), the potential for attracting more commuters to transit grows substantially (Interstate to the CES and McLoughlin - 81,259 vs. Interstate to the CBD - 32,133). From McLoughlin, the daily trips are 40,818 to the CES and Interstate vs. 28,877 to the CBD. When both routes take a slow diversion through downtown, the advantage of this fast-interconnected system is not realized.

Furthermore, access between the Yellow Line and the east-west light rail and bus routes would be faster on the eastside than in the CBD. Figures #5 and #6 show the potential destinations that could be served with convenient eastside transfers. The 71,218 trips from the Interstate Corridor that could benefit from the eastside connections are in addition to those trips to the east that are currently transferring to the Blue and Red Lines at the Rose Quarter and do not include future transfers to the Green Line.

The total number of trips from the Moloughlin Corridor to the north and east, which could benefit from an eastside connection, is 119,921 (Figure #6). This is 3 times more than would benefit from a westside alignment (39,481), even when the South...
Waterfront Zone is included with the CBD. The O and D data clearly shows that an eastside alignment would serve more commuters than a downtown alignment.

The crucial detail is to design the transfers and the modeling of the transfers so that they work effectively and do not pose an analytical bias. Recent analysis shows that when service is reasonably frequent, and the transfer environment is conducive, the penalty for transferring is no different from an amount of walking time equal to the actual time involved in making the transfer. As the purpose of the eastside alignment is to open up the system to many more potential riders, effort (and ultimately capital and operating cost) spent on optimizing transfers would be appropriate for this analysis.

While current transit ridership is skewed much more toward downtown than is travel in general, the obvious reason is that is where the current transit service is provided with sufficient intensity. The modeling process should be carefully reviewed to make sure that the calibration process to enable the model to replicate current ridership under the current system does not introduce any hidden bias toward that skewed pattern.

Contact:

Jim Howell – Director, Strategic Planner
(503) 284-7182
jimhowell89@hotmail.com
A North – South Rapid Transit Corridor

Traffic congestion in the 99-E travel corridor (McLoughlin – MLK/Grand – I-5N) is projected to grow to intolerable levels and yet there are no current plans to relieve this congestion with an effective public transportation alternative along this heavily used corridor.

A high capacity rapid transit line from Oregon City to Vancouver WA could be the optimal alternative. It would provide many varied trip opportunities along its 22-mile length, as well as convenient transfer opportunities to numerous east-west bus routes and three MAX lines.

Part of this line is already in place. The Interstate MAX (Yellow Line) provides frequent, reliable service on the 5.8 mile segment between the Rose Quarter and the Expo Center. Plans for the 5.5 mile segment between OMSI and Milwaukie are well under way and could be submitted for federal funding within a year.

What is missing? A critical 2.5 mile segment between the Expo Center and Vancouver, which could provide traffic relief across the Columbia River, is tied up as part of an expensive freeway river-crossing project. Ironically, the Columbia River Crossing Project will add to the corridor traffic congestion. It may take a decade or more to fund and construct, thus holding up any traffic relief that light rail could provide.

The 6.7 mile Milwaukie to Oregon City segment is not currently part of any regional plan. Although it is not as critical to the viability of the total corridor, this section should be included.

This leaves the 1.5 mile link between the Rose Quarter and OMSI to connect the north and south segments of this vital rapid transit corridor. This segment could – and should – be included as one of the alternatives to be evaluated in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Study (SDEIS) required by the Federal Transit Administration for obtaining federal funding for the proposed Milwaukie Light Rail Line.

All of the current alternatives being considered require diverting this line downtown over a new Willamette River bridge, through the Transit Mall and then returning to the eastside over the Steel Bridge. This slow diversion to the CBD would seriously diminish this route’s effectiveness as an alternative to auto commuting in this corridor.

Leadership at TriMet, Metro and the City must make a decision by September to include this alternative in the SDEIS if it is to be evaluated for further consideration. It would be a shame if they didn’t.

Jim Howell 7-19-07 jimhowell89@hotmail.com 503 284-7182
July 31, 2007

**Transit Access to South Waterfront**

Is putting a Milwaukee MAX station on the west bank of the river, either at the location in the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) or one at the recently donated OHSU site, the best way to serve South Waterfront with public transportation?

There is strong evidence that it is not.

If transit is expected to make a significant impact in reducing traffic congestion in the area, South Waterfront must have fast and reliable transit service from all areas of the metropolitan region, not just the McLoughlin Corridor. If most commuters must run the gauntlet on the transit mall and then transfer to a streetcar or bus, their trip would be neither fast nor reliable.

What if the Milwaukee Light Rail Line were routed directly north on the eastside from OMSI to the Rose Quarter where it would interconnect with the Interstate (Yellow) Line, and the proposed Eastside Streetcar crossed the Hawthorne Bridge and then ran south through South Waterfront?

No new bridge would be needed.

This combination of light rail and streetcar would provide the same transit access between Milwaukee and South Waterfront as the current proposals, with transfers between light rail and the streetcar being made on the eastside rather than westside. (See attached map.)

More importantly, this proposal would provide commuters from N, NE and SE Portland more direct and reliable transit access to the South Waterfront.

An eastside MAX connection would provide a direct north-south high capacity rapid transit spine that could eventually extend from Clark County to Oregon City. It would also provide convenient eastside transfer connections with three other MAX lines and over 20 heavily used eastside bus routes.

In addition, the Eastside Streetcar, routed directly to South Waterfront would provide a no-transfer trip between the Central Eastside/Lloyd District and South Waterfront. Furthermore, it would provide streetcar access to the Keller Auditorium Area.

The following table is created from Metro’s 26 Zone Origin and Destination estimates for all trips in 2025.
Trips between South Waterfront (Zone 3) and the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To SW</th>
<th>From SW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Corridor</td>
<td>10,604</td>
<td>6,093</td>
<td>16,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Zones 4, 5 and 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Corridor (Zones 2,</td>
<td>12,908</td>
<td>13,722</td>
<td>26,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18, 19, and 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Portland (Zones 6,</td>
<td>19,537</td>
<td>11,658</td>
<td>31,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 and 17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The potential trip market between South Waterfront and the Milwaukee Corridor is about 17,000 weekday trips. The potential ridership between South Waterfront and N, NE and SE Portland is about 58,000 weekday trips, more than three times as many.

Common sense indicates that a significant number of commuters who must travel between this large eastside area and South Waterfront would use public transit as their travel choice if this faster, more direct routing through the eastside were provided.

Jim Howell
3325 NE 45th Avenue
Portland, OR 97213
(503) 284-7182
jimhowell89@hotmail.com
Milwaukie LRT Facts

- According to the latest data from Metro and TriMet, the 2003 Locally Preferred Alignment (Lake Road to SW Jackson Street) would cost $1,255,090,000 in inflated dollars including 16 vehicles, expanded maintenance facilities and a new bridge across the Willamette River. The system cost of the bridge and its approaches is $443,000,000, 34% of the total project.

- The projected LRT ridership in 2030 is 24,360 daily boardings resulting in 8,000 additional boardings to the entire system over what would be expected if the project were not built (No-Build Option).

- The estimated running time between Lake Road and the Rose Quarter (8.53 miles) is 38 minutes (see attached table).

- 22 minutes of the total running time (60%) is devoted to the 2.53-mile segment between OMSI and the Rose Quarter with an average speed of 7 MPH.

- If the line extended north from OMSI to the Rose Quarter on a Water Avenue alignment (1.55 miles), it would take 8 minutes with an average speed of 12 MPH.

- The total running time between Lake Road and the Rose Quarter on the eastside alignment would be 22 minutes, equal to the running time in the LPA for only the downtown diversion between OMSI and the Rose Quarter.

- The constructed length of the LPA, including the bridge, would be 6.52 miles compared with 7.04 miles for the eastside alternative.

- The current running time on the Yellow Line between the Rose Quarter and Expo (5.76 miles) averages 18 minutes.

- If the Yellow Line were extended 0.5 mile to Hayden Island it would add approximately 2 minutes to its current running time.

- The running time between Lake Road in Milwaukie and Hayden Island on the eastside alignment (13.81 miles) would be approximately 42 minutes with an average speed of 20 MPH.

- The running time between Lake Road in Milwaukie and Hayden Island on the downtown alignment (14.79 miles) would be approximately 56 minutes with an average speed of 16 MPH.

Jimhowell89@hotmail.com 2-23-08
An Eastside Light Rail Link

Why is a bridge over the Willamette River being considered for the proposed light-rail extension to Milwaukie? Isn’t this overkill? Every weekday, more than 3,200 buses and MAX trains pour over the six existing bridges that connect the eastside and downtown.

What is missing in the transit system is a north-south high capacity transit line serving the 99E / I-5 corridor. The heavy commuter traffic on McLoughlin, MLK/Grand and I-5 north is a direct result of the lack of this transit service.

This option would be possible if, rather than crossing the river on a very expensive new bridge, the proposed Milwaukie light rail line extended north on the eastside from OMSI to the existing Interstate Yellow Line at the Rose Quarter. On this route, travel time between Milwaukie and the Expo Center could be only about 40 minutes, 20 to 30 minutes faster than today and at least 15 minutes faster than the via the proposed downtown routing.

According to data from Metro, two out of three commuters using this corridor have destinations on the eastside as opposed to downtown. These commuters would benefit from a direct eastside line. Excellent access to downtown can still be maintained with a quick transfer to over 3,000 buses and trains that will continue to cross the river.

South Waterfront would also benefit. The Porter/Sherman Bridge would only provide faster service from the South Corridor to a station at OHSU’s proposed new campus, where transfers to the streetcar would still be required for transit access to most of the South Waterfront District.

With the eastside alignment, this transfer could be made at a Hawthorne Bridge Station to either a streetcar or bus, routed across the Hawthorne Bridge and south on 1st Avenue to Harrison Street, where it could follow the existing streetcar route that serves South Waterfront.

The big advantage of this option is that South Waterfront would gain direct transit access to and from north Portland via the Yellow Line, and faster access to and from the airport and east county via the Blue, Red and Green Lines. In addition, it would provide faster connections with at least 16 bus routes that serve N, NE and SE Portland.

Following the principals of “least cost planning” an eastside alignment should have been considered as a South Corridor Alternative. It clearly would be less expensive to build, less expensive to operate and would most likely carry more passengers and stimulate more ridership on the overall transit system.

Jim Howell 5-21-08 jimhowe89@hotmail.com
Testimony to Steering Committee on the South Corridor SDEIS
By Jim Howell, 6-6-08

I support Metro and TriMet for filing a Supplemental Draft Environment Impact Statement to the FTA in order to construct a light rail line to Milwaukie in the McLoughlin Corridor.

Unfortunately, the sole purpose of this SDEIS is to obtain federal funds to build a narrowly defined project. A project primarily focused on the needs of a small segment of the population that will have to drive to park-and-ride facilities in order to access a light rail line to their jobs in the CBD and the OSHU South Waterfront campus.

The ridership forecast used to show the FTA that this project meets their cost-benefit threshold is largely dependent on auto dependent commuters.

It may be cheaper and easier to pick the low hanging fruit – these auto oriented commuters, attracted to free parking, rather than car-free commuters making the light rail connection via a network of direct and frequent bus routes.

In the long run, a system approach to transit planning will have to be used if transit is expected to become a major player in the regions transportation system. The current approach, focusing on one piece at a time, will be too costly and will not shift enough people from cars to transit to achieve a significant reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and oil consumption.

I am a realist. A Locally Preferred Alignment will probably be selected from the options identified in this SDEIS but, the following suggestions would have made the project more environmentally sustainable, cheaper to build, cheaper to operate, and would have added more ridership to the total transit system.

1. Do not build park-and-ride structures.

They are expensive, they encourage auto dependence and they are a major impediment to transit oriented development around stations. Nevertheless, low cost surface parking can become a temporary land-banking use until an adequate transit network is in place, at which time the parking lot can be converted to a compact mixed use development.

2. Include in the project a more robust bus feeder system.

For example, a frequent service cross-town bus route could provide a fast and convenient transfer connection at the Tacoma Station and replace the need for a thousand stall parking structure. A new route connecting Clackamas Town Center to Washington Square and WES via Johnson Creek Blvd., Tacoma Street, the Sellwood Bridge and Taylors Ferry Road would greatly reduce traffic
demand in these corridors. It would interconnect three rail lines and 30 bus routes, providing an exponential increase in transit opportunities over what is provided today.

3. Forego the construction of an expensive new light rail bridge by connecting this line to the MAX Yellow line through the eastside.

- The 3,200 buses and trains now crossing the river every weekday could provide downtown access. During peak hours, shuttle buses or streetcars from the OMSI Station could provide additional capacity to and from downtown. Incidentally, if these shuttles were timed to meet the Max trains, the trip to the CBD would be as fast or faster than the trip over the proposed out-of-direction Porter-Sherman alignment.

- South Waterfront would actually get better transit service than with the Porter-Sherman crossing if the project included a direct bus or streetcar link to South Waterfront via the Hawthorne Bridge, SW First and Naito and Harrison Street. This new faster connection to and from North, Northeast and Eastside Portland would attract many new riders, more than would be lost from the South Corridor because of a slightly longer trip.

- An eastside connection provides redundancy to the system not provided by an additional river crossing. The Steel Bridge will become a major bottleneck in the system when all four Max lines cross it. The Yellow Line will become a major problem because of crossing issues at the Rose Quarter Junction when the Green Line is added next year. An eastside alignment avoids this problem. In the event of a Steel Bridge breakdown, it could also provide access to all the buses that cross the river on the other bridges.

- An eastside connection would allow more frequent service with the same equipment and operating hours because it would cut about 25% from the total route running time. Frequency of service is a primary factor in attracting ridership.

In closing, an eleventh hour modeling attempt by metro staff of an eastside alternative, that did not include the systemic improvements mentioned above, still showed it would attract about as many passengers to the system as would the downtown options.

Jim Howell
3325 NE 45th Avenue
Portland, OR 97213
Jimhowell80@hotmail.com
From: Cliff Jenne <cbj2023@gmail.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 5/18/2008 5:51 PM
Subject: Light Rail Project (Milwaukie)

Regarding whether to extend the line to Park Ave., I have this comment. Your statement that approximately 1200 to 1600 households live within a 1/2 mile radius of the Park Ave. station. Maybe you have considered the Willamette View residents that live on River Road but there are about 500 residents and many of them do not have cars that use Tri-Met lift buses and bus line 34 to get to the downtown area and also the OHSU hospital. Many of us are on special tests at the hospital and do need to visit it occasionally for live exams. I would be in favor of the Park Ave extension for another reason also. The 1000 to 1200 car parking would certainly be attractive for those who live in Oregon City but work in Portland or OHSU. As you know, parking up at the hospital is limited and employees who work there are charged a parking fee. Anyone working in downtown Portland also needs parking and usually with some parking fee cost. My vote is for the extension to Park Ave if the cost and benefits relate. I do understand that it would cost one million dollars more per year for operating costs but what is the long run expansion plan and would the cost of construction now be favorable rather than paying the inflation costs of a later extension if practical. Thanks for listening.
Cliff Jenne 13021 S.E. River Rd. Apt. 312-P Portland, Or. 97222-5063 Tel. 503-652-6660
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing today to express my grave concern over the current plan for placement by Tri-met of their new light rail line in the city of Milwaukie. This line is being planned for what is essentially a mixed residential area with four elementary schools either right next to or within one block of the planned line. This situation is especially untenable because of the potentially grave safety problems for the children of this area. Noise disruption for children during school hours is also of great concern. I want to protest in the strongest of terms the current plan and appeal to you to help find alternative placement. TriMet needs to consider alternate routes which are nearby and far superior alternate routes providing light rail service without the huge problems that come with the present plan. Thank you for attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,

Your Name

Contact Number and connection to St. John’s Parish Community
From: JoAnn Jundt <herbjoann1313@yahoo.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 5/2/2008 8:59 PM
Subject: LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

RECEIVED A CARD IN THE MAIL ABOUT THE COMMENT PHASE. WE VOTED NOT TO HAVE THIS, BUT I GUESS THE PEOPLE DO NOT COUNT. BECAUSE YOU HAVE ALREADY STARTED IT.

I AM TIRED OF MY TAX DOLLARS GOING FOR THINGS I DO NOT VOTE FOR. THIS RAIL IS ONLY TO HELP THE PEOPLE THAT ARE NOT PAYING TAXES, PLUS THEY DO NOT PAY TO RIDE EITHER, THE REASON I KNOW HIS IS BECAUSE WE HAVE AN EMPLOYEE THAT TELLS US HE NEVER PAYS.

Be a better friend, newshound, and know-it-all with Yahoo! Mobile. Try it now.
June 22, 2008

Dear Commissioner Barnes,

This letter is to share my comments and observations on the present direction of the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project.

First let me say that I am not against light-rail coming to Milwaukie. In fact, I attended one of the first open house meetings in 1998 and agreed with many of the alternatives presented at the time which were mostly Main Street and McLoughlin Boulevard alignments. These alignments made sense since they bring riders through an already industrialized and urbanized part of Milwaukie.

In reviewing the selections that have been narrowed down ("Maps A, B and C") in the brochure presented at the most recent public meetings, I cannot say I support any of these alternatives. In fact, no one present at this particular meeting (about 50 or 60 persons) was in support any of these alignments and had significant concerns that were discounted by the presenters of the proposals.

I have also reviewed parts of the SDEIS. While I have not read all 400+ pages of the document, I take issue with some of the conclusions and the reasons offered for excluding the downtown alignments. Indeed, the SDEIS is a difficult read; even for educated persons.

The "Milwaukie Downtown Framework" plan (mentioned on pages 2-38 to 2-41 of the SDEIS) does not appear to include any provision for Light Rail, yet this plan would directly benefit from it. It seems to me that this should be an integral part of the vision. The "Framework" should be revised to integrate Light Rail into the vision or it should not move forward. I do not find this to be a valid argument for elimination of the downtown alignment from consideration.

To simply realign the route through neighborhoods and within one block of three elementary schools because it is the least expensive and least painful to businesses and warehouses does not make sense. These businesses will ultimately benefit from Light Rail.

As concerned parents of students at one of these schools:

1. We do not support any of the plans proposed, including the one most recently approved by the Milwaukie City Council (Plan "C" without the Monroe St. stop) and
2. We would like Metro and the Milwaukie City Council to reconsider the downtown alignment for Light Rail and integrate it with the downtown vision rather than using the vision as a reason to realign it where it does not make sense.

Thank you in advance for your thoughtful consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Randy and Lori Karambelas
Concerned Parents
St. John the Baptist Catholic School
Trans System Accounts - FW: Tri-met light rail placement

From: "Runnion, Kelly" <RunnionK@trimet.org>
To: <tuerkj@metro.dst.or.us>
Date: 6/2/2008 2:21 PM
Subject: FW: Tri-met light rail placement

-----Original Message-----
From: StanKaty@aol.com [mailto:StanKaty@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, June 02, 2008 10:45 AM
To: David.Bragdon@oregonmetro.gov
Cc: Carlota.Collette@oregonmetro.gov; Runnion, Kelly; bernardj@ci.milwaukie.or.us; stones@ci.milwaukie.or.us; barnesdl@ci.milwaukie.or.us; chaimovg@ci.milwaukie.or.us; loomisj@ci.milwaukie.or.us; Rep.CarolynTomei@state.or.us; Sen.KurtSchrader@state.or.us
Subject: Tri-met light rail placement

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing today to express my grave concern over the current plan for placement by Tri-met of their new light rail line in the city of Milwaukie. This line is being planned for what is essentially a mixed residential area with four elementary schools either right next to or within one block of the planned line. This situation is especially untenable because of the potentially grave safety problems for the children of this area. Noise disruption for children during school hours is also of great concern. I want to protest in the strongest of terms the current plan and appeal to you to help find alternative placement. Tri-met needs to consider alternate routes which are nearby and far superior alternate routes providing light rail service without the huge problems that come with the present plan. Thank you for attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,
Stanley & Katherine Keltz
Parishioners of St. John the Baptist Church
503-654-4610

Life is fragile, handle with prayer

Get trade secrets for amazing burgers. Watch "Cooking with Tyler Florence" on AOL Food.

file://C:\Documents and Settings\tuerkJ\Local Settings\Temp\XPgrpwise\484401FA\MetCen... 6/6/2008
Trans System Accounts - FW: Milwuakie Light Rail

From: "Runnion, Kelly" <RunnionK@trimet.org>
To: "Jenn Tuerk (E-mail)" <Jenn.Tuerk@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/13/2008 3:31 PM
Subject: FW: Milwuakie Light Rail
CC: "Unsworth, David" <UnswortD@trimet.org>, "Clark, Olivia" <ClarkO@trimet.org>

-----Original Message-----
From: kerns1557@comcast.net [mailto:kerns1557@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, June 13, 2008 3:12 PM
To: Carlotta.Collette@oregonmetro.gov; bernardj@ci.milwaukie.or.us; Rep.CarolynTomei@state.or.us; Runnion, Kelly; bcc@co.clackamas.or.us
Subject: Milwuakie Light Rail

I am writing to express my grave concern over the current plan for placement by Tri-met of their new light rail line in the city of Milwuakie. There are four elementary schools in close proximity to the planned line. This will cause serious safety problems for the children, noise disruption during school hours, and traffic congestion. The traffic on 25th avenue will be extremely detrimental to St. John the Baptist School because it intersects the school campus. Access to both the church and the school will be impaired. I am a proponent of light rail, but in this case I strongly recommend that there be an alternative placement. There must be alternate routes which will serve the purpose without such substantial disruption to residential, church and school communities.

Sincerely,

Diane Kerns
503-708-9091
Member, St. John the Baptist Parish
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From: <tomkosmas@comcast.net>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 5/4/2008 12:07 AM
Subject: Lightrail

I have lived in Milwaukie for 20 years and I know hundreds of people here. I have not talked to 1 person who believes that the light rail will do anything but cause grief. Traffic problems due to construction, bring unwanted people to our community, crime due to the same reasons that the Portland MAX is having, the cost to keep the maintenance up on it. I do not want to see any light rail in Milwaukie and do not know anyone who does.
Jenn Tuerk - Support for Milwaukee Light Rail

From: "Patrick LaCrosse" <placrosseor@comcast.net>
To: <jenn.tuerk@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/19/2008 6:54 AM
Subject: Support for Milwaukee Light Rail

Councilor Robert Liberty
Metro,
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, Oregon  97232

June 19, 2008

Dear Councilor Liberty,

The purpose of this letter is to voice my support for the proposed Milwaukee Light Rail system.

The 60 year old Oregon Museum of Science and Industry has been located in the Central Eastside of Downtown Portland for over 15 years. During that time, OMSI has seen its attendance increase significantly. However, it has never had adequate public transportation available to it to fully accommodate its attendance.

For the past two years, OMSI has led an owner's group to examine many proposed physical changes to what we call the OMSI district. My role has been to convene that group of 12 property owners for regular meetings to discuss issues. OMSI has been pursuing the preparation of a Master Plan for its future development at the same time.

We at OMSI have worked with Tri Met staff, Metro staff, OHSU, PSU, city planning staff, and many others on Master Plan related issues these past few years.

We are pleased to see Tri Met favor the Sherman alignment which would traverse OMSI land. Such route provides great access for OMSI's growing attendance, and will facilitate the development of the OMSI property. It also supports the continued operation and development of the businesses in the area—especially those located on Caruthers which might otherwise have been negatively affected by an alternate Rail route.

We believe the Rail Planning process has been productive and complete and we believe the addition of the Milwaukee Light Rail system overall will be a great boon to the Community and to the OMSI district in particular.

Sincerely,

Patrick

LaCrosse
Plan
Manager

OMSI Master
Project
Hi,

I wanted to voice my concern that the Harold street station may not be included as a stop on the inner southeast MAX line. This station will serve not only the north section of Westmoreland, but also Reed College and the neighborhood north of Reed College. I think that the additional stop will not delay the MAX line unduly enough to warrant removing this stop. Please keep the Harold street station in the final light rail plan for inner southeast.

Thank you,
Nicole LaDouceur
6725 SE 21st Ave
Trans System Accounts - light rail project

From: <slechert@aol.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 5/21/2008 11:51 PM
Subject: light rail project

I was unable to attend the Cleveland comment session and will try to make one of the other ones, but in case I don't, I wanted to ask a question.

Does the light rail plan for a Bybee station include a North bound exit from McLoughlin? Currently, there is not a northbound exit and I would like it to stay that way. A northbound exit would increase traffic substantially on Bybee. People would hop off McLoughlin onto Bybee when it is busy and try to take Milwaukie or 17th. Or if Tacoma is busy, they would then take Bybee to 13th to the Sellwood bridge. I do not want Bybee to turn into a Tacoma Street. A northbound exit would ruin Bybee and have a bad impact on the neighborhood.

scott lechert
westmoreland

Stay informed, get connected and more with AOL on your phone.
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to you today to express my grave concern over the current plan for placement by Tri-Met of their new light rail line in the city of Milwaukee. This line is being planned for what is essentially a mixed residential area with four elementary schools either right next to or within one block of the planned line. This situation is especially untenable because of the potentially grave safety problems for the children of this area. Noise disruption for children during school hours is also of great concern. I want to protest in the strongest of terms the current plan and appeal to you to help find alternative placement. TriMet needs to consider alternate routes which are nearby and far superior alternate routes providing light rail service without the huge problems that come with the present plan. Thank you for your attention to this very important issue.

Sincerely,

Penny Lee
(503) 654-0200 affiliated with St. John's Parish Community
From: Dana Lucero
To: Rothstein, Sid
Date: 6/24/2008 5:21 PM
Subject: Fwd: Public comment regarding Milwaukie light rail

>>> "Leedy, Erin" <Erin.Leedy@marketstrategies.com> 6/23/2008 3:54 PM >>>

Hello Dana,

I am a resident of Oak Grove and wanted to share my opinions on the light rail end point. I went online to add my comments today and only then realized the commentary period ended at noon today and not at close of business. I'm hoping you can incorporate my comments into the set of feedback received by the public to date.

First of all, my husband and I are strongly in support of Milwaukie light rail. We believe it'll be a boost to the community and will add flexibility to commuting options - much needed in light of increasing east side traffic and issues such as the Sellwood Bridge and its probably construction and/or replacement.

In looking at the options for endpoints, we strongly prefer Option B. We would really benefit from having the line extend past Lake Road and closer to the Oak Grove area. Also, the planned Bird station in the Island Station neighborhood makes a lot of sense. While we also like Option C, we prefer Option B for its 2 additional stations.

In terms of river crossings, we think the newer options - heading into South Waterfront - make the most sense and could benefit us in terms of heading to Oregon Health and Science University for medical needs. Also, a bridge at that point in the Willamette would be more striking than one closer to the Marquam.

I hope you can add this to your pool of public comments. We're looking forward to the next round of development.

Regards,
Erin and Greg Leedy
Oak Grove
Dear Metro Planners,

I just read the editorial in the Bee about the proposal to add the Harold St. station to the light rail line to Milwaukie.

First, I'm a business owner in the general area - 1 block south of Powell Blvd. at 35th. Second, I have some background (from a university a bit farther north, generally held in some disrepute by folks hereabouts) in transportation planning and analysis as well as a professional background in transportation computer systems, including about 5 years at ODOT.

With all due respect to the efforts your staff has surely put into revving up the computer model you use -- it is not enough to use this model as the only reason not to include the proposed station at Harold St. So, how'd you get it to show that loss, anyway? Hmmm..

1. You say you reckon ridership will go down, but not how much. Given the real congestion and choices faced by area drivers, I reckon it's effect on ridership will be very, very small.

2. You built many assumptions into your model to make it work the way you want. Change those assumptions, and the model works differently. You don't explain what your assumptions are. For example, what factors other than travel time influence your model's rider decisions, and how big or small are those influences?

3. You don't explain how your model works. Do you set fixed amounts for your variables, or do you allow for variable variation in multiple iterations of the model?

Whoa, Nellie! That's enough model mumbo-jumbo. My point is, I don't believe what your model says. I'd like to, but I don't. When I think about all the other high-priority things you must be wrestling with (choice of route, getting all the funding and resources, balancing neighborhood interests, balancing contractor interests, balancing political interests, balancing business community interests, etc.), I really don't think this model's claim of some tiny loss of ridership is important at all.

In other words, it feels like you're snowing me with this little story about the model, but there's a whole lot of really important things you're not telling me. Sorry, but that's the flavor I get, and it just doesn't wash. If there are good reasons for not placing a station at Harold St., then explain them. Otherwise, the community has a reasonable expectation for a station in the middle of the longest unserved section of the route - an area that is overwhelmingly residential. I'd think that would serve your interests admirably.

Thanks for listening to the ramblings of a deranged old man roaming the streets of SE Portland.

Marcus Lester
Harbor Care Reedwood
3549 SE Francis St.
Portland, OR 97202
Phone: (503) 232-5767
From: john lewis <jlewis60@hotmail.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 5/18/2008 2:12 PM
Subject: Comment--South Corridor

Metro,

I am not opposed to dedicated high traffic lanes but am opposed to light rail for several reasons:

Lack of versatility for future planning and transit changes
Locked in on electric power and coal burning
Very costly
Trains designed and built overseas
Embedded rails are hazardous to pedestrians and cyclists, skateboards, baby strollers, etc.

Now, dedicated bus lanes makes more sense and leaves opportunity for newer fuels and different vehicles. I suggest you look at the Springfield to Eugene dedicated bus line and stations. Tandem buses work great and allow for many possibilities. They meld with traffic easier and can be phased in as needed. As technology changes, so can the vehicles power sources. In emergency situations, vehicles can be easily added and removed. This would immediately provide more American jobs and add pressure to the transit industry to come up with better buses. This is cheaper up front and in the long run, no rail infrastructure and power grid to maintain. We have to look at costs and adaptability.

An embedded rail and power grid is not cost effective and adaptable.

Please consider my opinion.

Thanks,

John Lewis
2440 SE Tibbetts St.
Portland, OR 97202
503-816-1225

Test your Star IQ Play now!
I think the proposed Milwaukie MAX line is an excellent idea.

I do believe that either Sherman alignment is superior to the Caruthers alignments.

It's frustrating that OHSU is being catered to, disrupting the already established, perfectly good 2003 alignment. But since they do employ a huge number of people, I understand the desire to make their facility accessible by transit.
Please, please get that south rail line built asap! I reside near the I-205 section as it swings into West Linn in the Willamette area and the cars take the area's city streets when the 205 is jammed up morning and evening. Every car I see has a single driver in it. The highest density residential areas from Oregon City, Gladstone, West Linn and northward on the East side of the Willamette would benefit from that light rail extension. If adequate parking and feeder buses were available to move people to a Max station in Milwaukie or even further south, that jam on the freeway and thus my neighborhood streets would be greatly relieved. When those cars leave the 205 for city streets, no one who lives along Willamette Falls Drive can get out of their neighborhood street without a long wait for a break in the line of traffic from the freeway. Bus service south of Portland has always been miserable here in the suburbs. Bolster that service to provide access the southern Max line would help everyone and encourage folks to leave their cars at home. As a self-employed business owner, I have been required to pay TriMet taxes for many years and would love to be able to drive or bus part of the way north and take a Max to a meeting in Portland rather than circle blocks looking for a parking garage or street space in downtown. I would also love to be able to get to the airport without someone chauffeuring me or having to leave my car in an airport lot. I want my money's worth in tax payments to TriMet! I'm a great fan of the existing Max system, even if I seldom ride it and have longed for the extension. I'll be retired by the time you finish the south extension, but that will still be wonderful for me and my family members!

Chris Ling
Registered Representative
Agent
Financial Advisor
West Linn, OR
voice 503.6579433
fax 503.6570390
From: "Erin Lubbers" <erin.lubbers@gmail.com>
To: <jenn.tuerk@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/23/2008 9:05 AM
Subject: Milwaukie Lightrail

The light rail line between downtown Portland and Milwaukie gives people attractive options beyond single occupancy vehicles. That is the most effective way to add value and extend the effective life of our system, and the bridge option is the best they have come up with so far.

We have made smart steps with mass transit, and every addition has been prudent, well-thought out, and effective. We have every reason to believe that this line is being planned with the same care. I hope that the needs of businesses and the community are balanced in the decision making process.

We don't need to wait for far off plans – light rail has proven itself for 20 years. I support this new line from Portland to Milwaukie.

Erin Lubbers
Trans System Accounts - public comment re: Milw/Port light rail

From: Dolly Macken-Hambright <dollym-h@hotmail.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/19/2008 11:42 AM
Subject: public comment re: Milw/Port light rail

Metro, TriMet, et al;

How do you stop a moving train? Hopefully, by thoughtful public comment???

Regarding the proposed light rail line from Portland into Milwaukie please consider the following:

The overall cost and energy expenditure to just build the line would provide expanded bus service to underserved neighborhoods such as Linwood well into the foreseeable future, serving folks that would be able to actually use the service without driving to a park-and-ride location in order to use any public transportation.

Light rail is a fixed track that goes from point A to point B and back to point A. It has no route flexibility such as found with buses, and therefore serves overall a very meager number of riders, especially when factored with the cost per rider, which makes light rail very expensive when weighed against bus service. The nightly evening/morning news showing traffic along Hwy 26 to the W. clearly indicates that the MAX line has not been any too successful in reducing vehicular congestion and tends to serve pretty much only those persons that routinely used buses before the line was constructed, albeit with more driving or the additional use of buses in order to get to the MAX line, in many cases.

Light rail ceases to function when the ridership needs to depend on it, during heavy ice and snow conditions. Buses, however, are much more adaptable and have proven, alternate routes in order to continue to serve many of the people who need it most during those times:

While some of the argument for light rail is wrapped around the use of fossil fuels, it is necessary to point out that other cities, such as Los Angeles are experimenting with alternatively fueled buses, such as hydrogen-fueled buses. While this experiment has proven costly to date, at least some areas are attempting to address these issues, and knowing American ingenuity, these types of experiments will undoubtedly break ground for viable alternatives in the future, especially for mass transit. Light rail is old technology and runs on resources that require a huge expenditure of electricity (reads coal and dams), with limited overall passenger-carrying results.

Light rail also drives a number of other sets of circumstances such as Transit Oriented Development, Tax Increment Financing, and so forth, which do nothing for the tax-paying populace other than to provide new development along the light rail lines. Most of these publicly subsidized new developments are large, sometimes cheaply constructed, apartment/condo complexes, often of mixed-use. As has been proven on other routes and in other countries, much of this artificially inflated population is lower income, which, by its very nature, skews the need for other concentrated public-oriented services, which then drives the need for more, or more concentrated, government over-sight in a given area, both circumstances of which ultimately cost the municipality/county additional tax dollars.

Light rail is not as safe for passengers, either waiting for or riding, due to the lack of supervision at the stations and on the cars. This has never really been addressed on any sustainable level due to the overall cost of same and portends to remain a very large problem into the future. Milwaukie's police department already expends tremendous resources in downtown Milwaukie due in large part to the bus terminus, and it is foreseeable that light rail will cost exponentially larger tax dollars just to monitor the downtown and N. area with the addition of light rail and a more concentrated population. The rest of the city will undoubtedly be paying the price of lower police presence because of already shown statistical need for service in the downtown area. The county sheriff's office will be paying the price of addressing the need for more presence as the line extends into the county S. of...
Milwaukie. Neither of these needs will be met without increased tax revenues, and citizens directly, not the ridership, TriMet or Metro, will be paying the tab for these additional needs, regardless of whether in-house policing improves on MAX lines or not.

Regarding Milwaukie specifically, the footprint to be used for the preferred MAX line is huge in a fairly small area of very few blocks of our downtown. In the foreseeable future including a light rail line, downtown Milwaukie will likely lose any small-town feel and become just another over-sized, perhaps primarily self-serving community of small shops, restaurants and housing with a MAX line running through it. Light rail is too big to preserve much of the current downtown feeling, and while this affects the outlying neighborhoods somewhat less than those in closer proximity, we still feel that the loss of our downtown will cause grief to those that “knew it when”, those who have grown up in the area, those who have invested time and energy to help keep/make our town a source of pride for all residents.

The traffic which stays in Milwaukie but goes E. to W. will be greatly and adversely affected simply because of the logistics of the train crossings, and perhaps the forced closure of many streets. There are many folks who live in Milwaukie currently that perceive little or no reason to go to downtown Milwaukie today except for special events, meetings and the like, and even those reasons may not be enough to motivate Milwaukie’s citizens to venture into their own downtown if the ingress/egress/parking situation becomes less viable than it is today. Light rail will serve to cut Milwaukie off from its own citizens to some fair degree.

This light rail line into downtown Milwaukie will affect 4 schools and not offer much in the way of benefits to those schools. Everyone knows that additional distractions of noise, people and other diversions, not to mention the possible adverse effects to personal safety of students, are not conducive to better learning. The older students who apparently skip class during school hours and wander the streets of Milwaukie would, however, “benefit” from having an influx of more potentially adverse influences, as well as a means to remove themselves from town readily during school hours. This behavior is not conducive to building better citizens, however, so it does not serve Milwaukie, as a whole, very well.

Kellogg/Kronberg Park is a parcel of land that was donated to the city with the intent that it be a park for the citizens to enjoy, not as the underbelly of a light rail line. Fish recovery, indeed the entirety of the natural areas on the S. of downtown do not benefit in any way from the extension of light rail through downtown Milwaukie. In fact, the extension will adversely affect this area, most likely to the point of complete devastation.

In short, what does extending light rail into Milwaukie do FOR Milwaukie? It brings more people to Milwaukie, either to live in order to ride mass transit and possibly reap some intrinsic benefits, or merely to increase the needs of additional infrastructure such as water/sewer/traffic/parking/police and fire service/social services, etc., thereby increasing the need for government presence and losing the “small-town” feel of our downtown.

What does bringing light rail into downtown do TO Milwaukie? It takes a huge swath of space, ties up traffic into/out of the downtown area and onto/off of I-99, provides a ready conduit for undesirable activity, drives taxes ever higher (most especially if Milwaukie has to cover an initial $5M commitment to bring it here), adversely affects the livability of the existing, tax-paying citizens already living in the downtown area, cuts downtown Milwaukie off from many of the rest of the folks who visit downtown today, adversely affects natural habitat and potential stream water quality, begs the question of today's infrastructure and in general, causes the loss of an area many of Milwaukie’s citizens would like to continue to enjoy and live in.

All of this skirts the primary issue of the simple fact that Milwaukie citizens feel quite strongly that they have voted down light rail on multiple occasions and that this is being forced upon them by self-serving politicians/government. Many of the answers to questions tendered by citizens have never been answered, either at the “open house” level, in “working groups”, or otherwise and many of the answers have differed from one occasion to another. There is a very strong feeling among many citizens that there have been nefarious activities surrounding this segment of light rail, which will go largely unaddressed by the elected officials as well as the governance in general. None of these perceptions, right or wrong, will ever serve to make light rail palatable to the general populace.

It is in TriMet’s/Metro’s best interests to bring this alignment to a public vote, including the funding for same. If
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the vote supports light rail and the intrinsic costs thereof, there will be much less opposition. If the vote is against light rail, let that be the end!

What will folks in Milwaukie support? Perhaps there is sufficient support among the population to bring light rail to the Southgate location (Hwy 224/Hwy 99) and then run the line E/W down highway 224. This has been suggested many times, but seems to fall on deaf ears?? Only a vote of the people will truly answer any of these nagging questions.

Dolly Macken-Hambright
Linwood NDA treasurer, Milwaukie
I would like to comment on the Milwaukie light rail DEIS:

The extension of light rail through OMSI district is a logical next step, and I support it. I ride MAX every day, and every addition to the system makes it more valuable and increases transportation options.

The Sherman option balances the needs of eastside businesses with the transportation and circulation needs of the City. Putting MAX through the OMSI district establishes a new transportation corridor on the east side – that makes sense, and the investment in light rail is a proven winner.

As more people move to this region, we will need to find creative transportation solutions to move people between their homes and jobs. Light rail has proven that it can be effective in Portland.

Sincerely,
Peter Markgraf
I support the extension of light rail from Portland to Milwaukie. We are especially supportive of the Sherman street crossing. Light rail has been a good investment in this region and adding this segment will increase the value of the entire system.

The light rail crossing at Sherman is a good compromise. It is the least intrusive to businesses, and it was forged in collaboration with the public, balancing the needs of everyone who will be affected by this development.

Commuters, businesses, and people traveling into Downtown will benefit from this new light rail. It will promote economic development, private investment, and sustainable transportation.

Build the damn thing and build it soon.

Sincerely,

Tom Markgraf
From: "feedback feedback" <feedback.MRC-PO.MetCen@oregonmetro.gov>
To: <trans@metro-region.org>
Date: 5/5/2008 8:53 AM
Subject: Fwd: Milwaukie Light Rail Plan

Forwarding to Metro transportation planning.

>>> "Ann Masterman" <annwitch@comcast.net> 05/04/08 12:11 PM >>>
I looked at the maps of the proposed alignments. Here are my reactions to what I saw:

A light rail (or any other kind) station directly behind a school is so very scary to me. I have heard and read about all the crime problems in Gresham and Beaverton connected to light rail stations, and I definitely don't want that in Milwaukie. Those children deserve better than this plan.

Another station appears to be very close to Milwaukie High School. If you combine the student element and the transient element, you may find some policing problems.

The map shows the line going down the existing train line. This is so close to so many businesses (I'm sure this was the idea in the first place) that Milwaukie will be nothing more than a large light rail station. I don't like the idea.

Is someone planning on drastically increasing the police patrols at such proposed stations? It will be necessary, based on what has already happened at other places (Gresham and Beaverton). Please, not on my tax dollar.

The one thing I did like in the plan was extending it to Park Avenue. This would give the people from the surrounding area better access, and make it extendable to the Oak Grove, Gladstone, and Oregon City areas.

I have ridden on rail line in the Washington, D.C. area, and it works very nicely. However, the stations are not in the back yard of schools, and are mostly underground. We don't have that option here, and I foresee eyesores and crime problems. It makes me want to be in downtown Milwaukie even less than I am now. My grocery stores moved out and my drugstore closed. Not much parking left at my library, and it has been made known in years past that automobile traffic is not desired in the downtown area. I don't have much left there.
From: William Flynn <nccet@comcast.net>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/22/2008 7:20 PM
Subject: Portland-Milwaukie light rail project

Please be sure that there is some sort of shuttle to get people from the Sellwood/Moreland area served by the #70 bus line over to the light rail stop near Tacoma.

Martha

Martha Mattus
Office Manager
National Council for Continuing Education & Training
PO Box 820062
Portland, OR 97282-1062
503-233-1842
fax: 503-232-1073
www.nccet.org
I live very close to downtown Milwaukie. In theory, a light rail there would be fun for me and my children. We could ride downtown (where we never go because of parking, and it would be helpful for getting us to Beaverton, a frequent destination.

The reality, though, is that we would hardly ever use it. Occasionally if there was a real need, and once when it was new, for the novelty (for my kids). We can't afford to ride the MAX, or the buses. Only one of my three kids can still ride free. We would usually be gone long enough to need to pay a second fare for the ride home. Anywhere we went would be out of our zone.

I assume the expense of building the light rail would raise TriMet prices even higher. That would hurt most the people that the bus system should be helping - those who can't afford another option. I would rather keep TriMet prices as they are, so that I can at least occasionally use the bus if I have to.

I also do not think downtown Milwaukie is big enough for a transit center. It would take up so much space, and add so much noise and bustle, that it would end up as a dominant focal point. What a miserable focal point!

Despite that, I would seriously consider the convenience of a light rail - if only it truly were a convenience.

Please do not go forward with the Milwaukie light rail project!

- Heather Maxwell
Hello,
This email is in regards to the proposed plan to run light rail through the city of Milwaukie. I am against this happening because there are four schools in the location of downtown Milwaukie which brings a threat to our children. It is not necessary to come into Milwaukie with this. The line can go up Hwy 224 or it can stay of McLaughlin Blvd. One stop is enough. There certainly doesn't need to be so many in such a small area. No other areas have so many in such a short span.
Please take these comments into consideration and look more carefully at the proposed project.
Thank you,
Mary Lou McCann
To Whom it may concern,

I am a fan of public transportation, since I lived in Japan for awhile. I believe that we need to work towards having it more available to the population. I do not believe that rails need to be near schools however, and I feel it is unwise and unsafe to put children at risk in our efforts to make transportation decisions. I believe we deserve evaluations that consider all possibilities and minds geared towards making a long term decision that will serve the community for years into the future. I don't understand why Highway 99 is not considered in the way that Burnside has been used in the SE out to Gresham. It could even be designed like Vancouver, BC's Skytrain. We have to think of the routes already in use for transit and augment them, so there is less trauma to the existing communities where gentleness and safety are the most important components.

Thank you for working so hard to help with the problems of transit, but I think more studying needs to be done.

Sincerely,

Julia McCarl
2323 SE Barnes Rd.
Gresham, OR 97080
503-663-9264
Jenn Tuerk - Fwd: Milwaukie Light Rail

From: Lake McTighe
To: Tuerk, Jenn
Date: 6/16/2008 2:14 PM
Subject: Fwd: Milwaukie Light Rail

>>> "Don McCarthy" <donoregon@gmail.com> 6/12/2008 11:10 AM >>>

All too often the only contact regarding civic or political issues are usually negative.

I am one person who is in favor of the Light Rail coming to Milwaukie. In a perfect world everything would be easy and there would be no problems as voiced for those against such projects as this one. Also, all too often, those in favor of such projects rarely raise their voice.

I am but one voice. I am certain, however, there are many like myself who is in favor of this project.

Don McCarthy
Milwaukie, OR
From: Matt Menely <mtnsoles@hotmail.com>  
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>  
Date: 6/22/2008 11:45 PM  
Subject: Portland to Milwaukie SDEIS Comments

Below you will find our Comments, Concerns, & Questions regarding the Portland to Milwaukie SDEIS.

Why are other reasonable and viable alternatives left out of the SDEIS? There are other reasonable and viable alternatives that have not been included in the SDEIS. The alignment alternatives that have been included would harm to schools and neighborhoods. We do not see that any other alternatives have been studied in detail, or a comparison of all reasonable and viable alternatives has been made to the proposed alignments. Including all other reasonable and viable alternatives is required to fulfill the intent and purpose of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Voters rejected light rail 2 times already? The SDEIS provides little information regarding the two times that Milwaukie voters rejected this project, including a recall of the Mayor and City Council Members. It is our understanding that you are required by NEPA to disclose in detail if the project has been previously rejected and why.

Where is the local funding (Milwaukie/Clackamas county portion) coming from? Taxes to pay for the local funding are not clearly described in the EIS. The citizens of Milwaukie and Clackamas County should be provided this information to allow them to evaluate and give comments on the SDEIS.

This SDEIS is the third supplement to a very old document. Is there not a point at which the original EIS is tossed out and completely started over? Information used from the original EIS and subsequent SDEIS's could be out of date and in need of a full rewrite/restudy.

Why does the alignment need to come into downtown Milwaukie? It seems that the main argument being made is that it will be the catalyst to "revitalize" the downtown business district. Light rail and property development are 2 separate issues and should not be linked together. In our opinion, the only goal of light rail should be to provide reliable, safe, alternative transportation to the largest number of the population, with the least harm to Schools and Neighborhoods and the Environment, at the most reasonable cost to the taxpayers, not property development.

In our research on the Metro web site, Metro's own urban growth models show that of the 369,600 people expected to move into Clackamas Co. in the next 25 or so years (see Metro RTP page 2-6, table 2.2), the majority of them are going to be living in east county (Damascas, Carver, Estacata, and so on). Metro's own RTP traffic models also show that these people will likely use Hwy 224 one of their main routes into Portland. However it looks like the map Figure 4.2-5 somehow ignores this data? Shouldn't a light rail line be put where the bulk of the people are traveling, on hwy 224? Hwy 224 is the most direct route into the heart of Portland, not 205 where a light rail line is currently being built. We support an alignment that would go from Portland to the Milwaukie Southgate site, and then turned and headed out 224, before entering downtown Milwaukie. Milwaukie Marketplace, a large strip shopping mall located in Milwaukie and facing Hwy 224 has essentially replaced downtown Milwaukie as a center of commerce in Milwaukie. A Hwy 224 max line could include a station and park and ride on the large piece of vacant land directly behind Milwaukie Marketplace. A 224 alignment would not only also serve more of the residents of Clackamas county, but it would serve more of Milwaukie's residents and businesses. A further line extension could then continue out 224 either southeast towards Damascas, Carver, and Estacata, or head south along hwy 205 to serve Gladstone Oregon City, Canby, and West Linn. There is plenty of right of way in hwy 224 to handle the infrastructure needed for a light rail alignment.
Metro would argue that they already looked at the 224 alignment option in a past EIS, but that alignment still came into the Historic Neighborhood and went out to 224 on Monroe St. which would have cut through and destroyed the Historic Neighborhood which is why it was rejected by citizens.

We have enough pieces of large transportation infrastructure that have cut up Milwaukie (hwy 224, 99E, and 2 railroad lines). If the goal is to replace car trips, then put the alignment where the cars are currently traveling, and encourage people to leave their cars at home. If it must go south and touch upon Downtown Milwaukie, then put it on 99E or Main Street, rather than the Tillamook alignment. The mayor should not have been allowed to remove these reasonable and viable alignment options from the SDEIS.

Cut-through traffic and parking problems?
Increased cut-through traffic in Milwaukie, on Harrison, Monroe, Washington, and Lake Road have not adequately been addressed in the SDEIS. If the alignment goes into the Historic Neighborhood and Downtown Milwaukie will increase, as will increased parking issues (which are currently problematic without light rail). Add to that the need for crossing signalization at 3 out of 4 of those streets where the Light Rail line crosses them and there will become a traffic problem where their traditionally has not been one. We do not want to see more traffic coming through the neighborhoods just so that they can park and ride light rail. We already have that problem with the 30 year old “temporary” bus transit center. Parking issues in downtown and the Historic Neighborhood have increased since Tri-Met closed the park and ride station at Southgate a while back.

All 4 of these street have schools located on them:
- Lake Road- Rowe Middle School & Milwaukie High School
- Washington- Milwaukie High School & St. John the Baptist
- Monroe- Portland Waldorf School
- Harrison- Portland Waldorf School

Increased cut-through traffic on these streets will pose more danger to students at these schools as well as pedestrians accessing the Ledding Library (on Harrison) or multiple churches parishioners.

Chapter 4.2.2.6 in the SDEIS says:
"With all alignment options terminating at Lake Avenue (it's actually Road), the most frequently used station would be in downtown Milwaukie (Harrison/Monroe/Washington), with 16 to 18 percent of riders.”

Where are these cars coming from/to and where are they going to park? The SDEIS does not properly address the traffic and parking problems that will arise from this quote.

Noise and Vibration Impacts-
We are not going to dive into this subject too deep because it is probably going to be addressed quite well by those associated with the Schools and Historic Neighborhood. They all have very valid points about why the alignment should not be located so close to their houses or buildings and we totally agree with them. Everything that we have heard from Tri-Met to this point leads us to believe that they will only do the minimum mediation required by NEPA to address these problems, especially as the cost of this project continues to climb and costs need to be contained.

Problems with light rail trains in freight corridors?
Our understanding is that there have been some accidents with light rail lines located in close proximity to freight rail lines (Littleton, CO and San Diego, CA?) Is there a possibility that the Federal Railroad Administration or the Railroad company that owns the right of way will not allow the light rail alignment to be built along the Tillamook Alignment? If that is a possibility, then shouldn't other alignments be included in this study?

Doesn't the Mayor of Milwaukie have a conflict of interest?
The Mayor of Milwaukie, Jim Bernard, owns commercial property directly adjacent to the proposed alignment and possible station/terminus at Lake Road. It is essentially guaranteed that the Mayor's property values will increase dramatically should light rail be built on the proposed alignment, because it is zoned as commercial property. Commercial property values began to rise dramatically on North Interstate as that light rail line was planned and built. We would gather that the Mayor's property would do the same
once this line is set to be built. What is the possibility that he will benefit from this light rail line? He would likely be able to sell and/or redevelop his commercial property (and more easily gain funding for redevelopment) into more attractive retail/commercial space more easily if this alignment is built vs. not being built. Thus, Jim Bernard should not be representing Milwaukie on the Steering Committee, nor should be take part in any Milwaukie City Council votes associated with this light rail alignment.

Don’t get us wrong, we are fans of alternative transportation and would love to use light rail if it comes to Milwaukie. It just seems that there is not a proper look at all the reasonable and viable options taking place as part of the SDEIS.

Thank you for your time,

Matt & Sarah Menely
Milwaukie, OR Residents for 6+ years
PO Box 82518
Portland, OR 97282
503-654-1819

Earn cashback on your purchases with Live Search - the search that pays you back!
http://search.live.com/cashback/?&pkw=form=MIJAAF/publ=HMTGL/crea=earncashback
From: Ralph Merwin <prizmew@yahoo.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/23/2008 6:18 AM
Subject: Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail SDEIS comments

My comments regarding the SDEIS pertain mainly to the section in or near the City of Milwaukie.

In the Industrial Area, the alignment should stay on McLoughlin Blvd. This would allow for a Park and Ride at the former Southgate Cinemas location, as agreed to by TriMet and Milwaukie. Having a Park and Ride at this location is important since it allows potential riders coming in on highway 224 an opportunity for easy access to light rail. If this Park and Ride is not present, these riders will likely just continue to drive into Portland and not use light rail at all.

A Park and Ride at the Southgate location would also be useful for a bus layover function (as was successfully done previously).

South of the Industrial Area, the alignment should stay on McGloughlin instead of veering over to the railroad tracks. McGloughlin is an existing transportation corridor, and large projects such as a light rail belong in transportation corridors, not neighborhoods. This is a key item from the "14 Points" agreement in Milwaukie. Putting the alignment on McGloughlin would suddenly become very attractive if the right-of-way next to the railroad was not available, so the McGloughlin alignment should be given serious consideration (not just a quick all-night session as was done in the summer of 2007).

Regardless of the alignment location, there should be just one station in Milwaukie, at Lake Road. This should be a Park and Ride.

If the alignment stays on the railroad right-of-way, the entire section from 224 to Lake Road should be converted to a "quiet zone".

In the section between 224 and Lake Road, the rail bed should be build on vibration absorbing material.

The bus transfer/layover function should be moved out of downtown Milwaukie. More than half of the noise in downtown is from the buses starting, idling, stopping, etc. Such a concentration of buses also attracts large numbers of, for lack of a better word, "punxs" - people with nothing better to do than hang around bus stations. They litter the area, defecate in the bushes in neighboring businesses and make rude comments to passers-by. If this bus area was split into two bus stops (one north, one south near the light rail station at Lake), and the layover function moved to the Southgate location, the buses would become a pleasant addition to Milwaukie instead of a major detraction.

When the light rail crosses McGloughlin, it should be an at-grade crossing not a massive, blocks-long raised platform (flyway?). No matter where the crossing point occurs, having such a large raised section is a major visual detraction to the area.

The light rail line should extend to Park Avenue. There should be a station at Blue Bird to service that neighborhood.

Ralph
From: "Arlene Miller" <arlenemima@comcast.net>
To: "trans metro" <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/17/2008 2:19 PM
Subject: light rail comments
CC: "Joe Loomis" <loomisj@ci.milwaukie.or.us>, "Deborah Barnes" <barnesd@ci.milwaukie.or.us>, "Jim Bernard" <bernardj@ci.milwaukie.or.us>, "Susan Stone" <stones@ci.milwaukie.or.us>, "gregory chaimov" <chaimovg@ci.milwaukie.or.us>, "DuVal, Pat" <duvalp@ci.milwaukie.or.us>

LIGHT RAIL COMMENTS

I have lived in Milwaukie for almost 30 years. Reared two children here and now my two small grandchildren who attend the Milwaukie Elementary school, very near the "proposed" light rail.

With that said, I TOTALLY OPPOSE the light rail going through Milwaukie proper. Milwaukie is just too small a town to have a large rail project. We voted it down twice some years ago and NOT just for monetary reasons. We did not and still do not want it going through or near our neighborhoods and Milwaukie downtown is like a neighborhood with Historic Milwaukie a hairbreath away.

Milwaukie is like an oasis, a haven, a peaceful town and we want to keep it that way - there are not many left.

Please, I petition greatly to leave Milwaukie alone.

At a very last resort, light rail can have a terminus at Southgate and travel down Hwy. 224, with stops at Milwaukie Market Place, KMart, etc. with park-n-rides located at the stops.

I hope you will consider my comments.

Thank you,

Arlene Miller
503.659.9339
I am writing to express my strong support for bringing light rail service to Milwaukie.

I am a resident and homeowner in the Island Station neighborhood of Milwaukie. The proposed light rail service would provide a reliable, inexpensive alternative for transportation to downtown Portland and other areas. It would also help ease traffic load on McLaughlin Boulevard between Milwaukie and Portland.

As the population of the area grows, and transportation and fuel costs increase, the light rail project will go a long way to maintaining essential transportation required to keep this area viable.

Eric Miller
12322 SE 20th Avenue
Milwaukie, OR 97222
From: Eileen Murray <berdwmn41@hotmail.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/9/2008 10:31 AM
Subject: KEEP The Harold Street Station!

I support the building of The Harold St. Station; It will bring property values up, and encourage quality development and restoration of this already good neighborhood! Don't EXCLUDE the plans for Harold St. PLEASE!

Eileen Murray

Now you can invite friends from Facebook and other groups to join you on Windows Live™ Messenger. Add them now!
Trans System Accounts - Include Harold Street Station in Portland to Milwaukie LRT

From: "SEAN AND CATHY MURRAY" <nwmurrays5@msn.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/4/2008 9:33 PM
Subject: Include Harold Street Station in Portland to Milwaukie LRT
CC: "Sean Murray" <s.murray@alliant-systems.com>

Dear Metro Planning Team-

As a property owners and residents of North Westmoreland, we are writing to declare our strong support for inclusion of the Harold Street Station in the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Project.

When we and our three young children had the opportunity to move to Portland eight years ago, we focused our housing search in Sellwood-Westmoreland because of the relative affordability of homes, family focused community, and excellent public schools.

In the intervening years we have seen many changes. While Sellwood-Moreland has remained a vibrant and popular neighborhood, the steady rise in property values has priced many families out of the area. We have witnessed the impact of this situation first-hand with declining school enrollment threatening closure of Llewellyn Elementary, and increased development of multi-unit, car centered condominium projects which are not typically suitable for families.

Of all of the areas bordering the Portland to Milwaukie route, North Westmoreland is unique in providing high density zoning and relatively affordable property adjacent to an established and popular neighborhood. As we have already seen, development of this end of Sellwood is inevitable. The question remaining to be answered is what type of development we will see.

We believe that the addition of the Harold Street station can be the cornerstone for rebuilding north Westmoreland into a dynamic neighborhood of affordable, family centered homes. With the amenity of easy access to LRT provided by the Harold Street Station, the incentive for investment to renovate existing housing and develop quality multi-family housing is much higher. Besides increasing light rail ridership, this type of development will lead to stability in the local schools, and increased support for local businesses.

Without inclusion of the station, our neighborhood will remain a mis-zoned oddity. With the combination of high density requirements, and "cheap" property due to limited transportation access, I believe that we will see more car centered, single lot developments forced into the neighborhood. This will lead to reduced property values, lack of cohesive communities, and reduced quality of place. I do not believe that this type of development is in anyone’s best interests.

Portland constantly touts the livability of its neighborhoods, focus on sustainability, and willingness to lead on design issues. Inclusion of the Harold Street Station in the Portland to Milwaukie line is a golden opportunity to demonstrate these values and expand a vibrant and sustainable community.

For all of these reasons, I strongly urge you to please include the Harold Street Station in the final planning for the Portland to Milwaukie light rail Project.

Sincerely,

Sean & Cathy Murray
2043 SE Ellis
Portland, Or
503-619-4044
Trans System Accounts - Call for Support of Harold Street Station in Southeast Max Planning

From: "Sean Murray" <S.Murray@alliant-systems.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/23/2008 8:24 AM
Subject: Call for Support of Harold Street Station in Southeast Max Planning

Dear Metro-

As a property owners and residents of North Westmoreland, we are writing to declare our strong support for inclusion of the Harold Street Station in the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Project.

As you may have heard, both the Metro Citizens Advisory Council (CAC) and Sellwood Moreland Improvement League (SMILE) have voted on this issue, and are now publicly calling for inclusion of the station in the project. I attended the meetings where these decisions were made, and was impressed by the variety of input, and number of compelling reasons for inclusion of the station. These issues included:

- The station costs and travel time impact may be mitigated by City of Milwaukie's request for a single downtown station, and the CAC recommendation to follow the Tillamook alignment.
- The physical barriers and terrain for accessing either Bybee or Holgate Stations would be difficult and treacherous for most riders from the Harold Station area.
- The Harold station neighborhood has already been "up-zoned" in anticipation of the station. This is affecting property values and neighborhood development now.

We believe that the addition of the Harold Street station can be the cornerstone for rebuilding north Westmoreland into a dynamic neighborhood of affordable, family centered homes. With the amenity of easy access to LRT provided by the Harold Street Station, the incentive for investment to renovate existing housing and develop quality multi-family housing is much higher. Besides increasing light rail ridership, this type of development will lead to stability in the local schools, and increased support for local businesses.

For all of these reasons, I strongly urge you to work to include the Harold Street Station in the final planning for the Portland to Milwaukie light rail Project.

Sincerely,

Sean & Cathy Murray

2043 SE Ellis

Portland, Or

503-619-4044
From: Robert Liberty
To: Tuerk, Jenn
Date: 6/24/2008 3:24 PM
Subject: Fwd: Call to Include Harold Street Station in Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Planning

For the record

>>> "Sean Murray" <SMurray@alliant-systems.com> 6/23/2008 8:17 AM >>>
Dear Mr. Liberty-

As a property owners and residents of North Westmoreland, we are writing to declare our strong support for inclusion of the Harold Street Station in the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Project.

As you may have heard, both the Metro Citizens Advisory Council (CAC) and Sellwood Moreland Improvement League (SMILE) have voted on this issue, and publicly called for inclusion of the station in the project. I attended the meetings where these decisions were made, and was impressed by the variety of input, and number of compelling reasons for inclusion of the station. These issues included:

* The station costs and travel time impact may be mitigated by City of Milwaukie's request for a single downtown station, and the CAC recommendation to follow the Tillamook alignment.
* The physical barriers and terrain for accessing either Bybee or Holgate Stations would be difficult and treacherous for most riders from the Harold Station area.
* The Harold station neighborhood has already been "up-zoned" in anticipation of the station. This is affecting property values and neighborhood development now.

We believe that the addition of the Harold Street station can be the cornerstone for rebuilding North Westmoreland into a dynamic neighborhood of affordable, family centered homes. With the amenity of easy access to LRT provided by the Harold Street Station, the incentive for investment to renovate existing housing and develop quality multi-family housing is much higher. Besides increasing light rail ridership, this type of development will lead to stability in the local schools, and increased support for local businesses.

For all of these reasons, I strongly urge you to work to include the Harold Street Station in the final planning for the Portland to Milwaukie light rail Project.

Sincerely,

Sean & Cathy Murray
2043 SE Ellis
Portland, Or
503-619-4044
Trans System Accounts - FW: Defending Milwaukie from Trimet attack

From: "Runnion, Kelly" <RunnionK@trimet.org>
To: <tuerkj@metro.dst.or.us>
Date: 6/2/2008 2:21 PM
Subject: FW: Defending Milwaukie from Trimet attack

-----Original Message-----
From: Paul Newman [mailto:pnewman@pacificfluid.com]
Sent: Monday, June 02, 2008 9:48 AM
To: Runnion, Kelly
Subject: Defending Milwaukie from Trimet attack

I understand that Tri-met is still planning a run through Milwaukie with a station beside St. John's grade school. The noise and traffic congestion created by numerous trains running along side or near four of our schools (just a nine iron away) just does not make sense. They are a safety hazard to the children going and coming from school. Tri-met has proved these trains run to quiet to avoid hitting people. Tri-met has proven they cannot keep the passengers safe. The City of Milwaukie has proven they can't keep the transit station located in down town Milwaukie safe. Now you want to add to the problem! Take this message as a protest (don't have a picket sign) and a vote against this proposal. There are alternatives less disruptive to this community.

H. Paul Newman
503-654-2787
Member of St. John's Parish

file://C:\Documents and Settings\tuerk\Local Settings\Temp\XPgroupwise\484401FAMetCen... 6/6/2008
Jenn Tuerk,

I write to support the proposed light rail line from Portland to Milwaukie, Oregon. This is an important link in the light rail system for our region especially now with Global warming and high gasoline prices. Light rail has contributed significantly to the vitality of Portland bringing in people from the region to the Central City. The proposed new transit bridge over the Willamette River will provide another valuable connection to the south for the east and west sides of Portland. I urge you to build the Milwaukie Light Rail as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Ann Niles
618 NW 12th Avenue #316
Portland, OR 97209
503-227-8484
From: Lake McTighe  
To: Tuerk, Jenn  
Date: 6/16/2008 2:15 PM  
Subject: Fwd: Light rail in Milwaukie

>>> "Sherri Obermire" <obermiremom@comcast.net> 6/14/2008 1:18 PM >>>
I am writing today to express my grave concern over the current plan for placement by Tri-met of their new light rail line in the city of Milwaukie. This line is being planned for what is essentially a mixed residential area with four elementary schools either right next to or within one block of the planned line. This situation is especially untenable because of the potentially grave safety problems for the children in this area. Noise disruption for children during school hours is also of great concern. I want to protest in the strongest of terms the current plan and appeal to you to help find alternative placement. TriMet needs to consider alternate routes which are nearby and far superior alternate routes providing light rail service without a huge problem that come with the present plan. Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,

Sherri Obermire  
St John the Baptist parent/parishioner  
(503) 722-83457

file://C:\Documents and Settings\tuerk\Local Settings\Temp\XPgpwise\4856756FMetCent...  6/16/2008
To Whom it may Concern,

I would like to see Metro offer an alternative line through central Milwaukie as required by NEPA guidelines. I would then like Metro to publish a comparative study in the form of a table so that lay people such as myself can understand the environmental impacts more fully.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,
Robin O'Brien
14591 SE Creekside Dr
Milwaukie OR, 97267
Dear Metro,
We are in support of light rail, with the raising prices of gas, transportation options are a very good thing.
Thank you
Violet O'Neel
To whom it may concern:

Back when the first Milwaukie light rail Citizen Advisory Com began, (meeting in Sellwood) I joined the brigade because I saw it was so necessary for my neighborhood and for commuters who didn't want to add to the already packed McLoughlin. I cried when it didn't go through but worked with other Brooklyn leaders to get it back on the board again. Maybe now it will be built before I meet my creator.

Perhaps the rising gas prices is a blessing. People will now understand that the car is the last resort when they have other options. We need to give them those options and for a city the size of Portland, buses can't do it all.

I feel that if Metro had listened to Milwaukie leaders the first time around, (as far as the route,) it would have made it. This time it appears that there is synergy going on so I have hope that the Milwaukie/Portland Light Rail will really be built and it will be a great addition to our city and a saving grace to the neighborhoods.

Marie Phillippi
Brooklyn Action Corps
Despite our years-long citizen participation into the foregoing fact finding process and Oak Grove's ongoing input, we do get it! We can see it clearly...the handwriting on the wall....the reality. Metro and Milwaukie will have light rail... It is my belief that light rail ridership would certainly benefit bus/traffic downtown congestion for the south corridor residents of Milwaukie and the development and business stimuli that Milwaukie believes it will bring.

It is sought after, heralded by and would benefit almost exclusively...the City of Milwaukie. Many of my fellow Oak Grove residents and I have said and always believed that the Southgate increasingly barren "industrial area" would have been a perfect terminus, but was not on the final choice table. Given the three choices, then surely light rail should conclude in Milwaukie at Lake Road, your choice "A". As cited in your light rail bulletin, Choice "A" would cost less...$99 to $124 million in construction costs, $1 million less annually to operate, requires 6-7 fewer acquisitions...impacts 2 fewer planned parks. results in fewer noise and vibration impacts...and the biggest reason of them all...stops where those partnered reside, and desire the light rail benefit. Let Milwaukie have what it wants and give the residents of Oak Grove what we want.... and have repeatedly stated.

Julie L. Pittenger-Stanley
14320 SE Fairoaks Avenue
juliestanley11@comcast.net
Oak Grove Resident
Trans System Accounts - FW: South Light Rail

From: "Runion, Kelly" <RunionK@trimet.org>
To: "Jennifer Tuerk (E-mail)" <tuerkj@metro.dst.or.us>
Date: 6/23/2008 4:06 PM
Subject: FW: South Light Rail

From: Stephanie Poyser [mailto:stephp@jl-s.com]
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2008 1:21 PM
To: Stephanie Poyser
Subject: South Light Rail

Dear Director:

I am writing today to express my concern over the current plan for placement by Tri-Met of their new light rail line in the City of Milwaukie. This line is being planned for what is essentially a mixed residential area with four elementary schools either right next to or within one block of the planned line. This situation is especially untenable because of the potentially grave safety problems for the area's children. The additional noise disruption is also of great concern. (These schools are already saddled between two busy rail lines.) I want to protest in the strongest terms the current plan and appeal to you to help find alternative placement. Tri-Met must consider alternate routes which are nearby and far superior alternate routes providing light rail service without the huge problems that come with the present plan.

Thank you for your attention to this issue.

Stephanie Poyser
Long-time Milwaukie Resident

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail transmission may contain confidential and privileged information. Unless you are the addressee (or authorized to receive messages for the addressee), you may not use, copy or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received this message by mistake, please advise the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message. Nothing in this message should be interpreted as a digital or electronic signature that can be used to authenticate a contract or other legal document. Thank you.
Trans System Accounts - FW: Opposition to Light Rail in Downtown Milwaukee

From: "Runnion, Kelly" <RunnionK@trimet.org>
To: "Jennifer Tuerk (E-mail)" <tuerk@metro.dst.or.us>
Date: 6/23/2008 4:06 PM
Subject: FW: Opposition to Light Rail in Downtown Milwaukee

From: Tessie Prentice [mailto:prenticeconsulting@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2008 12:57 PM
To: Runnion, Kelly
Subject: Opposition to Light Rail in Downtown Milwaukee

To the TriMet Board of Directors,

I strongly oppose the current plan routing Light Rail through the downtown area of Milwaukee. The vicinity of four schools combined with an overabundance of public space that can not be monitored without dismounted police and citizen foot patrols makes for a potential drug dealing and vagrancy nightmare. TriMet needs to seriously consider the alternative solutions which are in better alignment of the current and future transportation needs. In short, running Light Rail through downtown Milwaukee will seriously damage the livability while not meeting transportation needs.

Regards,

Glenn Prentice
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From: TESSIE PRENTICE
To: bernardi@ci.milwaukie.or.us ; stones@ci.milwaukie.or.us ; barnesd@ci.milwaukie.or.us ; chaimova@ci.milwaukie.or.us ; loomisi@ci.milwaukie.or.us
Sent: Sunday, June 22, 2008 9:36 PM
Subject: Opposition to Milwaukie Light Rail Alignment

Dear Sir/Madam,

The current plan for placement of light rail concerns me because it is too close to schools. The safety of all the children needs to be considered, and there are alternative routes that can be used that won't affect schools. I recommend that TriMet looks at providing light rail service on an alternate route that won't create the huge problems that the current plan shows. I appeal to you to help find alternate placement of the Milwaukie Light Rail.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Tessie Prentice
503-653-7832
Trans System Accounts - comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) Evaluation

From: "manu.rehani" <manu.rehani@mrds-solutions.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 5/18/2008 9:54 PM
Subject: comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) Evaluation

My Comments are:
1) Re. Budget:
   a. The Price of steel has doubled in the last year. It is unclear what price was assumed in the budget calculations
   b. The price of gas has tripled in the last year. It is unclear what price of gas was assumed in the budget
   c. Since the budget numbers appear to be close to earlier estimates (based on a quick glance) I think the actual budget will be 50-75% higher.
   d. This should be reviewed and the public should be informed so that we can get an accurate understanding of the costs to weight the benefits
2) Re. Alternative alignments in Milwaukie City.
   a. I am disappointed that the only alignment is in extreme proximity to neighborhoods and schools.
   b. I don't see how the Light Rail will integrate as a "good neighbor" under these circumstances

Best Regards

Manu Rehani
Principal
MRDS Business Solutions, LLC
Portland, OR 97210, USA
Office: 503.764.9028
Cell: 503.810.0361
Fax: 503.214.8019
manu.rehani@mrds-solutions.com
www.mrds-solutions.com
From: Bob Reitenour <carquestbob@yahoo.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 5/7/2008 2:29 PM
Subject: Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail

Re: The report in the Portland Tribune "Milwaukie light-rail environmental study ready for comment"
When I was in the Portland/Milwaukie area last July and August, I noted that the property for the light-rail along the McLoughlin corridor was already being prepared which means it had already been purchased. My question is Why have public meetings and conduct a study now? This is not only useless and expensive, it is truly insulting to realize that our local governmental bodies believe the people who will pay a ton for this are just too stupid to know what is being done to them. It just never seems to change, does it? Probably why I moved out of the country. "Still disgusted after all these years..."

Be a better friend, newshound, and know-it-all with Yahoo! Mobile. Try it now.
http://mobile.yahoo.com/_ylt=Ahu0662tsR8HdtDypao8Wcj9tAcJ
Trans System Accounts - Light rail Milwaukie Line

From: "Ann Robinson" <annlmom@comcast.net>
To: "Runnion, Kelly" <RunnionK@tri-met.org>
Date: 5/18/2008 10:07 AM
Subject: Light rail Milwaukie Line

Please Distribute this to the Board of Directors

Sirs,

I am writing you today to protest in the strongest terms your plans to place the new light rail line in Milwaukie near the existing mainline rail tracks. It is my understanding that the original plan to place it downtown was nixed by the businesses and this alternate route was developed. My reasons for my objection are two fold, one the citing of this track would place it within one block of three elementary schools. Let me be clear I am huge supporter of light rail and use it often in my personal travels. The reality is however that the light rail system is not generally a safe system and brings with it the element of crime that puts people especially juveniles at risk. At a recent meeting in Milwaukie representatives of Tri Met produced three representatives of schools near Tri Met max line. This was very misleading as two of the schools had placed their schools next to the line on purpose and both revealed later they regret that decision.

One of their complaints is my second objection--noise-- you have failed to obtain the right of way thru Milwaukie which would enable you to avoid have the crossing arms of the mainline come down every a train rolls past. This frequent noise would be of great disruption to the schools in question.

I fail to understand with options such as McGlouglin Blvd. and better yet Hwy 224 nearby why Tri met would be willing to risk the personal safety of hundreds of school children. The reality in this is simple you can and must do better than your current plan. I would welcome the opportunity to hear from any of you on this important subject.

John A. Robinson
971-207-5344
parent of a second grader St. John the Baptist Catholic School downtown Milwaukie/ member of the school Board/Resident of Gladstone/Officer International Longshore union

file://C:\Documents and Settings\tuerk\Local Settings\Temp\XPgrpwise\48317840MetCen... 6/5/2008
DEAR PDX-MILW LRT SDEIS Administrator(s):

Please include in the SDEIS the three documents attached. One is a cover letter containing my comments on the SDEIS. The other two attachments are background information referenced in my letter.

Thank you

Pat Russell
16358 SE Hearthwood Drive
Clackamas, OR 97015
(503) 656-9681
Email: flanagan112@hotmail.com
Transmittal via Email

The Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project (SDEIS)
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

RE: Comments on SDEIS

Dear Decision-makers,

I request that the attached letter, dated June 5, 2007 (my file: Milwaukie-PDX Light Rail Comments June 2007 to Mil PC) and the attached edited City of Milwaukie Minutes from the August 10, 2006 Meeting concerning Kellogg Lake Dam Removal be entered into the record for the SDEIS.

In addition, I find the SDEIS very vague when it comes to describing the present condition of the Kellogg-Mt. Scott Creek Watershed that affects about 15 square miles, including the majority of the north urban area of Clackamas County, east of the Willamette River. The SDEIS notes that there is blockage of the watershed forming “Kellogg Lake” and that the SDEIS analyzes impacts in the areas based upon the “lake” condition.

The SDEIS fails to clearly state that the Kellogg-Mt. Scott Creek Watershed salmon access is virtually completed blocked to 4(d) Rule-ESA listed Steelhead fisheries. Kellogg-Mt. Scott Creek is a 4(d) listed stream and watershed.

Since the inception of the “McLoughlin highway” back in the 1930’s (US 99 E) extending from Portland to service the Milwaukie, Oak Grove, Oregon City communities, an apparent otherwise healthy the Kellogg Creek estuary has been subjected to destruction by roadway construction across the estuarine habitat-mouth of the creek intercepting with the Willamette River. Studies of the nearby downstream mouth and corridor of the Johnson Creek has clearly shown good response to recovery efforts. Such efforts have not been afforded Kellogg Creek.

The SDEIS should have identified the planning to date of lead and responsible agencies in their effort to open the Kellogg estuarine area by removal of the culvert-weir under the McLoughlin Blvd. road crossing. Attached to this testimony is a rather detailed, but layman description of planning and capital improvements outlined in Minutes, dated August 10, 2006 sponsored by the City of Milwaukie and attended by various key agency
staff including: US Corps Engineers and NOAA/NMSF. It appears from the notes that state and federal fisheries interests were represented in the recommended actions. Not present was the Oregon Dept. of Transportation (ODOT). It is not clear as of this writing what the ODOT position is on this project, although there must be some implied consent due to the fact that the City of Milwaukie obtained an MTIP grant to fund completion US Corps Engineers Environmental Assessments and Preliminary Engineering.

Following are more specific comments.

Existing Conditions, Section 3-8.1.2 (Waterways) and Section 3-8.1.4 (Wildlife) and 3-8.1.5 (Fisheries):

The SDEIS does not recognize the present condition of the entire Kellogg-Mt. Scott 15 sq. mi. watershed and its inability to be a productive fisheries to support, especially, steelhead, even though the creek and watershed is 4(d) listed under the SALMON ESA recovery effort. The section should have provided reasons why the watershed was blocked for fish passage, due to the McLoughlin Blvd. (US 99E) roadway crossing, along with a brief history of urban development since the 1960’s within the watershed that includes the major capital improvements and planning that have led to urban degradation including:

--construction of the I-205 from I-5 (Wilsonville area) to Sunnyside Road in 1974;
--construction of the Milwaukie Expressway during the late 1960’s, early 1970’s;
--formation of Clackamas County Service District #1 and installation of the Kellogg Wastewater Treatment Plan during the early 1970s (about 1973) that services the entire watershed;
--formation of the said CCSD#1 to implement surface water management strategies and policies in order to permit high density urban development;
--formation of the Clackamas County Regional Center Urban Renewal Agency to fund capital improvements and commercial development and the Clackamas County Clackamas Industrial Sanctuary Urban Renewal Agency to promote industrial development on either side of I-205;
--Construction of SE Sunnyside and Sunnybrook Blvds;
--Widening of I-205 (braided interchange at Sunnyside/Sunnybrook) and remedial improvements during the early 2000’s;
--Adoption the Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan and zoning (as early as the mid 1970’s), establishing standards to permit further urban development in the watershed;
--City of Milwaukie approvals to replace wetlands and drain high water table lands to accommodate commercial and industrial development along SR 224 in the historic Lake district, including the Minthorn Springs district; etc.

By not establishing a policy and strategic plan over the years—to restore fish access to the watershed and establishing minimal, unenforceable development standards and capital improvement plans that did not prioritize a healthy fisheries habitat from the Willamette River to the Happy Valley Bowl, downtown Johnson City and urban development to the Multnomah County line—the county and cities permitted further
degradation of the watershed and did not plan and FUND for the needed removal of the dam that has prohibited salmon access at least since the 1930's. And, in fact, Metro and ODOT and the county and cities have prioritized improvements and "modernization" to many sections of McLoughlin Blvd. corridor, but have carefully avoided the section of r/w affecting the Kellogg Creek estuary.

During the widening of the I-205 in the early 2000's to create the braided interchange with SE Sunnyside and Sunnybrook Blvd. and extended on and off-ramps, there was some question whether the old 1970's box culvert for Mt. Scott Creek should have been removed and replaced with a larger culvert or bridge structure. Today, this box culvert probably blocks the historic wildlife habitat corridor, especially for deer and other larger mammals. It is not clear how they migrate at this time. There is also a question whether the length of the extended culvert is fish friendly. Of course, this issue can't be addressed as long as fish access to the watershed is blocked.

These cumulative impacts on the watershed should have been noted in the SDEIS. The planning and funding for dam removal and estuarine recovery by such agencies as ODOT and federal and local agencies should have been noted.

IMPACTS, Fisheries (Section 3-13-14):

As noted above the cumulative impacts of upstream activities of government agencies was not noted. Although, crossing of an LRT facility might be argued to have minimal impact on the actual estuarine setting (presently a lake formed by a dam under McLoughlin Blvd./US 99E), the question must be raised about just how much cumulative impact on the Watershed is TOO MUCH!! Light Rail will encourage urban infill and put more pressures on the habitat edges and increase general urban impacts (increased hardscape/impervious surfaces, increase chemical runoff, etc.). The Watershed is unable to function properly for a listed fish species and no local, regional, state or federal program has been adopted and funded to address the watershed recovery. Therefore, any further impacts (such as from the direct and cumulative effects of a LRT facility) are significant and must be addressed now. Recovery of the watershed is a federal priority (Salmon recovery). Further, the DEIS does not identify the impacts of the older trestle treated with creosote preservatives leaching into the water resource and ground. Operation of the Kellogg Wastewater Treatment facility and downtown Milwaukie surface water management is not addressed, along with impacts of a contemplated large parking structure next to the estuary as part of the LRT project.

The SDEIS does not address the attraction of humans to the edge of the estuary and effects not only on fish (that are not yet present) but also on wildlife. The Kellogg Creek corridor is also a wildlife corridor that will attract large wildlife (such as deer, beaver, etc.), especially if the McLoughlin Blvd. Road Crossing is improved to allow a wildlife undercrossing (that would also support human undercrossing).
The reference that removal of the dam might increase overall ecosystem functions in the area might be true. However, it must be noted that neither the "plans", nor funding are in place.

Potential Mitigation Measures, Fisheries, Section 3.8.3:

The SDEIS correctly notes that measures should avoid, minimize and/or compensate, in that priority order. This writer has recommended that the best action is to redesign the multiple crossings of the Kellogg Estuary in this area into ONE CORRIDOR.

As it is today, not only are there utilities in and crossing the corridor, but there is a state/federal highway (US 99E, McLoughlin Blvd.), a local access road (to the Sewer Plant) and a railroad crossing. Federal fish recovery policies direct consolidating crossings into one corridor. The City of Milwaukie, TriMet, ODOT and Metro have failed to recognize the importance of this policy and there is a serious impact on the integrity of the estuarine conditions for steelhead, the salmon listed species under protection under the 4(d) Rule, ESA, Salmon Recovery. This area is a backwater area for fish during flood events on the Willamette River, along with part of the staging of life in the watershed.

If the LRT is constructed, a new r/r bridge structure, combined with the LRT structure should be a minimal mitigation measure. This also implies that the LRT should be a bridge structure ALSO over McLoughlin Blvd. near the intersection of said highway and River road. Otherwise, why should ODOT, METRO, and the county insist on maintaining a state arterial highway that is inefficient with peak hour disruptions from LRT 10 minute headway operations? There are a few similar situations in the region. One that has rated extremely high in accident rates is in Washington County where MAX crosses BASELINE ROAD at SW 185th Avenue. This surface crossing not only has delayed the traffic of TWO major arterials, but has increased accident rates due the prohibition of left hand turn movements (EB Baseline to NB SW 185th Avenue).

If this is how US 99E is rated, perhaps the cross-section of this roadway should be one lane in each direction with some left turn pockets where needed!

Rather than focusing funds toward creating plantings, the LRT mitigation should be a contribution to the eventual reconstruction of the McLoughlin Crossing. Engineering estimates indicate a cost (at 2006 dollars) at $ 8 Million. As of this writing there is absolutely no public agency setting aside any capital improvement funds, including the owner of the blockage, ODOT. However, set-aside funds could be leveraged with other federal, state, regional, county (and special district), and local agency commitments over the next few years.

Today, the following agencies “owe” some sort of mitigation of their historic past actions that have led to degradation of the watershed’s health:

Federal Agencies $2,000,000
--National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) - Endangered Species Act (ESA) jurisdiction over anadromous fish; it also has a role regulating fisheries.
--US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) - operates federal dams and locks for multiple uses.
--Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) - markets electricity from federal dams; it also has a key role funding fish and wildlife mitigation.
--Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) - implements and enforces the Clean Water Act.
--US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) - ESA jurisdiction over plants, wildlife and resident fish and also operates and administers hatchery programs and national wildlife refuges.
--US Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) - operates federal dams for multiple uses.
--US Forest Service (USFS) - manages the national forest system.
--Bureau of Land Management (BLM) - manages 16,233,739 acres of public lands in Oregon and 370,110 acres in Washington for wildlife, recreation, timber harvest, livestock grazing, mineral extraction and other public uses.
--Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) - trustee for tribal and individual Indian lands and resources held in trust.
--Individual Congressional public works legislation

State Agencies (& suggested funding) $3,200,000
--ODOT (bridge/segment modernization) $3,000,000
--Watershed Enhancement Board grant $100,000
--ODF&W $50,000
--Lottery Funds grants (15% dedicated to Parks and Open Space statewide) $50,000
--2008 State Legislation: "Agriculture and Community Water Act" [$10M in matching grants]
--DEQ (water quality enhancement) $50,000

Regional $2,000,000
--Metro 2006 Open Space Bond Grant $250,000 (Phase Two)
--MTIP (2010-2013 cycle earliest) $1,000,000
--LRT PDX - Milwaukee mitigation $750,000

Local $2,700,000
--DTD Road Impact mitigation, SDCs $400,000
--DTD Watershed planning $50,000
--CCSWCD (portion of property tax) $50,000
--CCSD#1 SWM 10% monthly service of service fee over three year program set-aside * $1,000,000
--NCPRD (FY 2010) ** $500,000 SUBTOTAL County/Unincorp = $2,200,000
--City of Milwaukee *** TSP CIP $500,000 SUBTOTAL Milwaukee $500,000
--City of Happy Valley, Johnson City and Gladstone contributions $200,000 SUBTOTAL Other Cities $200,000

Notes:
* FOOTNOTES: CCSD#1 SWM monthly service fee intake is about $3.5 million/year. Allocating about 10% of that income over three years would generate about $1 million. This major contribution would enable fish to access the watershed within the jurisdiction of CCSD#1 (development within CCSD#1 has degraded the watershed over the years; opening the dam will allow fish an opportunity to return to the watershed and the CCSD#1 an ability to analyze the benefits of its past investments on habitat restoration.
** FOOTNOTES: North Clackamas Park and Recreation District program either increases funding revenue through grants; adjustments of CIP priorities; or new Natural Areas Program. Project within district and would benefit the district and city of Milwaukee’s plans for regional trail from downtown Milwaukee at the Waterfront Park to Mt. Talbert, the Bowl in Happy Valley and Rock Creek in Damascus. Kellogg-Mt. Scott Creek greenway recognized by Metro 2040 Concept Plan.
***FOOTNOTE: The City of Milwaukee has received a $1.5 Million MTIP project approval for US Corp Engineers Study and Preliminary Engineering. The city also has the bridge reconstruction as a CIP proposal that they submitted to the Metro RTP 2035 project for inclusion. This project is identified as RPT 2035 Project # 10098 and 10101 which includes about $4 million for entry into Riverfront Park/service
drives and then $9 million for Hwy 99E bridge replacement under “Kellogg Creek Dam Removal/Bridge Bridge Replacement/Milwaukie TC River Access Improvements” (Metro Fall 2007, RTP 2035). There is no identified funding source for the city’s project, hence the reason for the multi-agency strategy. The meaningful restoration of the watershed is the removal of the blockage due to the crossing of the McLoughlin Blvd. (US 99E) roadway over the estuary and such as significant capital improvement has not been prioritized by any agency. In of itself, this lack of funding commitment could also be translated as a “taking” according to the Endangered Species Act 4(d) Rules, where lead and responsible government agencies resist recovery efforts. An appropriate “push back” action on the part of NOAA/NMFS could be imposition of a building moratoria within the Kellogg-Mt. Scott Watershed.

Please be more specific in the mitigation measures section of SDEIS. Otherwise, the language can only be interpreted as “do nothing.”

Sincerely,

Pat Russell

Attachments:
--Pat Russell June 5, 2007 Letter to City of Milwaukie Planning Commission
--Notes of August 10, 2006 Meeting Concerning Kellogg Lake Dam Removal, sponsored by the City of Milwaukie
June 5, 2007

City of Milwaukie Planning Commission
City Hall
10722 SE Main Street
Milwaukie, OR 97222

RE: Testimony
Phase II: Milwaukie – Portland Light Rail Transit Alternatives (LRT), SDEIS, 4th Alternative (Through Downtown Milwaukie) and Kellogg Creek Watershed Impacts

Dear Staff, Chair and Commission Members,

My thanks to Mayor Bernard and the city for extending the discussion on the need to include a fourth LTR option for consideration in the SDEIS (Supplemental Draft Impact Statement): an alignment that would enter downtown via Main Street or McLoughlin Boulevard as opposed to following the Tillamook Branch.

According to the city’s website: “Mayor Bernard has asked the community to consider this alternative so he can see if there is community consensus for including it in the study.” This letter encourages the Planning Commission to recommend to the Mayor and City Council the inclusion of such a 4th alternative. Further, the letter attempts to provide some background on the need for more detailed planning of a multi-modal transportation alignment, habitat setting and possible methods to CPR salmon and wildlife (Conserve, Protect, Rehabilitate), entering or inhabiting the watershed from the Willamette River to approximately the SE Oatfield Road bridge over the creek.

Purpose of Comments

Less than adequate attention has been paid to the critical habitat needs of fish and wildlife in the Kellogg Creek Watershed within the downtown area of Milwaukie, during the regional discussion of transportation options and Light Rail options over the last ten years. However, with the Metro/Tri-Met and City of Milwaukie movement to reenergize the Milwaukee-Portland LRT project, habitat issues must be an integral part of the consideration of options to be explored and studied in the 2007 SDEIS.

The absolute health and survival of the Kellogg Creek Watershed must be a high priority.
during the project scoping, research, analysis, preparation and implementation of mitigation measures associated not only with the Milwaukie-Portland LRT, but other projects within the study area which will be noted in more detail below. Nature is not a partner in balancing acts prescribed by politicians—such as EESE analysis (Goal 5), “best practices” or mitigation measures “where practicable” due to cost. Either the habitat will be functional or it won’t; either fish will migrate or they won’t. There is no middle ground.

The lower Kellogg watershed habitat is in dire straits, and we are in danger of losing migratory salmon and other important wildlife which historically have inhabited this watershed. Right now, the key obstacle to recovery is the dam, the non-functioning fish ladder, US Highway 99E crossing the habitat, the lake and numerous related human activities and planned projects in this area noted below, including the Milwaukie-Portland LRT.

The cumulative impacts of these activities must be considered and addressed in the SDEIS, along with the LRT alternatives. The primary planning priority should be avoidance of further impacts on the habitat and most importantly, LTR should be a major player in facilitating the recovery of the habitat. It will likely promote urban infill and revitalization and densification of the downtown area—placing additional pressure on the salmon & wildlife habitat needs in the Kellogg Creek corridor. LTR will impact the habitat either directly or indirectly, depending upon the alternatives.

By combining the energies and resources of the various public and private projects in the immediate area, there is an opportunity to fundamentally restore fish & wildlife access to the watershed—especially for salmon. The Planning Commission is encouraged to recognize and support a focus toward habitat CPR as part of this project SDEIS. Specific recommendations are outlined at the end of this letter.

Importance of ESA

The implementation of regional and local plans, including transportation components are subject to the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). Under this act, a “4(d) Rule” was established in 2000 by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to protect salmon and steelhead listed as “threatened” under the Act and is currently administered by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). The June 2000 4(d) rule adopted by NMFS prohibits “take” of salmon and steelhead listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) except in cases where the take is associated with an approved program that comes under one of the limits in the 4(d) rule. Certain “Municipal, Residential, Commercial and Industrial” (MRCI) Development and Redevelopment Activities have a significant potential to degrade habitat and injure or kill salmon and steelhead in a variety of ways.

The rule specifically makes reference to Portland-area Metro's Urban Growth
Management Functional Plan with focus on 12 specific issues in our urban region, including:

- storm water discharge;
- riparian buffers;
- stream crossings;
- stream banks;
- impacts to wetlands and surrounding vegetation;
- erosion and sediment runoff during and after construction;
- water supply demands;
- monitoring;
- funding; and
- enforcement.

Significantly, Metro has not yet submitted its Plan to NMFS for consideration as a limit to the take prohibition, nor has NMFS approved it for that purpose.

Further, Metro's “Nature in Neighborhood”, to this writer's knowledge has yet to be recognized as satisfying the ESA standard. However, “Nature in Neighborhood” is a step in the right direction. Therefore each capital improvement project must be measured against the ESA on its own merits, which needs to be fleshed out in the SDEIS. The city should make sure it is.

According to the “Rule", NMFS will focus on the following issues when evaluating the adequacy of Metro guidelines or local ordinances:

a. Siting that avoids sensitive or constrained sites.
b. Avoiding storm water discharge impacts to water quality and quantity, and to the historic hydrograph characteristics of the watershed.
c. Protection of adequate vegetated riparian buffers along all streams.
d. Avoiding stream crossings by roads wherever possible, and minimizing their impacts.
e. Protecting historic stream meander patterns, flood plains and channel migration zones.
f. Protecting wetlands and surrounding vegetation to maintain wetland functions.
g. Preserving the hydrologic capacity of streams to pass peak flows.
h. Landscaping to reduce need for watering and chemical application.
i. Preventing erosion and sediment run-off during and after construction.
j. Assuring that water supply demands do not impact flows needed for salmonids.
k. Monitoring and maintaining detention basins and similar tools.
l. Providing needed enforcement, funding, monitoring, reporting, and implementation mechanisms.


LRT Alignment Issues from Southeast PDX to points south

Although this writer is not attempting to take sides on whether light rail should happen in Milwaukie, (there is considerable opposition being voiced), there are a number of alternative alignments/corridors that could be examined in this study, in addition to the alignment south of SR 224 (Expressway) following the P & W Railroad corridor.
diagonally through downtown:

A. Extending LRT south of downtown

One alignment preferred by many is aligning the LRT with the US Hwy 99E corridor, especially south of the SR 224. This alignment would link the LRT with the roadway and both could be looked at together as they cross the Kellogg Watershed habitat. Federal, state and regional guidelines encourage avoidance or limited crossings of a habitat. There would be an opportunity to significantly reduce the corridor width of existing crossings, should the LRT be extended south of downtown. That is because the railroad, LRT and highway will all be merging in the area and will need to be sorted out. Additional local crossings of utilities and service roads should be included in this corridor. This multi-purpose corridor crossing should be as narrow as possible and must be bridged over the habitat and floodplain, beginning as far north as Jefferson Street and as far south as the one-way couplet of River Road at McLoughlin.

It is likely that even though the railroad line will remain a stand-alone improvement, the LRT and roadway design could take advantage of multi-level engineering and be pulled closer to the railroad tracks to narrow the corridor of the two existing crossings existing. Currently Hwy 99E and the railroad take up a crossing area on the north bank of at least 500 feet or more. (The city has an excellent map that shows the existing creek environs, parcel & road patterns and building placements—see ATTACHED).

The existing transportation corridors cut a very wide swath of transportation impact because each facility approaches the creek at a different angle. The Hwy 99E roadway could be realigned easterly toward Main Street (and be elevated) to be in tandem with the r/r alignment. This could impact Dogwood Park and the Kronberg city-owned property (dedicated to the city for park use), but provide a significant habitat improvement and increase Riverfront usability. Further, an "S"-curve alignment would assure slower speeds through the downtown corridor, such as 25 mph ("downtown" comes and goes very quickly and it shouldn't).

As the downtown area is higher than the habitat/creek level, the bridging will not need to be significantly higher than the r/r trestle. The visual compatibility of the Highway, LRT, frontage drives and the r/r trestle should also be analyzed from an architectural perspective, along with minimal visual impact on the habitat. Wide expanses of concrete would NOT be compatible, blocking light, air and rainfall. Instead the crossing should be broken into smaller increments to lighten its massive structure. The historical impacts of the trestle, whose support structure was heavily treated with creosote, needs review and possible consideration for reconstruction.

The need for an independent service road crossing should be seriously questioned, especially if local access is available by other means. Because lands on either side of the creek/habitat are in public ownership as far upstream as at least the r/r trestle, local access is available from a public street without crossing the habitat. This goal has implications for the riverfront park and boat ramp access concepts and present configuration of improvements/access for the Kellogg Treatment facility.

As noted, there is considerable opposition in the Oak Grove/Milwaukie Heights neighborhood toward extending light rail south to Oregon City via Hwy 99E. Along with this concept alternative being considered (extension of LRT to Park Avenue/Hwy 99E, including a Park N Rize Station), this writer suggests the alternative of following the P & W railroad corridor to downtown Lake Oswego. This alternative would provide an accessory link to the "Westside", taking commuting burdens off the I-205 corridor and Sellwood Bridge corridor. Metro did conduct a river crossing study a number of years ago.

South Willamette River Crossing Study Findings and Recommendations Report (Metro,
1999 - The South Willamette River Crossing Study examined travel constraints and capacity demands across the Willamette River and identified multi-modal crossing improvements between the Marquam Bridge in Portland and the I-205 Bridge in Oregon City.

Metro and the cities of Portland, Lake Oswego and West Linn are now discussing the Willamette Shore Trolley and undertaking a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. This corridor has many constraints that could be resolved by combining its efforts with a new crossing of the Willamette River.

B. Extending the I-205 LRT instead to Oregon City

As noted, if there is strong opposition to extending the light rail to Oregon City via the McLoughlin corridor, then perhaps, the resources should be focused on a more acceptable corridor along I-205 extended from the existing terminus at the Clackamas Town Center. This I-205 alignment could access: a) the SR 213 to the Beaver Creek and Red Soils area (or as far as Molalla); and/or b) old town Oregon City.

Cumulative Impacts on the Kellogg Creek Watershed

The exacerbating impact of the Portland-Milwaukie LRT extending south of downtown Milwaukie across the Kellogg Creek Watershed has not been adequately scoped out in enough detail to determine the cumulative impacts of the existing and planned crossings and developments/activities/conditions that include or will include:

- flooding characteristics of the Kellogg Creek and Willamette River (tidal influence)
- sewerage treatment plant activities & discharge,
- motor vehicle crossings (service roads and Hwy 99E, etc.),
- dams, fish ladders, culverts, drainage discharge (& rip-rap/revetments), abutments,
- development of the Dogwood park and Kronberg parcel,
- pedestrian and bike crossings,
- transient domestic pet activities,
- downtown redevelopment projects and intensity,
- Park N Ride structures and activities,
- LRT stations, staging and crossings,
- utility crossings and
- the existing P & W RR crossing (and future use, capacity).

The impacts of the cumulative crossings need to include the fish needs and impacts outlined in the 4(d) Rule of the ESA. The incremental impacts of each activity or project coupled with the other parts is what constitutes to a drastic cumulative condition that puts the habitat in jeopardy. All of the activities-projects must be studied and discussed within the context of the other. The most recent detailed analysis of the condition of the Kellogg Creek in the area was by a multi-disciplinary team composed of public agency staff, environmentalists and citizens in 2006.

Kellogg Creek Dam Removal Meeting, City of Milwaukie, Clackamas County Service District #1 (County Water Environment Services) METRO, ODOT, US Corps of Engineers, National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). 10 August 2006 (Minutes Available).
Additional discussion occurred during the planning of the city’s riverfront park and Dogwood Park/Kronberg property and adjacent public holdings (along with the potential siting of a Park N Ride station as part of the LRT corridor—later abandoned in view of the Kronberg land dedication for park purposes). Both of these projects are on-going with the goal to complete capital improvements in the near future.

Also, Metro and JPACT recently awarded the City of Milwaukie MTIP Funds (2008–11 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program) to study:

- **OR 99-E bridge at Kellogg Lake**
  - Project code: GS049
  - Funding category: Green streets
  - Location: Clackamas County
  - Status: Recommended
  - Sponsor: City of Milwaukie
  - Funds requested: $1,054,873
  - Total project cost: $8,725,930

The Kellogg Lake Culvert Removal Project would remove the existing box-culvert dam and replace the current OR 99-E bridge with a structure that would allow the lake to drain and restore the natural hydraulic function of the creek. According to an Army Corp assessment, the dam restricts fish passage under typical flow conditions. The replacement bridge would also be designed to accommodate north-south bicycle and pedestrian traffic and a multi-use under-crossing trail. The requested funds would provide engineering, environmental and final design work in preparation for construction (Information source: Metro Website).

According to this study description, the effort falls short of examining the total project area and activities affecting the habitat from the Willamette River, east to roughly SE Oatfield Road, and from downtown to roughly Hwy 99E, southerly/easterly of SE River Road (one way couplet, northbound).

Metro has adopted Title 3 and Goal 5 (Nature in Neighborhood) policies to guide local jurisdictions on water quality and habitat protection. However, as noted above these policies have yet to be recognized by NOAA as a specific 4(d) Rule program for Salmon CPR and are not designed with a high level of specificity that would assure protection of the Kellogg Creek habitat and fish needs in the study area.

Over the last few years, there has also been a series of studies and in-depth discussion concerning the current and future sewer needs of north Clackamas County, including its cities, Milwaukie, Happy Valley, Damascus, Gladstone, Johnson City, Oregon City, West Linn and Lake Oswego. As of this writing, the future of the Kellogg Treatment facility on the south banks of the creek and fronting the Willamette River is under study.

There are no capital fund commitments for the reconstruction of Hwy 99E, which must compete for funding priority with other highway projects in the region.

There are other important, on-going community studies and planning in the immediate area such as neighborhood planning, surface water management, transportation planning updates, downtown redevelopment and the like. However, there is less focus on the character and need of the Kellogg Watershed and specific SALMON CPR. The habitat is
more than just the 100 year floodplain or water’s edge.

Defining Habitat Need

In 1999, just prior to the publishing of the NMFS 4(d) Rule for Salmon CPR, Metro published a study on Salmon CPR that initially suggested a MINIMUM 200 foot setback from all fish bearing creeks. This created such a stir that the study was pulled and the Metro Council initiated a refocused program, formatted primarily on the state’s Goal 5 (now referred to as “Nature in the Neighborhoods” program). Metro never did address SALMON CPR head-on to the extent envisioned by wildlife planners. It is interesting to note that although an aggressive/protective setback measure was never adopted, Metro recognized the importance of existing high quality habitat (especially riparian) and that it should be protected. Another NMFS notion of defining the streamside habitat dealt with tree heights.

"In the urban growth limit, NMFS sought to underscore the importance of assessing the health of existing riparian zones. These zones provide critical life support functions for salmon such as food, shade and stream bank stability. The protection and restoration of riparian zones, especially in urban areas, is a common-sense starting point in any salmon recovery effort. Trees are a primary feature of most riparian zones. As a general guide, NMFS noted that a distance equal to the height of the tallest tree that can grow on that site (known as the site-potential tree height and often found to approximate 200 feet) is a good starting point for beginning a 4(d) assessment under the urban development limit. However, the agency noted that land ownership patterns would alter the actual extent of the riparian zone. Different jurisdictions will need to tailor their riparian and wetland management actions to match local needs and conditions." ["Common Myths About the 4(d) Rule", NMFS—http://www.wwr.noaa.gov/ESA-Salmon-Regulations-Peninsula4d-Notes/Final-4d-Rules.cfm]

This principal should apply to our “study area” as a minimum starting point. With the high percentage of public ownership surrounding the habitat, there is an obligation under ESA that the local agencies make every effort they can to CPR the salmon and wildlife habitat. And, it gets more complicated as the Willamette River influence is factored into the study. Without looking at the “big” picture, the habitat planning will fail for any one project. The overarching guide is recovery planning and assuring that as salmon and wildlife enter the watershed, they will be fully protected and assured of opportunities migrate upstream or return to the river from a short stay (such as flood events).

According to information on the NMFS website (http://www.nwr.noaa.gov/Salmon-Recovery-Planning/):

"Recovery is the process by which listed species and their ecosystems are restored and their future secured to the point that protection under the ESA is no longer needed. ... recovery must be grounded in existing conservation efforts and in a way throughout the region. ... NMFS has established a recovery planning process to ensure that local and state and county recovery planning processes tie into ongoing regional and local salmon conservation and planning efforts.

NOAA Fisheries Service has developed a strategy for recovery planning in the four states of Washington, Idaho, Oregon and California that combines ESA-listed salmon and steelhead distinct population segments in geographic areas. The Northwest Region has identified its first recovery planning areas, or recovery domains, and has established technical recovery teams of scientists for each domain. Recovery plans in each domain will address all salmon species within that geographic area, and will involve stakeholders on a more local level. The agency is crafting recovery planning and
implementation processes that are uniquely suited to each recovery domain to engender local buy-in. The Northwest Region has encouraged development of sub-basin...and watershed...plans that the agency expects will provide the building blocks for ESA recovery plans.

While NOAA Fisheries Service is responsible for adopting recovery plans, the plans will have a greater likelihood of success if they are developed in partnership with entities that have the responsibility and authority to implement recovery actions. NOAA is using locally developed plans to complete ESA recovery plans. Where local forums are not preparing recovery plans, NOAA Fisheries Service is working with them.

Smaller-scale sub-basin and watershed plans have been drafted for areas throughout Puget Sound and the Columbia Basin. These smaller-scale plans are designed and intended to be building blocks for locally developed recovery plans. NOAA Fisheries Service is very interested in working with state and local agencies and organizations to help such entities take the lead in the development of recovery plans.

Coordination needs to occur across land ownership boundaries and programs...The Northwest Region is working in collaboration with each state to develop locally supported plans that fit within the states' respective policy frameworks, and to meet the need for full recovery plans that comply with the Endangered Species Act..."

The agency has a specific consultation process to be utilized by agencies when an EIS is written; the city is encouraged to fully utilize this resource by listing and describing ALL the projects and activities noted above within the “study area”. The city should request and encourage NMFS to be proactive and pursue not only resolution of the LRT impacts, but the impacts and opportunities of all the projects/activities combined in the “study area”. Only then will the watershed stakeholders have a good assessment of SALMON CPR needs and requirements.

**Recommendation**

The Planning Commission is encouraged to recommend to the City Council and LRT Steering Committee to:

1. consider the additional alternative of LRT alignment through downtown Milwaukie via McLoughlin or other north south street through downtown;

2. evaluate detailed LRT alignment options across Kellogg Creek habitat and floodplain to include cumulative activities and avoidance of new impacts by restricting crossings to one confined, multi-use corridor between the Willamette River and the current r/r trestle crossing. Assumption here is that r/r crossing alignment will take precedence due to pre-existing r/w entitlements and that auto and LRT alignments are more flexible. Therefore, the study should focus on moving all existing and planned motor vehicle movement across the habitat to one location and build one NEW bridge for peds/bike, motor vehicles, LRT and trains.

Thank you,

Pat Russell

Attachment: City’s Map of the Kronberg Park area for illustrative purposes
Postscript:

Excerpt from the NMFS website:
http://www.wer.noaa.gov/Salmon-Habitat/index.cfm

Salmon Habitat

Habitat loss and modification are believed to be the major factors determining the current status of salmonid populations. Conservation and recovery of Pacific Northwest salmon and steelhead depend on having diverse habitats with connections among those habitats. The salmonid lifecycle involves adults maturing in the ocean, migrating back to their home streams and spawning, embryos incubating, fry emerging, juveniles growing, and smolts migrating to the estuary to acclimate to saltwater and moving out into the ocean. Each phase may require use of and access to distinct habitats. Loss of habitat reduces the diversity in salmon and steelhead life histories, which influences the ability of these fish to adapt to natural and man-made change.

Salmon need freshwater habitat that includes:

- cool, clean water
- appropriate water depth, quantity and flow velocities
- upland and riparian (stream bank) vegetation to stabilize soil and provide shade
- clean gravel for spawning and egg-rearing
- large woody debris to provide resting and hiding places
- adequate food
- varied channel forms.

Please help CPR Salmon in the Kellogg-Mt. Scott Watershed. Let’s make it happen!
City of Milwaukie, Clackamas County Service District #1 (County Water Environment Services) METRO, ODOT, US Corps of Engineers, National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)
Kellogg Lake Dam Removal Meeting
8/10/06

In attendance:
City Staff: JoAnn Herrigel (Community Services Director), Beth Ragel (Community Services Program Coordinator)
Guest Speakers: Chuck Willis (Corps of Engineers fish biologist), Bob Storer (Clackamas County)
Residents: Greg Seagler, Danil Meads, Lisa Batey, David Aschenbrenner, Debby Crank, Brian Naef, Jim Bernard, Megan Faria, Ed Zumwalt, Dion Shepard, Dave Green, Les Wilkins, Ray Bryan, Steve Berliner, Barb Johnson, Jessi Snow, Stephanie Tung, David Kohl.
Others in attendance: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) reps: Megan Callahan-Grant and Nancy Munn, and Chris Runyard (Friends of Trees)

Questions and Answers:

Q: What is the recent history of this proposal?

In 2000 an interagency group was convened to look at fish passage in Kellogg and Mt. Scott Creeks (Mt. Scott fish passage study.) They worked with HARZA, a consultant, who found that there was a need for improved fish passage and suggested further study to develop options for addressing the problem. The Corps of Engineers offered to do this study with Federal funds from the Water Resources Conservation Act (section 206) but they needed a public partner. The City of Milwaukee (COM) agreed and City Council approved a request for the Corps to conduct a study in February 2002. In September of 2002 JoAnn Herrigel, City of Milwaukee Community Services Director, held the first public meeting to cover the basics of the study. Due to a loss of section 206 funding in 2004 the study was put on hold. The COM requested a line item in the Federal budget with help from Representative Blumenauer and in 2005 the Federal government awarded the Corps a $200,000 line item specifically to complete the Kellogg Lake study. The Corps has been working since then on an environmental analysis. At this point funds have again been restricted and the final piece of the study, the economic analysis, is not complete. COM staff identified MTIP funds as a potential funding source and applied, in June 2006, for over a million dollars to complete a design of the removal of both the dam and the bridge and replacement of the bridge.

Q: What were the components and alternatives that the Corps of Engineers evaluated?
The Corps of Engineers developed the following three options:

1. Do nothing
2. Modify the dam but leave bridge over McLoughlin as is
3. Remove the dam and replace the bridge

The last two options would return the lake to a natural creek bed. The COM prefers to remove the dam and replace the bridge because this would provide benefits for fish and the natural habitat as well as provide benefits for people. As proposed, the bridge over the creek at McLoughlin would be replaced (it cannot be widened) and an underpass would be created for pedestrians and bicycles to safely cross under McLoughlin. Sidewalks and bike lanes would also be added on McLoughlin. These improvements would create north-south and east-west access to and from the Riverfront park and downtown Milwaukie.

Q. What has the City of Milwaukie done with the Corps of Engineer's study so far?

In June of 2006 the COM applied for Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) funding in the sum of $1,054,083, to conduct the preliminary engineering and environmental assessment of removing the dam and replacing the bridge. This proposed study would also look at how to re-vegetate the area once the lake is returned to a creek. The COM will know in February 2007 if they receive the MTIP grant. If the grant is awarded the study would begin in 2009 or 2010 and would take 2-3 years to complete. The proposal received a 100% rating on all criteria and is the only project in this MTIP "culvert" category.

Q: What is the existing condition of the lake?

Currently the lake is shallow, warm, and has low levels of oxygen due to slow water flow and lack of turbulence. The result is that key fish species cannot survive in the lake. There is also a lack of habitat for fish to take shelter in or rear young. Examples of fish shelter include streamside trees, plants and in-water pools created by downed trees or large rocks. A natural flowing creek would have lower temperatures and higher oxygen levels so fish could survive in the creek. A restored creek would also increase the availability of rearing habitat, including over-winter rearing habitat, for fish.

Q: Is cold ground water coming in to lake now?

Yes, there are underground springs that bring cold water into the lake. However, this water stays down at the bottom so that most of the water is too warm to host fish. The deepest part of the lake is about 8 feet now—just upstream of the train tressel. Water temperatures at this point are about 68 degrees. At the surface it gets up to 70-80 degrees.

Q: What species of fish would benefit from creek restoration?

Key species that migrate through the project area to and from the upper Kellogg Creek watershed include Lower Columbia coho salmon, Lower Columbia winter steelhead/rainbow trout, Lower Columbia coastal cutthroat trout, Pacific lamprey, and largescale sucker. These fish species currently spawn and rear to an unknown extent in the upstream reaches of the Kellogg Creek watershed. The species that are likely to benefit the most from an increase in the availability of over-winter rearing habitat in Kellogg Creek...
include ESA listed spring Chinook salmon, winter steelhead, and coho salmon. Resident cutthroat trout, which are listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), are also likely to benefit. Whenever it floods juvenile spring Chinook would come up the creek (ESA listed) using the backwater area as winter habitat and over winter bearing (though Spring Chinook Salmon don't normally occur in the lake.) In the winter at high water stage the area would flood back to a lake but in the summer it would be marshy with the beaded swale and a high diversity of wild life.

Q: Are any of these fish species classified as "endangered"?

Yes, several are classified as endangered or threatened. Lower Columbia coho salmon is proposed for listing as Threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). It is listed as Endangered under the Oregon Sensitive Species listings. Both Lower Columbia and Upper Willamette River spring Chinook salmon are listed as Threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). Like winter steelhead, they are not currently listed under the Oregon Sensitive Species listings, but a recent review of their status by ODFW (2005) concluded that they were "At Risk".

Q: What aspects of the lake did the Corps study?

The Corps assembled a team of biologist, anthropologists, engineers, and others. The various biologists looked at all species of fish and other animals present at the lake (particularly at species that are endangered) and the habitat presently available for these animals. Anthropologists looked at historic structures in the area like the bridge. The team determined what the likely response would be by various species if the creek were restored. This required that they study the lake at all stages through the year—low flow in summer to flood stage in winter. The Corps also studied the fish ladder to determine its usefulness.

Q: How does the fish ladder currently work?

The dam at the top of the fish ladder is a "weir" system with squared off edges. This creates a situation where most of the year the water simply overflows and rushes over the ladder—making it unusable by fish. There is only a small window of time in the year when the fish ladder is usable—when water flows are low.

Q: What would the proposed project look like once complete?

The proposed project has not been engineered yet. However, the general plan would involve creating a series of pools connected by the creek (called a "beaded swale") using natural river rock, cobble and gravel. The water in the creek would be about 1 foot deep most of the year (enough for fish passage). The beaded swale would consist of about 5 to 6 pools and about 1-2 acres total surface area approximately 50% of the year. About 3-4% of the time it would fill up to the current lake area of 15 acres. The design would be kind of like a handprint—the central lower part would be deeper and the fingers would extend back towards the bank and become shallower. In the winter the "fingers", or ponds, would flood. This pooling of water would provide shelter for fish to over winter. During the summer the pools would be shallow and filled with cold ground water (Kellogg lake is a net receiving area for ground water). The slopes along the banks would be re-vegetated with native plants and would be very green. Park-like elements could be incorporated such as pathways, kiosks and other features.
Q: What will determine where ponds go?

Again, the final design needs to be developed based on further study. The major consideration will be the existing contours of the lake. The ponds will be placed where contours would make them the most natural. This is most practical because over time the lake would revert to these contours anyway.

Q: Is the “beaded swale” design a practical or aesthetic approach?

It is a practical concern—the more excavation the more costly the project. So if you keep excavation to a minimum it keeps costs down while still providing habitat for fish and other animals.

Q: Is removing the silt the same as dredging?

No—dredging would remove much more material. Most of the sediment in the lake is probably uncontaminated and can be left on site and used. Where the silt first settles at the mouth is where the pockets tend to be contaminated. The contaminated material will need to be removed or buried.

Q: Is dredging the lake an option? Would that help the fish?

Dredging would not change the habitat available for fish nor change the temperature of the lake. Temperature determines density of water and oxygen level of water in the lake. Cold water stays down at bottom—separate from water above it. Also, what is dredged out would need to be disposed of—creating a challenge. Further, over time the lake would fill in again. By contrast, in free flowing creek silt and cobbles move in and out downstream and tend not to build up.

Dredging also would not serve to oxygenate the water—“bubbling” and flowing over shallow rocks is required for this to happen.

Q: How is the alignment of the creek determined? How constructed?

The Corps developed some contour maps of the project site that depicted the likely location of the original streambed. If the dam is removed and the lake drained, the existing stream will tend to form a new channel in the old streambed. The Corps intends to work with this natural alignment. Basically, the old streambed followed along the right bank of the project sight (i.e., toward SE McLoughlin) with a few meanders out into what is now the lakebed.

Q: Have projects like this been done before?

Two similar projects have been conducted in the local area. The first example of a “beaded swale” project can be viewed off 112th and Foster Road. This beaded swale is a component of a park located on the south bank of Johnson Creek just upstream of the bridge that crosses between SE 110th and SE 112th. From Foster go south on SE 110th (which becomes SE
112th) and take the first left just after crossing the bridge over Johnson Creek. The park is located on the left. There is information about the beaded swale and its function at various kiosks. The beaded swale at this location will have a changing appearance throughout the year under differing conditions of wetness and during the dry summer some of the ponds may be dry and overgrown with plants while others may still have some standing water in them. By contrast, the ponds that we hope to develop at the Kellogg Creek site will be designed to have water in them throughout the year—providing rearing habitat for Coho salmon.

The second similar project was a dam removal project at Mt Scott Creek. This project, done by Clackamas County in 2002, returned a small lake to a creek. The site is located in Clackamas on 122nd (north of Sunny Side Rd) across from Spring Mountain Drive. The COM has maps and photos of the project available. This creek has become a great habitat for many fish species and particularly Cutthroat Trout. Currently there are more Cutthroat in Mt. Scott creek than 16 other streams in the area.

Q: Would this design increase or attract mosquitoes?

Mosquitoes are drawn to warm standing water. Restoring the lake to a creek will reduce mosquito populations. Even in the summer with the marshy ponds formed from the beaded swale design, there will be fewer mosquitoes than currently, because the water filling the ponds will be cold ground water. Studies indicate that the best way to reduce mosquito populations is to restore functioning wetlands—partly because healthy wetlands have the right birds and fish that eat the mosquitoes.

Q: What happens to the nesting waterfowl once the lake is returned to a creek?

Wildlife biologists with the Corps of Engineers studied this. The studies indicate that there will be a tradeoff—there will likely be some changes in the types of birds in the area but the area will not see a net loss of birds overall. Some birds may adapt, some may leave, and other birds (particularly those that feed on fish) may increase. Smaller ponds will be more protective for waterfowl but there would also be less surface area for waterfowl—creating a trade off.

Q: Will fishing be possible?

Fishing will be possible—there will be Salmon, Steelhead and Cutthroat Trout in the creek and the creek was used for fishing in the 1950s (date?)

Q: How would safety/buffer/access to homes be mitigated?

This would be considered in the design of the project. Vegetative barriers (e.g. thorny bushes or shrubs) can be used along with fencing. Part of year the lake water will be high enough to also act as a barrier.

Q: How does Kellogg Creek compare to other creeks in the area such as Johnson Creek?

There are some similarities. Johnson Creek has many problems—one is that sections were lined in stone—which affects the creek and eliminates spawning habitat. Also, the headwaters of Johnson Creek are in high gradient areas that transition into flat plains—creating a problem.
with flooding. Kellogg Creek has the opposite gradient and so major flooding is unusual. Kelly Creek, a tributary of Johnson Creek, is about half way up the basin and is in good condition and has good species diversity. Coho need a 6% gradient or less to migrate and spawn—and upper Kellogg Creek and a small area of Mt. Scott Creek are two of the only places that this condition exists in the region. (???)

Q: Is there a sewer line under the lake?

There are some sewer lines under the mouth of the lake—but we don’t know for sure what else is under the lake. Some sediment has been studied and contours of the bottom have been studied but further information is needed. If the COM receives the MTIP grant this will be studied.

Q: What is the elevation difference between the upper end of lake to the Willamette River and how will the slope be accommodated?

The top of the dam is at 17.5 feet above sea level. About 7.5 feet would be removed—taking the culvert/creek bed at the dam end down to 10 feet above sea level. Currently, rock and debris have accumulated above the dam. This material will likely be moved down to the other side of the dam—creating a gentle slope out towards the Willamette River. The Corps would design so that there would almost always be at least a foot of water in the creek—sometimes more. If the dam is removed, about 50% of the time the Willamette will flood up into the area and create a lake—1/2 acre to 15 acres of water. About 3% of the time the area would flood (17-18 feet above sea level).

Q: How tall is the dam?

The dam is about 7 ½ feet tall and about 17 ½ feet above mean sea level at its top.

Q: Is the silt contaminated?

At the mouth of the lake the silt is contaminated from residential pesticides and other chemicals contributed from the upper watershed. There would be restrictions as to what we could use the silt for. Some could be buried provided it was not “biologically available”—would not leach into the water. Permits will be required and part of the evaluation to ensure the appropriate disposal of the silt. Some or most of the sediment may be uncontaminated and could be left on site.

Q: What is the MTIP and what will it fund?

The Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Fund is a program administered by Metro, our regional government, to grant Federal transportation funds. This proposed project fits in the “culverts” category. If the COM receives the MTIP grant this will fund the economic study and the development of the design for the project.

Q: How will the final project be funded?

The COM does not have funding secured to actually construct the project. However, NOAA and other agencies have already expressed interest in contributing to this project.
There are Endangered Species Act mitigation dollars and Natural Resources mitigation dollars from the Federal government that are available in the region. There are no plans to raise taxes to finance this project.

Q: What are cost projections?

Early estimates suggest the project could cost about $8 million. The Oregon Department of Transportation would need to be a partner since the bridge to be replaced belongs to them.

Q: What is the most expensive part of this project?
The removal/replacement of the bridge will be the most expensive part.

Q: Why has an option been picked already?
The Corps has said this is the most beneficial option. The COM prefers to remove the dam and replace the bridge because this would provide benefits for fish and the natural habitat as well as provide benefits for people. As proposed, the bridge over the creek at McLaughlin would be replaced (it cannot be widened) and an underpass would be created for pedestrians and bicycles to safely cross under McLaughlin. Sidewalks and bike lanes would also be added on McLaughlin. These improvements would create north-south and east-west access to and from the Riverfront park and downtown Milwaukie.

[Note by Pat Russell: In view of the number of travel lanes, paved shoulder, etc., the paved width of the road is significant and causes shading severely enough to prevent growth of plants. This should be carefully evaluated and options should be explored that increase light and air under the “bridge”. Some options might include:

1. Raising the height of the bridge that permits the light angle to cover the entire area.
2. Dividing the roadway into two parts (east-bound and west-bound) and creating an open air “parkway” that allows trees to grow in the space.
3. Design a bridge that NARROWS the lanes to minimum widths, such as 8 feet and provide design elements on the bridge and prior to the bridge that causes vehicles to slow to say 35 mph. The city/state could also lower the speed limit since it is in the downtown area, due to presence of pedestrian and commerce, including traffic signals.
4. With the creation of a pedestrian, open space corridor along the stream corridor, pedestrian crossings of the stream area could be done by separate crossing structures. For example, part of the master plan for the Riverfront Park would include a way to move bicyclists and pedestrians. On the upstream side of McLaughlin would be an “offroad” crossing in a very natural setting, taking into consideration that fact that Willamette River water will back up into the creek during the winter and spring high water.

The concept of creating a passable pedestrian environment under the bridge must be an aesthetic experience and it is extremely important that this area contain the highest degree of fish habitat protection and vibrance as it is adjacent the Willamette River.]

Q: What would a “culvert” be in this situation?

A “culvert” in this project would involve returning the lake to its natural stream bed—not a
cement culvert or pipe. The cement that is currently under the bridge would be replaced by natural rock.

Q: How will this impact property values?

Property values are difficult to project or evaluate. However, the design can be done so that it is attractive. Restoration of the creek may also attract new wildlife and bring some new features to the area that are pleasing.

Q: What is the mission statement for this project?

The Corps of Engineers study had the stated goal of improving fish passage. The COM has since expanded the goal of this project to include benefits to people—the underpass, new bike lanes and sidewalks as the result of replacing the bridge.

Q: How complete is the Army Corps study? Are copies available?

The economic analysis/feasibility study is not done and final design has not been done. The MTIP grant, if awarded will fund this. The COM of Milwaukie will try to get the text of the Corps of Engineer’s study and make it available to the public.

Q: Will the COM seek further public input or will this proposal go to a vote?

Milwaukie City Council approved going forward with the MTIP application at their May meeting. If any additional funding will be required from the City then the City Council will need to look at it. All City Council meetings are public meetings and people will be informed. There will also be additional public process required under NEPA—any project with Federal funding must have public review process which would involve a presentation of the final design and alternatives including a “no action” alternative. In short, there will be several more opportunities for public input and comment. Likewise, the COM is committed to working with local homeowner to mitigate any negative impacts of this project as much as possible.

Q: Who owns the dam and bridge?

The dam and bridge are owned by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT).

: ) ☺ ☺ ☺

Miscellaneous Notes and Articles of Interest:

EMAIL

RE: Milwaukie Info [History]
From: Thelma Haggenmiller (thelma.haggenmiller@msn.com)
Sent: Mon 11/26/07 1:05 PM
To: "Pat Russell" (flanagan112@hotmail.com)

Thelma,

Ironically, the site of the Kellogg Wastewater Treatment was formerly the site of a rock crushing plant that the neighborhood wanted out of there because of noise and dust.
Your best local resource for any Milwaukie information is Madelaine Bohl. She is the person who runs the Milwaukie Museum.

She did a lot of research for us about the Trolley Trail and eventually put the information into a book that we now sell for the Museum.

Contact information: Madelaine Bohl
2416 SE Monroe
Milwaukie, OR 97222
503/658-5267 madbohl@juno.com

EMAIL
From: Pat Russell <flanagan112@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 1, 2007 1:37 PM
To: daperker@news.oregonian.com
cc: sbshawn@comcast.net
Subject: from the "frequent critic"

Andy,

I am glad for your op ed because DEQ and other state and federal agencies need to know that there's a definite problem on the Clackamas River if it can't meet its rather minimal TMDL's (Water Quality set by a timid DEQ)—after all we have to have balance among competing and stakeholder interests, even if the native fish can't talk. It seems that the balance is a buzz word for "the fish are on their own to survive because its not happening in our weak economy and societal lifestyle" and not in this county.

This has not been a life or death issue for our citizens, like a tanking economy and war on terror or powerful and controlling "stakeholders". I haven't heard anyone being killed from drinking the water or dying of water borne diseases from being in the water.

At least the Clackamas River still has fish; the Kellogg-Mt. Scott Creek has NO FISH and we still are doing NOTHING about it as a priority, even though its a 4(h)-listed watershed. The "fix" will cost about $15 million (maybe a bit more). Its called removing a dam on McLoughlin Blvd, just south of Downtown Milwaukie.

We have to spend $1.5 MILLION in MTIP funds (thank you US Taxpayers) to study the problem to death! (I don't know how many years this has been going on, but apparently there is quite a history to Kellogg Lake....most public officials refer to it as a "lake" as if we are talking about some natural water feature which it is not). I only learned about it year ago and cannot fathom why there seems to be such inaction or lethargy—like its the county of Milwaukie's problem. I've been here since 2001 and was more focused at the time on METRO's fish recovery program (the compromise referred to as "Nature in Neighborhood"—coming to your local neighborhood, no later than December 2008).

The state legislature since 2000 has authorized 10s of millions of dollars to repair STATE bridges, but apparently they forgot this one. And then they shuffled "excess" funding over to build more arterials and expand/improve freeways and capacity.

It reminds me how long it took to finally require Washington County and cities to solve their sewer problem back in the 60's and 70's. This is one reason why I am so critical of the county and use of CCSD#1. How many millions of dollars has our sewer and surface water management fees gone toward different CIP projects. But someone (some folks) in the county administration over the years have never apparently questioned whether all the surface water pollution dumping in the Kellogg Watershed drainage should be mitigated through a rather simple solution (that would have a lot of bang for its buck) that would REALLY help the salmon in the creek (that are not there)—get rid of that DAM.
What gives— they are going to blame the blockage on ODOT and the city of Milwaukie? Give me a break. DEQ could have really been a “hero” if they had directed more focus on a rather simple CIP project. How hard is it to raise a four lane arterial.

Yet we are spending $3 Million to plan the HARMONY ROAD/SUNNYBROOK EXTENSION arterials and construction of a FIVE LANE BRIDGE OVER the r/f crossing (at Lirwood/Harmony/Railroad Avenue/Lake Road intersection) through a combination of funding—mostly SDCs. AND this project has been placed on a high priority list and funding projected to available within the next few years.

We are snapping up regional center and Sunnyside (and Industrial Sanctuary) SDCs and tax Increment (Urban Renewal) to build Sunnyside road and Sunnybrook Blvd to Damascus’s doorstep, including a high priority construction of SE 172nd Avenue (now part of the Sunrise Corridor “SYSTEM” priority program).

The county’s DTD and WES pretty well speak for the values of this county and fish are at the bottom of the list.

Also, did you know that WES has dropped their leadership role in maintaining the Salmon Recovery Coordinating Council because a new director or his boss (the county administrator) don’t see the connection between water quality (TMDLs mandated by DEQ) and fish habitat. I guess they figure it costs too much to do their share in mitigating for all the runoff we generate that flows into the Kellogg Watershed and Clackamas Watershed. And yet right next door, Johnson Creek has been a quite high priority focus over the years in Portland/Mult. co./Shamsham, etc. as they recognize their obligation to return that creek to a healthier salmon habitat. Actions certainly speak louder than a bunch of plans sitting on shelf (many collecting dust—like the CCSD#1 Surface Water Master Plan that no one can figure out what it was supposed do and what are the MEASURABLE implementation strategies, except maybe flash in front of DEQ).

I am looking for performance. I know our staff mean well and we still have quite a ways to go. However, if you look at all this through the eyes of the Chamber of Commerce (aka as the SCC?), one word of fish and trees raises all sorts of red flags. No leadership there. Of course, we are all looking toward to the substance of the county’s newly created Office of Sustainability. Certainly, they will be welcomed with our long-standing wish list, including that DAM.

I am getting awfully tired of hearing from DTD staff that our codes do not apply or the standard doesn’t require the level of standards our neighborhoods have come to expect in sensitive areas. This environmental issue is NOT a MEASURE 37 issue. It is a mandate that can be justified by the NOAA/NMFS 2000 4[0]-Rule under the Endangered Species Act and Clean Water Act.....we at the state level cannot excuse ourselves from meeting federal policy.

This critique has been a little like a shotgun blast, but your article evoked some more feelings this afternoon that I couldn’t focus toward something else.

Again, I personally appreciate your elevation of these issues. 15,000 partiers was certainly a kicker.

Pat Russell
16358 SE Hearthwood Drive
Clackamas, OR 97015
(503) 656-9681
Email: flanagan112@hotmail.com

River keepers
US Representative Darlene Hooley took to the Willamette for a trip to promote legislation that would pump $100 million into the waterway over 10 years
By Patrick Sherman
The Clackamas Review
September 12, 2007 (2 Reader comments)

[PHOTO INSET] During her trip down the river, Rep. Darlene Hooley traveled aboard boats operated by the various law enforcement agencies having jurisdiction — including the Clackamas County Sheriff’s Office.
Before returning to Washington, D.C., last week, Representative Darlene Hooley spent several days just going with the flow. Starting in Eugene, she took a two-day trip by boat downstream to Portland, stopping twice in Clackamas County.

Her mission: to promote a new piece of legislation she intends to introduce in Congress to benefit the river and the communities that share its banks.

"The inspiration came from the communities themselves," she said. "We want to connect communities to each other and to the river. We turned away from the river for many years, but now we are turning towards it."

"My legislation would provide $10 million per year for 10 years, to be used for recreational facilities, interpretive materials, the health of the river itself as well as economic development."

She came armed with facts about the Willamette, which lies principally within her district.

"Seventy percent of Oregon’s population lies within 30 minutes of the river," she said. "It’s a treasure that people need to enjoy."

She also explained that a canoeist or rafter who headed north from Salem would need to paddle for four hours before reaching a suitable take-out spot.

Hooley herself made better time on the river, traveling onboard law enforcement patrol boats, including from the different sheriff’s offices along her route, the Oregon State Police and the Department of Homeland Security.

"They know the river — they have the expertise," said Hooley, explaining her choice of traveling companions. "Today, we stopped a boat that didn’t have the right flag displayed for having a skipper in the water, and we also pulled over a boat for making waves in a no-wake zone."

"This is what they do, anyhow — so we just hitched a ride along with them. We’ve also had experts in all kinds of different fields riding along with us."

In Wilsonville, Hooley was met by Oregon City Mayor Alice Norris and West Linn Mayor Norm King, who rode with her as far as Clackamette Park.

"We’re both so pleased that Congresswoman Hooley has taken the interest to focus on the river, which is the lifeblood of so many Oregon communities," said Norris. "Norm and I would like to see a project go forward which would result in a new state park or a national heritage area centered on Willamette Falls."

Norris explained that, as a national heritage area, the falls would rise to national prominence, as well as the national standards for a geographic feature of its type, but that control would remain in local hands.

"It would be different in that the state or federal government wouldn’t take ownership," said King. "It’s more of a partnership, which is a big part of Darlene’s proposal."

For Hooley, the trip was an opportunity to see and appreciate the river as she never had before.

"We went from Corvallis to Independence, and I don’t think we saw another boat," she said. "There were blue heron all over the place, and we saw three bald eagles."

"It’s been amazing — this has been an amazing trip. I’m so glad I did this."

Reader comments
Re: River keepers
Pork barrel spending? I hope voters remember this the next time the Democrats accuse Republicans of misspending tax dollars.

"This Guy" (Not verified) Thu, Sep 13, 2007 at 04:47 PM
Re: River keepers
Dear Darlene, you didn’t go far enough in your district visit on the Willamette River to see what’s happening to the
waterfront along downtown Milwaukie. Did you know that our state has blocked a salmon bearing stream a number of years ago and has not taken any step to correct the situation? This is a 4(d) ESA Salmon Recovery Stream. The NOAA/NMFS indicated seven years ago in 2000 that this stream requires recovery for salmon migration and rearing.

Did you know this stream upstream from the dam is actually in pretty good shape and that 4 cities, and a county, special districts and many community leaders have been spending 10's of millions of dollars to repair damaged habitat to bring back some semblance of its historic character?

What good does it do to spend 10's of millions of dollars to meet the Clean Water Act and the STATE's Dept. of Environmental Quality tepid TDMi standards if the salmon have no way to use this river? The dam entirely BLOCKS their passage.

Because you represent us concerning federal priorities, would you investigate and come up with some strategy to remove this dam within the next 5 to 7 years? Do what it takes.

Yes. you ask which 4(d) ESA protected stream this is? I encourage you to ask the city councils of Happy Valley, Johnson City, Gladstone, Milwaukie and the Board of County Commissioners for Clackamas County. It is really a no brainer.

So what can you do for us. A local citizen trying to make sense out of why a dam is not being removed at HYW 99E for the Kellogg-Mt. Scott Watershed...little doesn't mean it is any less important than the showcase problems of the Clackamas River, Johnson Creek, Tryon Creek, Willamette River, or Tualatin River. It is no less important than the billions of dollars being spent on the Columbia River trying to please too water users while the salmon runs have been decimated. Remember that the BPA Env. Plan Council has pointed out many times that natural streams and drainage area below the dam (Bonneville) are ideal areas to focus salmon recovery to help offset what is being lost upstream of the Columbia River dams.

This salmon habitat I am referring to is part of the Lower Columbia/Lower Willamette system that you have recognized for needed at least $100 Million over a ten year period. At the same time I am sure you will talk even louder about how the Portland region needs a $6 BILLION Bridge over the Columbia, along with a $1 BILLION FREEWAY to Sandy, Oregon via Clackamas. So what counts the most? Salmon and community sustainability and lifestyle or more of our chasing our tail in our car to get from Point A to B.

It's time to put your influence more than the federal government has said is a priority. If we can build $800 Million Light Rail projects to Milwaukie, we certainly can fix a little dam for a whole lot less. We cannot continue to build capital improvements around this problem and continue to avoid it while pumping 100's of millions into freight and transportation mobility projects or upscale downtown housing to spark economic investment in a small community at the crossroads of regional infill.

Thank you for listening.

"Pat Russell, Clackamas, Oregon"
(Not verified) Fri, Sep 14, 2007 at 12:37 PM

City's state: 'Great!' Milwaukie Mayor Jim Bernard points out the progress the city has made since his first State of the City address in 2001

By Patrick Sherman
The Clackamas Review
September 12, 2007 (1 Reader comment)

According to Milwaukee Mayor Jim Bernard, the state of his city is "Great!" That was the message he delivered at his sixth state of the city address, held at the Milwaukee Rotary Club's weekly meeting last Tuesday.

"There's been a lot of change around here since I delivered my first address back in 2001," he said.

The mayor described how the city had control of the disused Safeway store on Main Street, and was groping to find a new use for the property.

"It had been the site projected for a new transit center, but that idea fell through. Other development ideas included a coffin warehouse or a taxidermy museum. According to the downtown plan that was adopted in September 2000,
that parcel was slated to be the location of a downtown anchor.

"Neither a coffin warehouse nor a taxidermy museum seemed to be the kind of anchor that would successfully launch revitalization in downtown."

Today, he said, North Main Village has risen on that property, drawing residents back to downtown and creating new retail space, which will be home to a new restaurant in coming months.

The mayor continued, highlighting other achievements of the past half-decade: re-making McLoughlin Boulevard, the city's new softball fields, as well as the progress being made towards bringing light rail to Milwaukie and the ongoing planning for Riverfront Park.

"I have talked about real, physical changes since 2001, but something else has changed — something that's harder to define, but I think it's much more important," said Bernard. "Every Sunday, I work our Farmer's Market. I've been doing it for nine years, since before I became mayor, and I talk to hundreds of people of all ages and all walks of life.

"Despite their varied backgrounds, they are united by two things. The first, and this has been present for years, is their dedication to the market. The other, which has developed over the past few years, is their excitement about where Milwaukie is headed. There is an optimism in this community that I had not felt the first time I made this address in 2001."

Looking ahead, he stated that the city council had last month signed a memorandum of understanding with Tom Kemper and Main Street Partners to develop the Town Center project on the site of a city-owned parking lot and the former Olson Brothers Texaco station.

"Plans call for 76 town homes and condos, 10,000 square feet of retail space on Main Street, 6,000 square feet of office space facing McLoughlin, and 80 residential parking spaces within the first floor," said Bernard. "This will be a signature project for Milwaukie. It's right on McLoughlin, and the upper floors facing west will have some of the greatest views the Willamette River has to offer."

The mayor also said that the city had just secured over $1 million from the federal government to pay for preliminary engineering, environmental analysis and design work related to the restoration of Kellogg Lake.

"Once completed, this project will allow us to replace the Kellogg Lake Bridge on McLoughlin and build a mixed-use path running beneath McLoughlin Boulevard, creating a straight connection between our downtown and Riverfront Park," he said. "Furthermore, this project includes the removal of the Kellogg Dam and the restoration of fish passage for several endangered and threatened fish species."

He highlighted the city's success in reducing Part 1 crimes — serious offenses such as murder, rape, robbery and assault. In 2006, Milwaukee enjoyed a 27 percent decline in these offenses; the steepest rate of decline in the nation.

Bernard also hailed the growing economy, noting that the previous year brought with it more than 600 new jobs, as well as a commitment by PCC Structurals to build a $25 million plant in the city.

"A lot has changed, and in the coming year and beyond, things are going to change even more here in Milwaukie," he said. "But if we hold on to the things we value most, like citizen input and citizen participation, I'm confident we will continue growing in ways that respect our past."

"There's a new feeling here in Milwaukie, and I'm proud and excited to be a part of it."

Reader comments
Re: City's state: 'Great!'
I guess bringing light rail to the city is "accomplishment" if you define accomplishment as not listening to your voters.

"This Guy" (Not verified) Thu, Sep 13, 2007 at 04:50 PM
Re: City's state: Fish trying to get upstream job 120th done
What our beloved mayor didn't tell us is that there is no money to actually construct the improvements that would eliminate the dam that is blocking salmon from migrating into the Kellogg-Mt. Scott WATERSHED. It simply not enough to study it to death. It needs to get fixed.
If our Mayor is "eh, double toothpicks" bent on bringing a $1 BILLION light rail to town, and ignore its impacts on fisheries at Kellogg Creek, then he has failed the community and the watershed. He has secured major improvements over the Johnson Creek; widened McLoughlin to Jefferson, a stone throw's short of fixing the dam under the highway; demolished derelict old buildings between the river and the historic McLoughlin Blvd.; pursued riverfront plans and funding; mounted a campaign to get our schools fixed; spirited discussion to remove the Kellogg treatment (sewerage) facility off the river and out of the downtown; championed the Trolley trail to tie to the Springwater Trail; promoted economic development to protect the existing industry and businesses in town; secured cheaper drinking water through wells; encourages the building of a new freeway; has seen ODOT fix parts of the Milwaukie Expressway; and the list goes on. But when it comes to fish, the waiting has become unbearable. That little segment of McLoughlin is a no-man's land because no one wants to spend the money to correct a historical wrong. Do you see ODOT stepping up the plate? I thought our governors have proclaimed that the state can do a better job of recovering salmon that the feds and has insisted to let us do it our way. So far, this poor little forgotten stream (a good home for many salmon to spawn and rear young) has just not gotten the same attention as a freeway or bridge over the Columbia River. We power rate payers are also spending billions of dollars to watch an expensive compromise on dams vs. salmon go NOWHERE. No one is questioning the little engine that could (the Kellogg Creek and fish). Let's put its recovery on the MAIN TRACK right now. Fund it over mobility CIP proposals. Commit to that if the light rail goes forward, so too shall the Kellogg dam and open the gates for the salmon. Otherwise everyone will be shaking their heads, tearful-eyed crying that we really want to do something, but there's no money... especially while we are sending money (about $1 BILLION a day) and human investments overseas to promote democracy.

"Pat Russell, Clackamas, Oregon"
(Not verified) Fri, Sep 14, 2007 at 01:06 PM
From: <rutledge5573@comcast.net>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 5/10/2008 7:27 PM
Subject: light rail project connecting Oak Grove, Milwaukie and downtown

Hello,

I would like to see a light rail project that connects Oak Grove, Milwaukie, Southeast Portland and Downtown Portland.
I think we need alternatives to driving cars and this would be a great project.
I would like to be able to hop onto a light rail line and go anywhere in the metro area and having a line that runs to Oak Grove would go a long way to making that possible.
I would like to see a light rail line that runs down McLoughlin Blvd.

Thank you,
Catherine Rutledge
From: "DuVal, Pat" <duvalp@ci.milwaukie.or.us>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/18/2008 7:04 AM
Subject: FW: Light Rail Support

-----Original Message-----
From: James Bernard [mailto:bgarage@bernardsgarage.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2008 3:01 PM
To: DuVal, Pat
Subject: FW: Light Rail Support

From: goran@activetelesource.com [mailto:goran@activetelesource.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2008 2:19 PM
To: stones@ci.milwaukie.or.us; deborahbarnes@comcast.net; gchaimov@comcast.net;
bgarage@bernardsgarage.com; loomisjr@ci.milwaukie.or.us
Cc: Imholzman@reliablecredit.com; neilh@darkhorse.com; CampbellA@ci.milwaukie.or.us
Subject: RE: Light Rail Support

Greetings,

This is Goran Samojlovski from The Active Group at 10501 SE Main Street. I echo Lee’s sentiments regarding the benefits of light rail and offer this additional comment. I may not be able to attend this evenings meeting as I have another function at 7:30pm. As always, I appreciate the opportunity to offer my voice in this process.

From what I have gathered, the issue currently before the council relates to the amount of money that the City of Milwaukie would be requested to “kick in” to the project. To my knowledge, the City is being asked to raise and provide approximately 5 million dollars towards this project that is expected to cost close to 1.2 Billion dollars to complete. If you do the math, that comes out to 4/10ths of one percent which is almost free when you look at it. I’m surprised that this is now being raised as a potential stumbling point as I find it hard to believe that anyone thought it was not going to cost the city anything. I never had that assumption, nor do I assume I won’t somehow have to contribute through my business or individually (preferably by using these services) to help pay for this. But free was never a thought that came across my mind. If this financial consideration is indeed the issue before you, I think the amount proportionate to the total cost is more than equitable and shouldn’t affect the council’s decision to bring light rail to Milwaukie.

Once light rail is established and the benefits that will come to the area as a whole are in full swing, I believe there will be very quick return on this investment for the city.

Thank you again for allowing me an opportunity to provide input.

Sincerely,

Goran Samojlovski
President
The Active Group
From: "Paul STS" <paulsts@verizon.net>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/23/2008 11:15 AM
Subject: public comment for the record, Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

6-23-2008
Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project,
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland, OR 97232

RE: Milwaukie Light Rail, public comment

To all responsible,

From the perspective and experience of an Oak Lodge resident living in Clackamas County I believe the process for public comment and effective public input has been, and is, disingenuous as it relates to the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail study. Decisions are being made before the public comment period has closed, before all public comment submitted, or been considered.

The public involvement process as prescribed in the State of Oregon’s Planning Goals (Goal 1) has not been followed or met in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail process.

As a former member of the McLoughlin Corridor Study and the South Corridor Alternatives Study I can attest that the findings and recommendations have not been utilized and followed.

Clackamas County, Milwaukie, Trimet, and Metro have not adequately engaged the residents the Oak Grove/Oak Lodge, an area south, which is being considered for a parking structure. The parking structure and the associated traffic congestion is not desirable, hence Milwaukie does not want the parking structure in their City. The city councilors and county commissioners did not ask or involve the Oak Lodge community prior to deciding to add or suggest that alternative.

The crime that has been associated with Light Rail was seriously downplayed in the early stages of the study. In early 2007 public officials of some local governments had responded with inaccurate statements suggesting that there was no linkage or problem with Light Rail transit and crime. Not till some particular violent assaults at and on Light Rail lines were made headlines in the newspapers and on television did the local governments begin an effort to police the problem. Tri-met by their own admission does not have the funding, manpower, or trained personnel to prevent abuse, assaults, and robberies, nor do the cities have adequate resources.

The local news channels and newspaper web sites offer "search engine" resourcing of the hundreds of crimes that have occurred on Light Rail. Crime on Light Rail has been a problem from the beginning. Trimet officials recently claimed that they learned from the Gresham Max line and have changed the design of the stations, they cited the Interstate Line as an example. But crime has risen sharply on the Interstate Line, a young woman was just severely beaten and robbed just days ago. One only needs to read the newspaper and watch television to realize the danger.

The land use and development that is encouraged near Light Rail Transit lines is partly to blame. The
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combination of Light Rail, affordable housing, and high density development/environment is attracting a high rate of crime. Crime is occurring on Light Rail and at the stations, but more importantly property crimes in neighborhoods near Light Rail increase substantially. The City of Gresham recognizes this fact as does the nearby City of Wood Village.

The Oak Lodge Community has a significant number of retired residents as well as retirement communities. These particular residents are at the greatest risk and are easy prey for the criminal element that use Light Rail to commute as well as the venue to commit crime.

In closing it is my understanding that Trimet, Metro, local Counties, and the Cities have not yet solved the funding problem for Operations and Maintenance of Light Rail and have not found a solution for the unacceptable level of crime it attracts. They have had years to do so. We should not be building a Light Rail line into a community that has a high number of retirement communities and retired residents all the while not solving the problems the existing Light Rail lines have created. There is an obvious connection between high density, Light Rail and crime. It is irresponsible to subject our citizens to the level of crime and the social blight that Light Rail has delivered thus far.

I do believe Transit is important and I support bus transit. The flexibility bus service offers makes it a smarter investment. I believe Light Rail is best suited along freeways such as the existing line on I-205, but should be kept away from neighborhoods.

Safety must be a priority! The Portland-Milwaukie Light Project and its supporters have not demonstrated a solution for the safety crisis they are inadvertently engineering.

Paul Savas
Resident of Oak Lodge
PO Box 68240
Oak Grove, Oregon 97268
From:  "Runnion, Kelly" <RunnionK@trimet.org>
To: <tuerj@metro.dst.or.us>
Date:  6/2/2008 2:22 PM
Subject:  FW: TriMet in Milwaukie

-----Original Message-----
From: Sawtellles [mailto:sawtelles@yahoo.com]
Sent:  Sunday, June 01, 2008 7:18 PM
To:  Runnion, Kelly
Subject:  TriMet in Milwaukie

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to you to express my concern over the current plan for the placement of the Tri-Met line in Milwaukie.

We have four schools in the direct vicinity of that location. This brings safety concerns and noise pollution that will be a disruption in the schools.

I have not met one person outside of the mayor and city council who are in favor of bringing tri-met to Milwaukie. The council is not listening to the concerns of citizens. They are being told they can be on board or else it doesn't matter what they think because it is happening. It is disconcerting to hear that the current mayor will benefit from the sale of his property for this location. That, to be sure, is a conflict of interest.

We would like to continue the support of Tri-Met coming to Clackamas Town Center, which will place it in a position to continue on to Oregon City in the future. Downtown Milwaukie does not need a broader transit area for people to gather. The bus station is bad enough. We feel it will only take the market of people we need out of Milwaukie, not into it. Milwaukie is too small for this!

Please help us get Tri-Met to at least consider alternate routes that would not present us with the huge worry of the safety of our children. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mark & Elizabeth Sawtelle
503 654-8878
St. John’s Parish Community and School Parent
Trans System Accounts - Milwaukie Light Rail Project

From: carolyn scott <happe.me@hotmail.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/5/2008 1:25 PM
Subject: Milwaukie Light Rail Project

I have been watching and listening to the information regarding the MAX line proposals in Milwaukie. I have been a resident of Milwaukie since 1968 and I am shocked and dismayed that Tri-met is considering an action which will have such a sustained negative impact to our community. According to the proposed mapping, there would be a MAX stop within steps of 4 separate schools -- yes steps. There are currently over 2500 children, elementary through high school, almost across the street from said stop. Among this student population are probably hundreds of students who have no option but to walk to and from school each day. Based on the history of heinous crimes that occur in and around the Light Rail stops, all of these children are being placed at great risk for harm and injury. I believe the community's moral and ethical need to protect our children far outweighs any minimal benefit this proposed stop has to offer. In addition, I believe that Tri-met is opening itself to all realms of litigation should any harm befall even one of these children due to the Max operations in the area.

I hope all of the Tri-met and city leaders involved are seriously taking this information into account before making any final decisions regarding the current proposals.

Thank you for you time,

Carolyn A. Scott

Search that pays you back! Introducing Live Search cashback. Search Now!
Trans System Accounts

From: "Theresa Scott" <terry@thebomber.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/18/2008 9:20 AM

Thank you for the opportunity to voice our opinions.

If I have to vote for one it would be option A Tacoma to Lake.

I believe that there are better options than light rail that would not disrupt the current geography of our district and would provide more economical solutions to the transportation dilemma.

Not only does option A save tax payer dollars, which is wise in these difficult times, it would be devastating for many business on McLoughlin Blvd. Customer access to a business would be very limited. Customers would have to make serious detours to get to a business of choice and might otherwise go somewhere else. Therefore, there is NO reason to plan for that increase. The bus system in our area is a much better use of our dollars and provides more direct transportation and drop off points for consumers. It does not intrude on space. We do not have to build multi million dollar tracks and bridges to accommodate it any differently than car and truck transportation and if the busses are not full then we just have to cut back on the number out on the road.

We are very concerned about the possibilities of light rail going down the center of McLoughlin Blvd. As you've seen in other business districts it has caused many challenges.

#1 inconvenience for customers to reach a business.

If light rail goes down 99E Customers would have to travel and turn around several "country" blocks down the road to get in a driveway. In order to provide access Metro would have to pay for and ODOT would need to approve U turns and or develop the tracks so they were flush with the road way and easy to cross for the many businesses in our 4+ mile stretch. It would put many people who are hanging on by a thread out of business.

#2 Light rail provides access to our area for potential criminals and migrants. We don't need any more, THANK YOU.

#3 Light rail is a costly proposition which has not paid for itself in any of the other districts its been utilized in.

#4 Light rail has security problems. I know you'll say they are under control, but it is very easy to ride for free and the reduced rates don't currently cover the cost of running the train. See your reports.

#5 Trimet is tried and true and working fine. If anything add smaller inter rural bus lines.

Theresa (Terry) Scott
503-654-6491 x4
PR Manager The Bomber Complex
www.thebomber.com
The Wings of Freedom Showcase:
   Exhibits and Volunteer Manager
www.b17wingsoffreedom.org
The "2 Sisters Trio"
www.thebomber.com/twosisterstrio
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Eric,
Thank you for your continued great writing and interest in a Harold Street Station. I agree entirely with your comments on the station, and I believe it will be a tragedy if the line is put in without it! Thanks again, Dean.
Hello,

My name is Susan Shawn, 13655 SE Briarfield Court, Oak Grove, 97222. I live outside of Milwaukie, in the unincorporated area of Clackamas County.

Milwaukie has the potential to be a lovely little town nestled along a small bay in the Willamette River. It is a unique location, and when the dam is removed at the mouth of Kellogg Creek, and the creek restored to its natural flow, Milwaukie will be sitting in a fabulous natural area on two sides; west and south, with Johnson Creek towards the north.

Light rail is simply too large a footprint for this little place. It will reduce Milwaukie to simply a train stop on the way to Oregon City and beyond, tromping on its natural beauty, and creating unnecessary disruption. I believe it is accurate to say that the people of Milwaukie have voted down light rail several times in the past.

A far better solution in my mind is to bring the light rail to the north of the town, and then take it down Hwy 224 to Oregon City, via I-205. Then string a trolley car through Milwaukie and Oak Grove. The trolleys are built in Clackamas County so the money will stay local. People like trolley cars, their footprint is much smaller, and they could become more like the PSU line. There are plenty of people who live along Hwy 224 and I-205 who could ride the bigger line. Connectivity could be arranged through scheduling.

Another option is to wait awhile and see how the economy develops now that we seem to be facing peak oil. It may be that there will be some new developments just over the horizon that will change transportation options into something we've never seen before. The cost of the light rail line itself could be spent developing these new options. People are talking about solar powered vehicles, and so on, which could include mass transit options.

Thank you.

Susan Shawn
I'm writing to express my support for the Milwaukie Light Rail project and the DEIS. The project is an important extension to our regional high-capacity transit system, and takes on even greater importance at a time of rising gas prices and increased demand for transit.

Creation of a new transit river crossing is also a very important milestone for the region and will benefit the entire transit system, including our expanding Streetcar network.

Thank you.

Chris Smith
2343 NW Pettygrove St.
Portland, OR 97210
503 223-3688
Trans System Accounts - Harold Street Light Rail Station

From: "Gary Sorrels" <GaryS@bhsr.us>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/2/2008 10:16 AM
Subject: Harold Street Light Rail Station

I ask that you support the Harold Street station. I live in the area and Westmoreland needs this station.

Thank you,

Gary Sorrels
From: "Barbara Spears" <blspears@easystreet.net>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 5/6/2008 11:07 AM
Subject: Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

Sirs: This is in response to your recent postcard soliciting comments about the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project. I wish to be counted as someone who objects to this project in its entirety. When I sit in traffic on the highways in Portland, I will think about the fact that Metro, in its ultimate wisdom, has decided that they should decide where I need to go and what kind of transportation I should take, rather than leaving it up to me. If there is money available, it should be spent on our roads, which are clearly popular and in need of expansion.

Barbara Spears
I think the streetcar going to Milwaukie should be able to stop at the Harold Street even if it takes a minute longer. It is silly to think that the station is not needed when it is an important stop for the people near the Bybee Station in Eastmoreland. Please put the Harold Street station into the plans and stop worrying about a one minute delay in the schedule. Jan Swire, jan swire31 @ msn.com
From: Peter Tackaberry <bucketberry@yahoo.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 5/19/2008 11:54 AM
Subject: Light Rail to the SE

I am applaud your continuous efforts to expand the MAX light rail from Portland to Milwaukie.

I live in Westmoreland and look forward to having the Max as an option of commuting. It seems like an obvious move it the right direction to expand our light rail as our gas prices continue to increase with no end in sight, and the traffic congestion on MLK grows worse each day.

Please continue to fight the good fight and expand the MAX light rail from Portland to Milwaukie!

Thank you,
Peter Tackaberry
6222 SE 17th Ave.
Portland, OR 97202
503.226.7858
Trans System Accounts - Milwaukie Max: Statement in Support, with considerations to pedestrian access from north at Clinton/Gideon stop

From: "Ethan Timm" <leander37@gmail.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 5/19/2008 12:58 PM
Subject: Milwaukie Max: Statement in Support, with considerations to pedestrian access from north at Clinton/Gideon stop

To whom it may concern:

As a property owner and resident of Hosford-Abernethy, I strongly support the proposed Milwaukee Max alignment as described in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Regarding the crossing options, I am still in favor of the 2003 LPA, as it secures OMSI as a key node in Portland's transportation/education/tourism systems. There is already a streetcar link to South Waterfront, so I don't see why the MAX has to run through there as well. At such an effort and expense, it seems wasteful to double up rail lines, when South Waterfront riders could transfer at Harbor Drive to the MAX.

As for the bridge, I support the cable-stayed options, as I think they are distinctive, modern, and provide an additional icon for the city.

Regarding the proposed Clinton/Gideon stop, I believe it is crucial that pedestrian access from the north be safe and convenient. As there are already so many grade crossings in this area (hence, trains blowing multiple whistles for safety), I think that another pedestrian/bike grade crossing at either SE 14th Ave, or SE 15th Ave is possible to get residents and visitors conveniently to the train.

Example of pedestrian grade crossing on the Trimet System:
http://freethireriverpark.typepad.com/photos/safe_pedestrian_train_cro/beavertontransitstation.html

Thanks for your consideration

Ethan Timm
Portland, OR
I’ve been a supporter of Light Rail since the beginning. But I believe I oppose the Milwaukie extension, now.
Here’s why:
2. Fast growing North Clackamas Co. Where on earth is this fast growth? Most of Milwuakie/Gladstone is already built out. The growth is east of I-205...nowhere close to this light rail. You’ll just import more traffic into the Milwaukie area. Why would I support that?
3. Busses do just fine. I ride two every day.

So, spend the money on more frequent bus services. What ever happened to the ten minute corridor? Oh I forgot, this is TriMet. Long on promises, short on delivery. Don’t get me going on your $3 mm waste of money trying to do something with Southgate. Just put the park and ride back the way it was. You own the lot, don’t you?

Ok, so you don’t listen to me and go ahead and build it. Well then:
1. Choose the locally preferred option in Downtown Milwaukie. Maximize parking spaces at Southgate and other locations to the south.
2. Choose the bridge crossing that uses the Ross Island Bridge, especially if that reduces cost of rebuilding that bridge. If not Ross Island, then the 2003 (northern) site. The objective should be to get the train south as quickly as you can.
3. Extend the line to Park Ave to cut down on traffic in old town Milwaukie.
I support having MAX from Milwaukie to Portland — and all over town! Please count me in as a supporter. I ride TriMet daily to work from the Milwaukie Transit Center. I’m also in support of a stop in downtown Milwaukie, the light rail coming through downtown Milwaukie, AND I support having the park and ride at the old Southgate lot.

The buzz on the bus is that TriMet might not do the park and ride at Southgate. Everyone is upset about that. If that is part of your plan, you should know that there are a lot of bus riders that support that. AND ESPECIALLY when there is light rail coming through there.

Please consider listening heartily to the supporters like me who are not necessarily as loud as the few who are not supporting Light Rail.

Thank you.

Gloria Totten
Lifetime Milwaukie Resident
Hello, Please add my comments to the public input for the Portland South Corridor Light Rail Project.

I support the added SE Harold Street Station. Would serve more people than you think -- especially if many bike parking racks were added to the station -- Denmark-style.

I support carrying the rail line as far south as funding supports. Build it now and our long-term smart growth will be supported in the future.

I support the Committee’s choice on where the light rail crosses the river.

I support maintaining and restoring as much green space, water and land habitat protection, and parks and green corridor protection as possible for the overall project.

Thanks for taking public comments!

Sincerely, Lara Utman
1606 SE Insley St.
Portland, OR 97202
503-550-9535

"You must be the change you wish to see in the world." -- Mahatma Gandhi
To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to support the proposed light rail line to the city of Milwaukie in Oregon. Light rail is very important to our city and our region and it would be very beneficial to have the alignment built. I am supportive of a new bridge over the Willamette River. It is needed for transit to the OMSI district and South Waterfront and that will eventually support a streetcar connection around Portland's inner core.

I strongly support this project.

Sincerely,

Dee Walsh
Dee Walsh
Executive Director

Dee Walsh
Executive Director
REACH Community Development, Inc.
1135 SE Salmon
Portland, OR 97214
503.231.6692
www.reachcdci.org
I am in favor of mass transit projects. However, one of the big disadvantages of living in a city is the racket. Noise from transportation facilities (rail, streets, highways) should be inaudible to humans and all other creatures beyond the boundaries of the land specifically occupied by these facilities. Subways and tunnels are a way to come close to achieving this.

The noise analyses done for this EIS and the document on which it is based [Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. Federal Transit Administration, 2006] have severe shortcomings. One is the use of averages such as Leq and Ldn. I give a simple example. An idling city bus is said (FTA) to produce 75 dBA at 50 feet. (I think that is an underestimate.) If it operates 3 minutes every hour, then its Leq(hour) is 62 dBA, a large reduction in the describing value of the noise, but still the fact that it would be very annoying is not changed. The only fair way to present noise data is not with some devious average but to show fast-response measurements versus time. Averages typified by Ldn and Leq are very much favored by organizations, such as the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Aviation Administration and the USDA Forest Service, which promote noisy activities.

The Schultz curve is used (FTA) to determine the percentage of people highly annoyed for a given Ldn. Ignored by FTA is the wide scattering about the curve of the data to which the curve is fit. FTA, using the curve fitted to the data, states that 10% of people are highly annoyed by an Ldn of 60 dB. At least one survey gave a high annoyance value of about 7% at an Ldn of only about 47. If people are bothered by the addition of noise on their property, residence, or places they customarily go, it should be eliminated. It can be very harmful to their health, state of mind and overall well-being. The imposition of noise is inverse condemnation.

The matter of barriers as sound blockers is addressed. However, reflection of sound by walls, buildings, etc. is not. Reflection can both amplify sound and lessen its attenuation (e.g., the old-fashioned speaking tube). There appear to be locations along the proposed routes where reflection should be taken into account.

Thomas J. Walsh
1525 SE Rex St.
Portland, OR 97202
To Whom It May Concern:

I live in Milwaukie and work in downtown Portland. Currently I carpool in the morning and bus home at night. I don’t retire until 2028 and look forward to taking MAX in 2015. Get the show on the road! When I am really old I will still be able to enjoy all the things Portland has to offer.

On a side note, I am grateful at this point that there will be ‘no’ stops behind the Portland Waldorf School and near the catholic school. Lake Road should make a good station, shouldn’t be fine with high school age kids, but I do hope that the line continues on to Park Ave. Since I live directly on Lake Road I am very concerned about the increase in traffic that might come to Lake Road. I do not want it to become the main artery to and from the station (but I still want light rail, not trying to contradict myself here if that makes sense).

Sincerely,
Cameron Waner
3920 SE Lake Road
97222
503.659.4200 Home

-----Original Message-----
From: Ragel, Beth [mailto:RagelB@ci.milwaukie.or.us]
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2008 11:29 AM
To: Ragel, Beth
Subject: Submit Light Rail comments--deadline June 23rd at noon
Importances: High

One more reminder. Please distribute to your mailing lists:
Share your comments with local and federal decision makers regarding Portland-Milwaukie light rail by **Wednesday June 23rd at noon**.

Comments can be emailed to trans@oregonmetro.gov. Written comments should be sent to: Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project, Metro, 600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland, OR 97232. Comments can also be recorded on Metro’s transportation hotline at 503-797-1900, option 6.

Comments can also be submitted on comment cards at public open houses and testimony can be provided at the public hearings. See list of meetings at the Metro website here: www.oregonmetro.gov/southcorridor

All comments received during the formal comment period (May 9-June 23, 2008) will go into the formal record and be submitted to decision-makers locally and to Federal Transportation Association.

Thanks,
Beth Ragel
Program Coordinator
Hello Mayor Bernard,

Just a note to show support for the light rail plan as approved last August. Light rail is an important adjunct to the metro area’s transportation needs, and the rail easement is certainly the most cost effective and least disruptive plan to bring light rail through Milwaukee. I have no doubt that the addition of rail transit will enhance downtown Milwaukee and help alleviate automobile commuter congestion, provide another less-expensive transportation alternative in a climate of skyrocketing gas prices, and contribute to a cleaner environment, lower carbon footprint, and more sustainable economy.

Thank you for your time.

Chris

Chris Warner
Senior Editor, Dark Horse Books
P: (503) 652-8815
F: (503) 654-9440
From: "Haralee Weintraub" <haralee@haralee.com>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/3/2008 3:13 PM
Subject: Light Rail, Oak Grove, Milwaukie

As a resident for 28 years in the Oak Grove, Milwaukie area I have been looking forward to Light Rail for years. With gas prices so high and environmental issues, I would love to be able to walk to a light rail stop and get off downtown Portland. Now I can take the 32 or 33 bus with not the best schedule during the week-ends.
I live above Rex Putnam High School, off Oatfield Rd. I can now walk down to McLaughlin or stay on Oatfield to catch the bus.
My sister lives in NW Portland and with Max and the street car she uses her car infrequently. Actually she uses it just to come to my home because the bus service is not commuter friendly.
North Clackamas County with light Rail will be a piece of heaven in 2011!
Bring us Light Rail. I will support, I will vote.
Haralee Weintraub
I live in the neighborhood through which the route passes.

I pay lots of taxes.

No light rail.

None.

Stop it.

I don’t want it.

I don’t ride it.

I won’t ride it.

Stop taking my money for something I don’t want.
Please include a station at Harold Street on your proposed Inner Southeast Light Rail Plan. A one minute stop to unload passengers would not be too long of a delay, many people in the Selwood area can use bikes to get to town, but a light rail station would be a welcome addition in our area, especially as the population ages. The run between Holgate and Bybee stations is too long, we need a station at Harold street to encourage more ridership from the neighborhoods, especially a neighborhood that is so conscience of pollution and one that wants to make a difference. Jeanie Mountjoy, Barbo Machinery, 4617 SE Milwaukie Ave, Portland, OR 97202, 503-232-8158.
From: "Julie Wisner" <julie@sterling.net>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/11/2008 10:10 PM
Subject: milwaukie light rail

I am against putting light rail through downtown Milwaukie. I do not want it to come into downtown and disrupt the traffic patterns causing huge delays in traffic causing traffic to back up on all east and west streets when the train goes by. It is way too expensive. Milwaukie voted it down years ago. Milwaukie has a charm that will be ruined with a lightrail train running through it. The train should come to the southgate site at the north end of town and not come into Milwaukie. The train will bring crime, noise, congestion and reduce Milwaukie to a mere transfere station for a lightrail train. The physical size of the light rail cars is way too big for the small town scale of Milwaukie. They will look grossly out of place in our quaint city. keep light rail out of downtown Milwaukie! We voted it down already!
Julie Wisner
I need to add one more comment to my previous comments. I believe the City of Milwaukie's City council should put light rail up to a vote of the citizens of Milwaukie.

We don't want light rail here. We have already voted it down twice. Now we have Metro and a handful of liberal spenders in City Government wasting our tax dollars on a light rail train only they want.

Why is City Council so afraid to put light rail up to a vote of the people of Milwaukie?

Is it because they know the majority rules? And they are not representing the majority.

Julie Wisner

----- Original Message -----
To: Metro PDX-Milwaukie Light Rail Planning Dept.,

I am a long-term Milwaukie resident who has been extremely active as a local volunteer for over 15 years, serving on several citizen committees regarding Regional Center Planning in the mid-90's, Lake Road Neighborhood Chair for a number of years, and have served on the Design and Landmarks Commission for 11 years.

I am very well acquainted with the history of Light Rail Planning in Milwaukie—much more so than the average Milwaukie citizen and also most of those who have served recently to make decisions about Light Rail coming into Milwaukie and what the alignment should be.

I disagree strongly with the current plans and alignment for the following reasons:

MILWAUKIE DOES NOT WANT A DENSE, URBAN ENVIRONMENT, AND THEY HAVE THE RIGHT TO REFUSE IT.

1. In the recent past Milwaukie has voted NO on Light Rail. The population does not want it. Neither Milwaukie City Council, nor Metro have evidence that the majority of the population are in favor of this Line coming through Milwaukie.

This project should rightly go before a vote of the people since public money funds this project, we deserve a voice in how tax dollars are spent.

Also, I'm very aware that this Line is meant to serve more riders than those just in the Milwaukie area. This is a regional plan and decision, not just a local Milwaukie decision. But, it does drastically and permanently change in a negative way, how residents live and travel in Milwaukie. The current, preferred alignments are repeating the same mistakes in planning as those from the 1990's, which bring the train too close to schools and quiet residential neighborhoods.

Milwaukie is an older community, very built-out
with established neighborhoods. Residents live here for very specific reasons—often citing the quiet small town feel so foreign to urbanized Portland. They also state they don't like Portland's density, traffic, and urban environment, therefore they choose to live in Milwaukie.

The majority of Milwaukie residents have not lobbied METRO or Milwaukie City Council to request that this small town residential community be forever altered and changed into a crowded, high-density urban housing project, which Light Rail is meant to create.

I'm well aware Light Rail is "married to" high density urban planning & development, I'm no fool about this. Most of local citizens are ignorant of this link between the two, they don't realize the type of rezoning and construction which will rapidly happen with a Light Rail train.

Milwaukie has an award winning Downtown Design Plan which can evolve and be constructed WITHOUT the presence of Light Rail. The presence of Light Rail will negatively alter the way our downtown redevelops if the alignment is built along the Tillamook corridor in the present options.

2. TRAFFIC DISRUPTION FOR MILWAUKIE'S EAST-WEST TRAVELERS IS TOO GREAT

The current proposed alignment cuts across all of our Eastbound-Westbound collector streets which move the local population each day. Frequent trains stopping traffic on all of our E-W streets from Harrison to Lake Road will daily gridlock our morning and evening commuters, school buses, emergency response vehicles, etc.

I have attached a PDF doc., a plan I sent to Milwaukie City Council in early May 2008 proposing a Test Study of traffic impacts on these streets simulating Light Rail trains tying up traffic due to their frequency and blockage. To my knowledge, no one has acted on this proposal—I strongly believe it should be done.
Milwaukie Light Rail Test Drive Project
Proposed by Patty Wisner
Milwaukie Resident

What:
Conduct an on-site study of traffic impacts caused by Northbound/Southbound light rail trains traveling along the proposed Tillamook alignment in downtown Milwaukie.

Milwaukie City Staff will conduct a Monday through Friday on-site study during morning and evening peak rush hours stopping traffic at S.E. Harrison, S.E. Monroe, S.E. Washington, and S.E. Lake Road to mirror the frequency, duration, and timing of stop lights/light rail crossings of light rail trains traveling in both directions across these streets at peak rush hour times: 7 a.m. to 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. for five straight days minimum.

Why:
No one on City Council, city staff, Metro, Tri-Met, the business community, the school district or local residents have any first-hand, eye-witness experience with the impacts of frequently stopping traffic during rush hours on these major east–west collector streets used for thousands of car, bus, and truck trips a day. No one knows if the operation of light rail will cause serious negative impacts to drivers of all types as well as traffic backups on McLoughlin Blvd., Hwy 224, or neighborhood streets intersecting these collector streets.

Since these streets are critical for the unimpeded daily travel of the local workforce, school buses, mail carriers, freight carriers, emergency vehicles, police, parents transporting students, shoppers, and service providers, it is imperative that an on-site simulation study as described in this document, be conducted and evaluated before the final recommendation and adoption of this proposed alignment.

This “Test Drive” simulation is a low-cost project using city staff, and city equipment. It is far less costly now to study the impacts or lack of impacts at this time than to wait until a billion dollar light rail system permanently disrupts the daily function of Milwaukie, and it’s too late to do anything about fixing problems caused by frequent traffic stoppages and traffic back-ups.

Milwaukie has never experienced a physical obstruction like light rail which would frequently stop and delay travel on these high-use collector streets west of Hwy 224.

When:
Before the close of the 2008 school year. The study needs to include how the operation of light rail effects school buses using these collector streets. Completing the study while school is still in session allows the collected data to include impacts on school bus routes. The data can be evaluated before City Council deliberates on the final adoption of the light rail alignment.

How:
City staff researches a current light rail location (the observation area) which is similar to the Tillamook alignment crossing over S.E. Harrison, S.E. Monroe, S.E. Washington, and S.E. Lake Road. The observation area should have crossing streets of similar size as Milwaukie’s above mentioned collector streets—width, number of lanes etc. Blocks between streets should also be of similar size.

City staff should observe this light rail area during morning rush hour and evening rush hour. Staff should time and record the elapsed time from when the stop lights stop traffic while waiting for an approaching light rail train, to the entire length of time it takes for the train to clear the intersection and the traffic light turns green for vehicles to proceed. Staff should record the frequency of how often this stoppage happens when trains are traveling inbound and outbound during peak rush times.
Staff should use the average speed of the train and the frequency and duration of each train traveling in both directions to formulate a best guess estimate of how trains will travel between S.E. Harrison to S.E. Lake Road in both directions to set the schedule for stopping and delaying traffic on all four streets during each trip of each train which would service Milwaukie during rush hours for this simulation study.

Once this timing has been determined, Staff will plan the type of signage needed on each of the four collector streets informing drivers they will be stopped temporarily, staff will also plan the number of flaggers needed (two for each street), also how many staff are needed to record data and use video cameras. Staff could also enlist the help of local neighborhood volunteers and high school students interested in community service. Traffic backups should be noted, especially if traffic is backing up in excess of one quarter-to-one half mile or more from the proposed light rail alignment.

Staff will be stationed at all four collector streets to record the amount of cars stopped (in each direction) at each time the flaggers stop traffic to simulate each train traveling in either direction. Staff will record whether traffic backs up on adjacent streets and highways. Staff can also video significant backups or driver behaviors such as road rage.

The study will be conducted for a minimum of five consecutive days during peak morning and evening rush hours. Staff will collect data, evaluate it and present findings to the City Council, Planning Staff and key decision makers.

This study will require the use of the following equipment:

- Flagger Signs for Stop and Slow
- Walkie-talkies
- Video cameras
- Laptop computers
- Paper and Pen
- Road Signage to denote change in traffic pattern

Optional: A driver response form handed to drivers stopped in traffic to gather driver’s opinion of being stopped everyday from light rail trains. How will effected drivers really feel about this? They have a right to use the roads to get where they need to go, what is their reaction to building a permanent obstruction to their road usage in the form of light rail?

SOUND STUDY: The study could also include examining the decibel level of required light rail horns and bells at each collector street crossing. Staff would have to research what would be involved in a study to use sound equipment to create accurate sound levels of light rail warnings at each crossing during rush hours.
To whom it may concern:

I served on the TriMet Board for 9 years, 8 as chair, while the West Side was being planned. In my opinion the most important and correct decisions we made were to base the alignment on getting the passengers from the far terminus to Portland's commercial center as fast as possible; the mistakes were bowing to pressure to do otherwise. There will always be commercial and political interests hoping to profit from changes in the alignment which may be convenient for a few potential riders at the expense of driving away the majority who want swift and simple point-to-point operations. Also we were not as good on safety and fare inspections as what is now necessary to keep the public's confidence. Since TriMet's financial adequacy is in the long run dependent upon its popularity and overall reputation you must ensure your decisions reflect public needs.

Loren L. Wyss
Wyss Foundation
Trans System Accounts - Comment from PSU

From: Dan Zalkow <zalkowd@pdx.edu>
To: <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/23/2008 11:30 AM
Subject: Comment from PSU

Portland State University has been actively monitoring the progress of this project, and we are extremely excited about it. I recently learned that the South Corridor Steering Committee will be making a decision to eliminate the Harbor station as part of the LPA with the understanding that the station will be consolidated with the Lincoln Station during Preliminary Engineering. This "new" station may be sited between the currently proposed Lincoln and Harbor stations.

Over the past year, I have continuously made sure that there was no consideration to eliminate or move the Lincoln station since PSU plans to redevelop its 4 acre site to the south of the proposed station (University Place) as a transit oriented development where the stations and development are planned together or at least planned in strong consideration of one another. This site could house up to 3000 PSU students.

We are open to discussing the idea of moving the Lincoln station, but this discussion as well as additional public processes including discussions with property owners at RiverPlace should occur before making a decision that nearly guarantees that the Lincoln station is moved. Leaving both stations in the LPA seems to be the prudent decision at this time, with the evaluation of the stations to occur during Preliminary Engineering.

We are very interested in continuing a dialogue regarding these stations and we would be happy to meet with members of the committee or agency representatives to discuss the future station locations west of the Willamette River.

---

Dan Zalkow, AICP
Associate Director & Planner
Housing & Transportation
Portland State University
Phone: (503) 725-5466
www.hats.pdx.edu
We are writing to voice our opposition to the south corridor light rail project which would run approximately 1/4 mile from our home. There is currently bus service where the new line would run, yet cars still clog McLoughlin Blvd northbound every morning. Why? Because no matter how much public transit there is, people will always rely on their personal vehicles. I see buses that are less than 1/2 full during rush hours. I pass 3 Park and Ride lots each morning and not one is ever full. If people don't ride the already available busses, what makes you think they'll ride the train?

We've also seen WAY too many stories lately in the media about the lack of security on the existing Max lines. How would the new line be different? TriMet can't keep the current lines secure, so how are they going to keep additional lines secure? The Milwaukie Police department can't even manage to curtail the drug activity or speeders on my street, so don't tell me that they're going to step up and help. If TriMet can't hire more security for the existing lines, where will they get the money for security for the new line?

The City of Milwaukie is focusing on reducing the amount of vehicular traffic and trying to increase pedestrian traffic in the downtown area. How does adding Park and Ride lots fit in to that plan? If the city doesn't want it's own residents parking downtown to do their shopping already, why would they want people to park their cars all day when they're at work (and not bringing dollars to local merchants)? Encouraging light rail (with park and rides) seems a little contradictory to the City's plans thus far.

Instead of wasting precious dollars on mass transit that the masses won't use, how about improving the roadways and making things more efficient to reduce rush-hour gridlock for the true masses? How about fixing the Sellwood Bridge before it collapses and causes REAL problems for commuters crossing the Willamette?

Susan and Doug Zeiler
Milwaukie residents
From: "Joseph Zipagang" <jzipagan@standard.com>
To: "trans@oregonmetro.gov" <trans@oregonmetro.gov>
Date: 6/2/2008 10:22 AM
Subject: Harold Street Light Rail Station

I ask that you please support the Harold Light Rail Station. I live in the Sellwood/Westmoreland area and this would make the commute to work very convenient.

Thanks,
Joseph
June 23, 2008

VIA E-MAIL

Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232

Re: Comments on SDEIS for Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

Dear Metro:

This office represents a coalition of business and property owners in the North Milwaukie Industrial District (the "Industrial District"), including Oregon Worsted Company and 6710 LLC. We submit these comments on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) prepared for the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project.

In summary, property owners in the Industrial District are extremely concerned about the impacts to their businesses that would occur if the 2003 LPA alignment is selected and a corresponding 600-space park and ride facility is located at the former Southgate Theater site near the intersection of SE Milport Road and McLoughlin Boulevard. We believe that the SDEIS analysis does not provide sufficient consideration of the economic significance of the Industrial District to the City of Milwaukie and to the metro region, and that the SDEIS should provide closer consideration of the detrimental impacts that would result if the 2003 LPA is selected rather than the Tillamook Branch alignment. Further, in the absence of a viable mitigation proposal for impacts to the SE Milport/McLoughlin intersection, any alternative that includes a 600-space park and ride in the Industrial District should not be considered as a realistic alternative.

The Industrial District is bisected into an east side and a west side by SE McLoughlin. Although both sides have significant transportation issues, the east side is particularly constrained due to the fact that there are only two roads providing access to the entire area, one of which is the stoplight at SE Milport Road and McLoughlin Boulevard. Adding a light rail line and a 600-space park and ride facility to the existing commercial and industrial bottleneck at this intersection would have disastrous results on the operations of the businesses on the east side of...
the Industrial District. The volume of peak-hour commuter trips that would be associated with this park and ride facility is incompatible with existing industrial and commercial truck traffic, and will overwhelm the capacity of the SE Milport and McLoughlin intersection.

This fact is acknowledged in the SDEIS, which considers impacts to the SE Milport and McLoughlin intersection at page 5-25, and concludes as follows: "With the 2003 LPA and 2003 LPA to Park Alignment Options, this intersection would have over-capacity operations from the 600-space Milwaukie Park and Ride." Although a handful of theoretical mitigation scenarios are noted in the SDEIS, no detailed analysis of the viability of mitigation at this intersection is provided. Based on our experience, ODOT is extremely unlikely to make any changes to the McLoughlin signal timing. In the absence of any analysis in the SDEIS regarding whether the impacts from the park and ride could actually be mitigated, this alignment option may be completely untenable and should not be receiving legitimate consideration in this process.

Further, the SDEIS does not include a sufficient cost/benefit analysis regarding the economic benefits of the Industrial District or the impacts that would result from the 2003 LPA alignment and resulting park and ride facility. To that end, attached is a January 10, 2006 memorandum from economists Johnson Gardner providing a summary of the direct economic benefits provided by the North Industrial District businesses to the City of Milwaukie. As stated in that memorandum, businesses in the North Industrial District generate a total of $308 million of commerce in the City of Milwaukie, which represents slightly over 17 percent of the City's economy. Also, businesses in the District account for 2,484 jobs in the City of Milwaukie, which constitutes 15 percent of the City's total employment. Businesses in the District support average wages of $44,300 across all industries affected, which is 20 percent higher than Clackamas County wages for corresponding industries.

Also attached is a supplemental memorandum from Johnson Gardner dated January 16, 2006, which provides an analysis of the tax revenues generated by businesses in the Industrial District. As stated in the attached memorandum, commerce and employment driven by District businesses generate $27.8 million in state and local tax and fee revenues annually. Of that amount, $3.4 million is property tax, $20.8 million is in taxes on business and commerce, and over $6.7 million is state income tax, which helps fund education at the local level. Local schools receive about $2.2 million in taxes annually from North Industrial District businesses.

As evidenced by this economic data, more than just the location of a park and ride facility is at issue in this process. Property owners and business leaders in the Industrial District have expressed their legitimate concerns regarding the negative impacts of the proposed facility on existing businesses in the area. The functionality of the Industrial District is in a precarious balance that should not be further encroached upon by the proposed park and ride facility, which is incompatible with the area and has no viable mitigation for its impacts. Siting the proposed park and ride facility in this location will undermine the economic growth potential of the
industrial district and employment center, and will negatively impact the economy of district and
the City of Milwaukee as a whole. Metro's final EIS should not disregard or marginalize the
Industrial District by failing to completely consider the impacts of the proposed non-industrial
use in a designated industrial area.

The economic considerations identified above and in the attached memoranda should be taken
into account in Metro's analysis, along with the higher costs and displaced businesses that would
result from adopting the 2003 LPA alignment. The SDEIS expressly notes that the Tillamook
Branch option would cost $25.6 million less to construct than the other options, and would also
require fewer acquisitions and displacements of existing businesses in the Industrial District.
Combined with the acknowledged fact that the 2003 LPA alignment would result in failure of the
SE Milport and McLoughlin intersection, causing disastrous impacts on businesses in the
Industrial District, we believe that the more reasoned analysis requires a conclusion that the
Tillamook Branch alignment provides the most judicious alternative, as previously concluded
after careful study by the 2004 Transit Working Group and the elected leaders of the City of
Milwaukee.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and the attached memoranda from Johnson
Gardner.

Very truly yours,

Roger A. Alfred

Enclosures
MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 10, 2006

TO: Mr. Mark Whidow
    PERKINS COIE
    1120 NW Couch Street
    Tenth Floor
    Portland, OR 97209

FROM: JOHNSON GARDNER

SUBJECT: Impact Analysis of the North Milwaukee Industrial Cluster

JOHNSON GARDNER was retained by PERKINS COIE to estimate the economic and fiscal contributions made by the North Milwaukee Industrial Cluster and Corridor to the Milwaukee and Clackamas County economies. The cluster is defined in this analysis as industrial and commercial development bounded by SE McLoughlin Boulevard/99E to the west, the Union Pacific Railroad Line to the east, the Milwaukee city boundary to the north and the Milwaukee Expressway/Highway 224 to the south.

BUSINESS REVENUES

JOHNSON GARDNER estimated direct, indirect and induced business revenues resulting from commerce located within the Industrial Cluster. FIGURE 1 below provides a summary of study findings regarding business sales generation in Milwaukee.

FIGURE 1: MILWAUKEE BUSINESS REVENUES FROM INDUSTRIAL CLUSTER COMMERCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>$31,298</td>
<td>$4,751</td>
<td>$36,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>$54,271,952</td>
<td>$1,990,266</td>
<td>$56,262,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$470,066,184</td>
<td>$200,856</td>
<td>$47,267,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$106,840,912</td>
<td>$1,947,837</td>
<td>$108,788,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>$56,666,840</td>
<td>$1,174,876</td>
<td>$57,841,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>$18,918,468</td>
<td>$135,140</td>
<td>$19,053,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$123,261</td>
<td>$123,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>$3,264,012</td>
<td>$659,444</td>
<td>$3,923,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Business Services</td>
<td>$1,041,113</td>
<td>$1,247,471</td>
<td>$2,288,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Health Services</td>
<td>$27,783</td>
<td>$11,280</td>
<td>$39,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Hospitality</td>
<td>$4,202,859</td>
<td>$601,847</td>
<td>$4,804,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>$1,426,631</td>
<td>$116,129</td>
<td>$1,542,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$293,990,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,073,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$302,063,300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Irwin, Claritas, Inc., U. S. Census Bureau, and Johnson Gardner, LLC.

1 Data gathered in the course of this study is confidential in nature. For reporting the aggregation of proprietary data in this study, Johnson Gardner follows Oregon Employment Department protocol. Publication of data in aggregate requires at least three firms in a specific industry for data to be released.
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Utilizing Implan methodology, Johnson Gardner estimates that Industrial Cluster businesses generate a total of $308 million of commerce in the City of Milwaukee. Cluster-related commerce single-handedly represents over 17% of the City’s economy.

- **Direct Impacts:** Business within the cluster generate $294 million in sales annually.
- **Indirect Impacts:** Businesses elsewhere in the City of Milwaukee benefit from Cluster commerce to the tune of $8 million annually.
- **Induced Impacts:** Spending by employees in the Cluster generates an additional $6 million in sales for Milwaukee businesses.

Industrial Cluster commerce benefits more than the City of Milwaukee, but provides significant economic activity throughout Clackamas County. Figure 2 below provides a summary of the business revenue impacts of the Industrial Cluster on Clackamas County businesses.

**Figure 2: Clackamas County Business Revenues from Industrial Cluster Commerce**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Induced</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>$11,298</td>
<td>$1,023,127</td>
<td>$540,196</td>
<td>$3,135,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,672</td>
<td>$201</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>$12,744,846</td>
<td>$2,796,033</td>
<td>$939,812,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$47,066,184</td>
<td>$6,976,110</td>
<td>$60,731,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$105,846,512</td>
<td>$12,953,700</td>
<td>$519,024,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>$56,666,660</td>
<td>$15,156,356</td>
<td>$5,666,264</td>
<td>$25,488,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>$18,518,668</td>
<td>$1,292,615</td>
<td>$9,300,498</td>
<td>$28,913,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,796,396</td>
<td>$1,745,084</td>
<td>$5,541,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>$3,264,012</td>
<td>$12,288,000</td>
<td>$12,042,150</td>
<td>$27,594,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Business Services</td>
<td>$1,941,118</td>
<td>$17,567,194</td>
<td>$12,629,214</td>
<td>$22,137,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Health Services</td>
<td>$87,783</td>
<td>$106,170</td>
<td>$13,028,475</td>
<td>$13,222,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Hospitality</td>
<td>$6,202,458</td>
<td>$1,513,610</td>
<td>$7,374,188</td>
<td>$15,090,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>$3,498,624</td>
<td>$3,229,922</td>
<td>$6,318,602</td>
<td>$9,046,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$294,990,100</td>
<td>$68,329,700</td>
<td>$96,329,700</td>
<td>$462,590,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Implan, Claritas, Inc., U.S. Census Bureau, and Johnson Gardner, LLC

- **Direct Impacts:** Business within the cluster generate $294 million in sales annually, all within Clackamas County.
- **Indirect Impacts:** Businesses elsewhere in the County experience over $80 million in activity providing vendor and support goods and services to Cluster businesses.
- **Induced Impacts:** Spending by employees in the Cluster generates an additional $6 million in sales for businesses throughout Clackamas County.

**Employment**

Johnson Gardner finds that the Industrial Cluster is a significant employment center in the City of Milwaukee directly and through economic ripple effects. The employment impact of the Industrial Cluster for the City of Milwaukee economy is found in Figure 3 on the following page.

Businesses within the cluster are estimated to account for 2,484 jobs in the City of Milwaukee, or a full 15% of the City's employment. The Industrial Cluster is the site of nearly 2,340 jobs,

Economic Impact of the North Milwaukee Industrial Cluster
predominantly in Manufacturing, Construction, Wholesale Trade, and Transportation, Warehousing & Utilities. These four sectors, as will be discussed later in this document, are among the highest-paying sectors locally, all paying family-wage jobs.

**FIGURE 3: MILWAUKEE EMPLOYMENT FROM INDUSTRIAL CLUSTER COMMERCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Jobs (Full-Time Equivalent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>390.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>466.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>571.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>390.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>330.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Business Services</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Health Services</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Hospitality</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,399.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Imprint, U.S. Census Bureau, and Johnson Gardner, LLC

- **Direct Impacts:** Businesses within the cluster employ 2,399 people annually.
- **Indirect Impacts:** Vendors and services suppliers to the Cluster employ over 67 people annually within the City of Milwaukee.
- **Induced Impacts:** Spending by Cluster employees generates an additional 77 jobs annually in the City of Milwaukee.

As with business revenues, Industrial Cluster employment clearly contributes to the broader Clackamas County economy, significantly more so than for the City of Milwaukee alone. **FIGURE 4** on the following page summarizes employment impacts of the North Milwaukie Industrial Cluster on the Clackamas County economy.

In total, the Industrial Cluster is estimated to support nearly 4,000 jobs annually throughout Clackamas County directly and via ripple effects.

- **Direct Impacts:** Businesses within the cluster employ 2,330 people annually.
- **Indirect Impacts:** Countywide vendors and services suppliers to the Cluster employ over 702 people annually.
- **Induced Impacts:** Spending by Cluster employees generates an additional 944 jobs annually throughout the County.

---
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FIGURE 6: CLACKAMAS COUNTY EMPLOYMENT FROM INDUSTRIAL CLUSTER COMMERCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Jobs (Full-Time Equivalent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>399.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>466.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>571.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>399.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>339.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Business Services</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Health Services</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Hospitality</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,339.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Iplan, U.S. Census Bureau, and Johnson Gardner, LLC.

WAGE LEVELS

Analysis of payroll and wages generated by the Industrial Cluster indicates that the Cluster not only supports substantial employment locally and countywide, but wages for those jobs match or exceed County averages for all industries affected. Findings of wage levels are found in FIGURE 5 below.

In total, Industrial Cluster-related commerce in Milwaukee and Clackamas County supports wages that average $44,300 across all industries affected. Furthermore, average wages supported by Cluster-related commerce are 20% higher than Clackamas County wages for corresponding industries, on average.

FIGURE 5: MILWAUKEE & CLACKAMAS COUNTY INDUSTRIAL CLUSTER WAGE LEVELS (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Average Annual Wages by Level</th>
<th>Average County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Induce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>$15,650</td>
<td>$42,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$48,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>$58,509</td>
<td>$50,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$47,259</td>
<td>$47,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$54,605</td>
<td>$54,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>$63,374</td>
<td>$63,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>$26,793</td>
<td>$26,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$47,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>$42,588</td>
<td>$47,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Business Services</td>
<td>$28,625</td>
<td>$41,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Health Services</td>
<td>$15,204</td>
<td>$17,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Hospitality</td>
<td>$25,619</td>
<td>$14,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>$22,252</td>
<td>$32,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$49,660</td>
<td>$45,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Iplan, U.S. Census Bureau, Oregon Employment Department, and Johnson Gardner, LLC.
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MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 16, 2006

TO: Mr. Mark Whitslow
PERKINS COIE
1120 NW Couch Street
Tenth Floor
Portland, OR 97209

FROM: JOHNSON GARDNER

SUBJECT: Fiscal Impact Analysis of the North Milwaukee Industrial Cluster

JOHNSON GARDNER was retained by PERKINS COIE to estimate the economic and fiscal contribution made by the North Milwaukee Industrial Cluster and Corridor to the Milwaukee and Clackamas County economies. The cluster is defined in this analysis as industrial and commercial development bound by SE McLoughlin Boulevard/99E to the west, the Union Pacific Railroad Line to the east, the Milwaukee city boundary to the north and the Milwaukee Expressway/Highway 224 to the south.

This memorandum summarizes key findings with regard to the fiscal impacts, or tax revenue contributions, made by the Industrial Cluster.

TAX IMPACTS

Utilizing Implan methodology, JOHNSON GARDNER estimated the tax revenue impacts of the Industrial Cluster at the State and local levels. Figure 1 below provides a summary of major tax impact categories and taxes paid as a result of Industrial Cluster commerce.

FIGURE 1: TOTAL TAX REVENUES FROM INDUSTRIAL CLUSTER COMMERCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Origin Jurisdiction/Category</th>
<th>Annual Tax</th>
<th>Tax Origin Jurisdiction/Category</th>
<th>Annual Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Profits &amp; Dividends</td>
<td>$3,711,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Insurance - Employee Paid</td>
<td>$312,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td>Income Tax</td>
<td>$6,720,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Insurance - Employer Paid</td>
<td>$7,082,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>$5,380,146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Business-Paid Taxes</td>
<td>$20,765,170</td>
<td>Total Personal Taxes</td>
<td>$7,082,940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL DIRECT TAX IMPACT OF MILWAUKIE INDUSTRIAL CLUSTER $27,848,010

SOURCE: Oregon Department of Revenue, Implan and Johnson Gardner

1 Data gathered in the course of this study is confidential in nature. For reporting the aggregation of proprietary data in this study, Johnson Gardner follows Oregon Employment Department protocol. Publication of data in aggregate requires at least three firms in a specific industry for data to be released.
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JOHNSON GARDNER estimates that commerce and employment driven by the North Milwaukee Industrial Cluster generates $27.8 million in state and local tax and fee revenues annually.

- Roughly $20.8 million in tax revenue generated are State-level in nature, largely corporate taxes, fees, social insurance, income tax and other items.
- Tax revenues staying locally are largely limited to property tax at $5.4 million annually.
- Tax on business and commerce drives the majority of revenues, at nearly $20.8 million of the $27.8 million total.
- Persons employed as a result of Industrial Cluster commerce pay over $6.7 million in state income tax annually, the majority of which funds education at the local level.

Although total tax revenues driven by the Industrial Cluster are sizeable at the State level, local taxes—largely comprising property taxes—are even more significant as a share of total, local property taxes paid in the Milwaukee area. Figure 2 below provides a summary of property taxes generated by the Industrial Cluster, with detail of local jurisdictions that benefit from tax revenues.

**Figure 2: Property Tax Revenues Generated by North Milwaukee Industrial Cluster**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Category</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Levy Rate</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Property Tax Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.7255</td>
<td>$5,717,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Levies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5411</td>
<td>$174,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas ESID</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3590</td>
<td>$115,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Clackamas Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4215</td>
<td>$1,642,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3776</td>
<td>$1,735,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations &amp; Maintenance Levies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Milwaukee</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1367</td>
<td>$1,334,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4042</td>
<td>$775,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County Fire District 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2427</td>
<td>$723,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Clackamas Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4983</td>
<td>$187,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0685</td>
<td>$22,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro - Oregon Zoo</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0937</td>
<td>$30,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County SU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1335</td>
<td>$43,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Urban Renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7617</td>
<td>$365,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vector Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0065</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vector Control Local Option 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0050</td>
<td>$8,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3618</td>
<td>$3,342,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Levies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Milwaukee</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2273</td>
<td>$73,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2244</td>
<td>$72,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County Fire District 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1421</td>
<td>$45,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Clackamas Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1011</td>
<td>$355,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1818</td>
<td>$58,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TechMec</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1154</td>
<td>$37,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5921</td>
<td>$642,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Clackamas County Assessor’s Office, IMPLAN & Johnson Gardner
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On an annual basis, the Industrial Cluster is estimated to pay $5.72 million in local property taxes, or roughly 25% of all property tax revenues collected in the Milwaukee area. Property taxes paid by Industrial Cluster commerce fund a variety of local services and bond obligations.

- Local Education: Local schools receive $2.2 million in taxes annually. Including bond levy revenues, North Clackamas Schools are the single-largest beneficiary at $1.8 million annually.

- Municipal Services: The City of Milwaukee, the second-largest beneficiary, receives $1.4 million in property taxes for operations and maintenance (O&M) as well as bond debt obligation for capital expansion. Industrial Cluster property tax revenue represents over 17% of the City of Milwaukee General Fund property tax revenue budget.

- County Services: Clackamas County, the third-largest beneficiary, receives nearly $1.1 million annually for various public services including O&M and urban renewal.

- Capital Expansion: Property taxes generated support sizeable capital purchases by several jurisdiction, most notably school space and vehicle purchases by the North Clackamas School District ($355,160). Other beneficiaries include City of Milwaukee capital facilities and equipment needs, community college expansion, fire service vehicles and equipment, metro-area parks and public transportation vehicles and equipment for Tri-Met.

---

1. As a percentage of total tax assessed for Clackamas County Tax Code areas 002-012, 012-018 and 012-133, which comprise the great majority of the City of Milwaukee (Clackamas County Assessor’s Office, 2005).

June 16, 2008

To Decision Makers:

My name is Frank Amato and I and my family have lived in Milwaukie since 1952. I strenuously oppose the extension of light rail into Milwaukie proper! And I especially oppose crossing Washington and Monroe Streets with a stop site in between. There are four schools in the immediate area and hundreds of small children. It is simply too dangerous for them, and will only create vandalism and the threat of physical harm. Plus the traffic stoppage on Monroe and Washington streets will create a mess!

I am also a business owner with a building in the Milwaukie industrial area along International Way employing about 20 local persons who feel exactly the same way I do!

Please keep light rail away from the heart of Milwaukie! It should end where the old Hanna Car Wash Plant used to be: north of King Road.

Sincerely,

Frank W. Amato
May 23, 2008

I am very much against putting light rail through Milwaukee. It will ruin our little towns. I am an old farmer where I live. I live one block from Mr. Seeglow's. I have lived here for 60 yrs. I feel there is invading our privacy. I vote no to map going through here.

A concerned citizen
June 23, 2008

For public comment record regarding, the Portland – Milwaukie Light Rail Project

Submitted by: Valerie E. Aschbacher, 15141 SE Hickory Ct., Milwaukie, OR 97267

Please see attached article from the Clackamas Review, dated June 18, 2008:

Question(s): If “the county’s long-term plan for the area envisions Harmony as a major arterial”, then why is Metro Council/City of Milwaukie planning a light rail through a segment of historic downtown Milwaukie, which would eventually extend to McLoughlin Blvd./Oregon City - claiming in the SDEIS document that McLoughlin Blvd. is the only major transportation corridor in the area)?

Wouldn’t it serve the region better to alleviate the already present traffic congestion in North Clackamas County by offering alternative transit systems, rather than creating more roads for automobiles to drive on? Shouldn’t we be striving to reduce commuter travel time, fuel consumption/emissions?

Couldn’t other transportation systems be developed, besides more roads for cars, so that local residents could get around their suburban neighborhoods, on light rail, bus, streetcar, bicycle or on foot easier?

Is an overpass over the train tracks at Linwood Avenue REALLY the only way to “sufficiently improve congestion along Harmony Road”?
Harmony needs overpass to fix congestion

The purple section is Harmony Road from 57th Avenue to International Way. An overpass would go over the train tracks; the intersection may expand to five lanes. The plan could also include a roundabout at Fuller and an extension of Sunnybrook from there to 82nd.

by Matthew Graham
mgraham@clackamasreview.com

An overpass over the train tracks at Linwood Avenue is the only way to sufficiently improve congestion along Harmony Road, according to the design firm working on road improvement possibilities.

“If we want to do something with Harmony, you have to do something with the Linwood railroad intersection, you have to do a crossing there,” said Ron Weinman, a transportation planner and project manager with the county. “You have Clackamas Community College being built up and then eventually you see the area north of Harmony and Fuller become a mixed-use area — all those things add up to additional traffic.”

The county's long-term plan for the area envisions Harmony as a major arterial through the area, which Weinman said would also limit adverse affects to the neighborhoods by keeping backed-up commuter traffic from...
Neighbors say no overpass; planners say it’s only way to alleviate traffic

Continued from page A1

cutting through residential streets.

But many nearby residents are unhappy with the plan. Representatives from the Cedarcrest Neighborhood, the southern border of which is Harmony Road, say they don’t want to sacrifice their neighborhood for Happy Valley and other county commuters.

"Myself and my neighbors do not want any alternative that has an overpass," said Stan Wax, who lives just north of Harmony in the Linwood neighborhood. "You can put two lanes on 82nd Avenue, get them up Sunnyside to 224."

Peter Coffey, of Otak consulting firm, said improvements to 82nd Avenue or the creation of the Sunrise Corridor would not significantly pull traffic away from Harmony.

"I’ve done this study with and without Sunrise, and there wasn’t much difference in the amount of traffic on Harmony," he said.

The county currently has six options it’s considering, though only two of those would significantly improve traffic conditions. Those two involve widening Harmony to either three lanes or three lanes most of the way and five lanes at points. They include a three-lane Sunnybrook extension that would curve behind the colleges and the Aquatic Center but still on top of the ridge, from Harmony down to 82nd Avenue.

Both would also have impacts on the wetlands and waterways in the area.

Charles Kettenring, a representative from ODOT, said the rail route is scheduled to be a "high speed rail corridor."

"There’s no doubt in my mind that this will be two tracks," he said. "By 2025 they say rail product will double; this is the only viable rail route. It’s coming and the only safe way to deal with it is to treat it as a highway."

Kirk Pearson, with Clackamas Community College, said improvements to the road will be important for the college site on Harmony, which houses satellite campuses for CCC and the Oregon Institute of Technology, as well as the Aquatic Center.

"I think with the increasing population and the campuses and the park lands, that access is going to be really important," he said.

Comment on all the stories in this issue at www.clackamasreview.com & www.oregonicitynewsonline.com
June 23, 2008

For the 45-day public comment record, regarding the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

Please see attached article from The Oregonian, dated Friday, June 20, 2008 – as yet another example of how the east side of the Portland/Metro region continues to be favored when it comes to the availability of better transit systems.

The new “Cadillac” commuter rail route will start to address the needs of the people living in the Beaverton, Tigard-Tualatin & Wilsonville areas.

In North Clackamas County – now, after waiting for over 20 years for light rail projects to enter into the South Corridor, we merely get the choice of varying alignments/extensions.

As collective citizens, we don’t get any choices at all of the intended route to be forged through our communities. Soon the fate of our limited transportation options will be sealed at the mercy of deemed justice by Metro Council/City of Milwaukie Council – some of whom could have questionable conflicts of interest in favoring/rejecting the prior or current alternatives presented.

Our Portland-Milwaukie light rail “opportunity” appears to be much less than what has already been developed in the west region...a tourist attraction tram, a well-connected light rail to the airport, the ability to save money on fuel/parking expenses when called to serve jury duty, easy access to a convenient and ever-expanding streetcar system which connects people to more health/medical advances, great restaurants, upscale shopping, an abundance of cultural/historical museums, and other entertainment venues throughout the city of PDX.

And now, the business/commerce and residents of the west side are additionally privileged to have their workforce ride on a reliable, speedy and comfortable commuter train, too! WOW!

Submitted by: Valerie E. Aschbacher, 15141 SE Hickory Ct., Milwaukie, OR 97267
‘Cadillac’ of railcars arrives

Trains will carry riders between Beaverton and Wilsonville this fall

**By JOHN FOYSTON**
**THE OREGONIAN**

The first railcars for the Westside Express Service arrived at TriMet’s Wilsonville maintenance yard Thursday from Colorado.

WILSONVILLE — There is such a thing as a “new-train smell” and it’s just as beguiling as the automotive equivalent, judging from the crowd that clambered through — and under — TriMet’s just-arrived commuter railcars Thursday.

The new 85-ton Diesel Multiple Unit and its lookalike, but unpowered, trailer car arrived at TriMet’s Wilsonville railcar maintenance facility early Thursday morning, and the welcoming crowd showed up shortly after.

“This is the Cadillac,” said Vern Wise, gesturing at the DMU’s spacious interior with its rows of high-backed, blue-upholstered seats.

Wise, a retired trainman and a member of the Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce, was there with chamber CEO Steve Gilmore. “Steve and I felt it was important to come out this morning and show our support for the commuter rail project.”

The crowd of admirers included TriMet mechanics and management. “We’re all excited,” said TriMet General Manager Fred Hansen. “It feels like Christmas morning around here.”

The 14.7-mile Westside Express Service will begin carrying passengers between Beaverton and Wilsonville sometime in the fall, aboard three DMUs and one trailer car. The other two DMUs are scheduled to arrive from the Colorado Railcar factory later in the summer. They’ll make the trip like these units did, towed at the end of a freight train.

Please see RAILCARS, Page C8

**Westside Express**
Washington County commuter rail:
- **Average daily ridership:** an estimated 3,000 to 4,000 trips by 2020, with half of the riders new to transit
- **Frequency:** weekdays every 30 minutes during morning and afternoon rush hours
- **Travel time:** 27 minutes between Beaverton Transit Center and Wilsonville
- **Train speeds:** 37 mph on average, with a top speed of above 50 mph

**Source:** TriMet
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The Colorado Railcar Web site says the DMU gets 2 miles per gallon. Figure a full load of 74 seated passengers, two people in wheelchairs and a few standees and call it 160 passenger/mile.

The mileage drops to 1.5 mpg when towing the unpowered car, but the head count at least doubles, which works out to about 240 passenger/miles for every gallon of diesel.

“A regular diesel locomotive is overpowered for hauling a couple of commuter cars,” said Jody Moore, a factory test engineer who accompanied the cars on their journey west. “DMUs offer higher fuel efficiency, lowering operating costs and, because there’s no separate locomotive, one less vehicle to maintain.”

The DMUs meet all new federal safety standards for operating on freight rails, but they have an almost truck-like power train. Most locomotives use big diesel engines to run generators that create electricity for the traction motors that power the train. Each DMU has two smaller, 600 horsepower Detroit Diesels, one at each end of the car.

Each engine has a hydraulic transmission that spins a drive shaft powering two of the four wheels at each end of the train.

“TriMet is a perfect example of why DMUs make sense for agencies coming from the bus side,” Moore said. “Everything on these vehicles, except maybe for the air brake system, will have a high level of familiarity to their mechanics.”

---

**Railcars:**

TriMet figures 2,500 trips a day to start

*Continued from Page C1*

The railcars weren’t ready to roll — the DMU was shipped with neither of its driveshafts installed, so its hydraulic transmissions wouldn’t be spinning during the tow, and other fitting-out remains.

Then there are static and running tests to be conducted in the next few months, said TriMet’s director of operations, Steve Banta.

“This has all been theoretical so far — now we have to make sure that what works on paper actually works, that the doors and platforms line up and all that. So far it’s been great.”

TriMet estimates that initial ridership will be about 2,500 trips a day, said spokeswoman Mary Fetsch. Those estimates were made well before $4-per-gallon gas, which could bump ridership above those numbers.

Fuel prices could well be higher when WES starts rolling, making TriMet’s choice of self-contained railcars over conventional locomotives and passenger cars look even more inspired.

---

*John Foyston: 503-294-5976; johnfoyston@news.oregonian.com.*
June 23, 2008

For public comment record regarding the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

Submitted by: Valerie E. Aschbacher, 15141 SE Hickory Ct., Milwaukie, OR 97267

Many people are concerned that MAX brings crime to their neighborhoods.....
I am more concerned with how many stops/stations are planned, which in effect increases the opportunities for more criminal-types to gain access to more neighborhoods.

Please see attached article entitled “MAX assault fuels line safety concerns” found in the local newspaper – Clackamas Review, June 18, 2008.

If Portland could stop thinking of the light rail as a semi-streetcar system with multiple stops/stations, and consider it more of a commuter system to get large numbers of people from one city center in the region to another – there would be less opportunities for criminals to readily hop on/off, at will, with ease.

If light rail routes were more effectively placed, to increase its ridership pool among larger groups of students, professionals/business persons, and other more desirable commuters – then perhaps the persons who are unemployed, school-dropouts or criminal-types and who are more likely to create problems, may feel outnumbered and not so comfortable traveling in areas outside of their element. (In other words, if light rail was most convenient for particular targeted(positive impact) audiences, it could become more inconvenient for some other(negative impact) audiences)

Every reasonable effort should be made to provide all customers of MAX a more secure, experience. And, many persons of low-income rely on and must continue to have access to public transportation. However, if better marketing/strategic planning could be done in the early planning stages, to encourage some of our better citizens to use transit systems regularly, it might result in having to deal less often with the ones who use light rail primarily as a vehicle of crime.

Can the taxpayers afford to pay for more on-duty police to ride around on the MAX? Don’t we really need more officers out on the streets?
MAX assault fuels line safety concerns

Milwaukee police chief called for expanded force in January

by Jim Redden
Pamplin Media Group

The racially charged attack on a Vancouver woman riding MAX early this week is reinforcing concerns among regional leaders that TriMet needs to do more to improve safety on the transit system — even as the agency prepares to expand service into Clackamas and, perhaps, Clark counties.

"It's clear that if a 28-year-old woman can get harassed and beat up, TriMet is not doing enough," said State Sen. Rick Metsger, a Welches Democrat who is chairman of the Senate's Interim Transportation Committee. "They need to step it up."

The white woman was assaulted by five black teenagers, some of whom yelled racial slurs at her, on a MAX train in North Portland.
Milwaukie police chief wanted more officers in January

Continued from page A

around 6:45 p.m. on Monday, June 9. The woman had been in and out of a hospital for treatment.

Four of the teens were arrested Monday and charged with crimes ranging from assault to intimidation. The fifth teen was captured Thursday, June 12.

"Perception is reality," Metsger said of the widespread media coverage of the assault. "How many husbands are going to tell their wives, 'I don't want you riding the train, take the car instead.'"

What more can we do?

The 2007 Oregon Legislature gave TriMet $250 million for preliminary stages of a transit bridge over the Willamette River between South Waterfront and inner east Portland. After a 71-year-old man was beaten by gang members at a Gresham MAX stop last November, Metsger co-chaired a joint committee of the Senate and House Transportation Committee that demanded TriMet report on its planned safety improvements.

"We can hold future funding over TriMet's head to make sure they do something about safety," said Metsger, who expects TriMet to report back to the committees this fall.

Portland City Transportation Commissioner Sam Adams agreed the incident could have widespread negative consequences.

"It would be a shame if five teenagers make it harder for everyone else to access transit," said Adams, who is working on projects that could extend light rail to Milwaukie and Vancouver. They include the bridge project the legislature helped fund and the Columbia River Crossing, which is considering adding light rail to a new I-5 bridge.

TriMet spokeswoman Mary Fetsch said the transit agency has already increased security since the June 9 assault. According to Fetsch, about 50 fare inspectors, supervisors and other employees with light-rail responsibilities have been ordered to put aside their other duties and ride the trains every day, looking for fare evaders and disruptive behavior.

"We now have a lot more eyes on the trains," she said.

Fetsch also noted that TriMet substantially increased security after the November assault. Among others things, the agency increased the number of sworn officers in its Transit Police Division from 28 to 41, created new eastside and westside precincts, hired more private security guards and began installing more surveillance cameras at light rail stops — an effort that is still continuing.

"We are constantly asking ourselves, 'Are we at the right levels of security? What more can we do?'" she said.

Livability problems

Some people think TriMet can do a lot more.

On Jan. 11, Milwaukie Police Chief Larry Kanzler sent TriMet General Manager Fred Hansen a seven-page letter recommending changes in the agency's security system. Kanzler is worried about crime spreading into Clackamas County when the MAX line under construction to Clackamas Town Center opens late next year.

"Soon, nefarious people who are engaged in gang/drug/crime activity will be traveling on light-rail between Hillsboro, Gresham and Clackamas Town Center," he wrote.

Kanzler is also worried about crime spreading to Milwaukie on the MAX line from downtown Portland that is still being planned.

In his letter, Kanzler said TriMet should increase and reorganize its security system by opening new 24-hour Central and South precincts supported by detectives who can investigate serious crimes. He said TriMet needs 150 to 160 sworn officers — near four times the current number.

Kanzler also said five more officers should be assigned to Milwaukie when the line opens there.

Fetsch said the number of officers will need to be increased as service expands, but that no exact figures have yet been agreed upon.

"Obviously as we expand our system we also expand our police and our staff," she said.
June 22, 2008

Dear Metro Council Members and Planners of the Portland- Milwaukie Light Rail Project

My grandpa would be 100 years old on his next birthdate. He drove his car until he was 95 years old, and as he drove along River Rd. and McLoughlin Blvd. he would often share stories about what used to be here or tell something about what is still there. When he told the stories, you got a real sense of the hustle and bustle, the periods of growth, and his role in it.

I grew up living only 2 blocks from McLoughlin Blvd., and one block from the trolley line. My mom tells me stories about how she loaded a (large) baby carriage onto the trolley car to go into downtown Portland, where my dad worked. When I was a child, and the trolley car was gone, I used to ride my bicycle on the path where the tracks had run, to get from my house to Gladstone, Jennings Lodge, and sometimes these treks would take me to the Clackamas River for more exploration. While I enjoyed these adventures, I would often wonder why the tracks were no longer in use.

Later, when I was married and our son was 3 years old, we purchased a home near Rex Putman High School, only 6 blocks from McLoughlin Blvd. and 2 blocks from Oakfield Rd. I had visions of him being able to ride his bicycle around the same neighborhoods as I had done. But, it was not possible. Living in an unincorporated area of Clackamas, the roads had no sidewalks or sufficient shoulders to safely traverse on foot or bike. Living in a 70’s housing development, we were confined to the cul-de-sac and two nearby streets. Our son would not be able to ride his bicycle to the local grocery store and get an ice cream bar, as I had often done. Instead, we were forced to use a car to conduct all daily living activities outside of the home, using McLoughlin Blvd. as the main transportation route.

I continued to think about the days of the trolley, and wondered if something like this would ever be able to exist again.

Then, the light rail came to Portland. I waited with great anticipation, and joined the crowds who rode it during its first week of operation. I imagined the possibility of a light rail coming down the old trolley trail, and was delighted to learn later that was to become the next planned route – from Portland, into the McLoughlin Blvd.

It made perfect sense –to resurrect a light rail where there once was a trolley car to serve the quite populated area within the McLoughlin Blvd. corridor. And, it seemed completely logical to run something new where something else had already run before, rather than to forge a completely new path. Each time I would find myself stuck in traffic on McLoughlin Blvd. or behind a Tri-Met bus, I would wish for the days of the return of a trolley in this corridor, but now in the form of a light rail.

The housing construction increased significantly in the 70’s and 80’s. Our son was in school, and we also noticed an increase in his class sizes. We eventually moved to a larger home, near property which had been set aside by the NCSD to build another middle school, 4 blocks above...
Outfield Rd. We wondered about the impacts of this growth on our community. Also, we started using backroads to get around the increased traffic congestion.

We heard light rail would be headed our way......with excitement, we embraced the possibility wholeheartedly. Then, we learned it would not come to this area after all. Instead, it would be extended West from downtown PDX to Hillsboro. With great disdain and disappointment, we wondered if we would ever have our day?

Life went on.....Our son went off to college, and only returned to the area a few times a year. On one visit home, he commented on how much McLoughlin Blvd. had changed. I hadn’t really noticed, although I found myself subconsciously avoiding this route. I knew it had started its degradation in the 80’s with the addition of adult video stores and nude dancing bars. I knew each time another used car lot took up space on the boulevard, or car dealership was remodeled, that the auto industry was unfortunately going to continue to define commerce in this area, the same way it had done on SE 82nd Ave. and SW Canyon Rd. in Portland.

Having so much pride and personal history in this commercial/residential area, I was in denial that the landscape had really changed to the great extent my son had noticed. He continued to comment with each visit home, until I could not ignore it any longer.

In the meantime, NCSD decided to sell the property near our home, as the majority of growth had now shifted to the Sunnyside/Happy Valley area. The old Clackamas HS became the new middle school. This seemed better for our neighborhood, so this move didn’t bother me.

However, I did mourn the loss of The Emporium store at Oregon City Shopping Center and Albertson’s grocery at Holly Farm Mall. I made a concerted effort to patronize Oak Grove Cinema, Ace Hardware, Office Max, and any new restaurants/coffee shops or other businesses along the strip to help in some small way to keep the area alive. I still eagerly awaited the day light rail would arrive – with the possibility of rebuilding and revitalizing, not only McLoughlin Blvd., but downtown Milwaukie and downtown Oregon City, as well.

For a period, we contemplated moving out to Sunnyside, to a nicer, newer home, in a less rundown area for shopping and commuting. But, after traveling out there a few times, we decided the traffic was utterly unbearable! So, we decided to stay in Milwaukie, perhaps for another 50 years, - where 5 generations of my family, have lived, worked/owned businesses – within the McLoughlin Blvd. corridor.

When, I learned the next light rail project was going to be from the airport to the Gresham/PDX line, I was starting to lose patience. Then, when I discovered this line would eventually be extended south to Clackamas Town Center, it seemed like light rail would never get to us. But with our hope, we kept a sense of humor. When picking our son up from the airport, we often joked that if he stayed away from Portland long enough, someday I could simply pick him up at the light rail station during my shopping errands at the mall!

But, secretly I wondered, would I really live long enough to see the day, when I could ride the Max from McLoughlin Blvd. to downtown Portland? There was hope on the horizon......
The proposed routes were being displayed at the Milwaukee Farmer’s Market. Initially, I didn’t care where it went, as long as it headed this way. I noticed the improvements on the Milwaukee Riverfront. I wondered if it was to help prepare the way for the Max?

No, the line along the waterfront was rejected.

I wondered if it would make its way down through the streets of downtown Milwaukee – that seemed like a good idea. I thought that is what was being planned, eventually.

I learned only 2 weeks ago, this route was rejected, and now the route is proposed to run near my place of worship, and 3 schools. Having been an educator for 20 years, this appalled me. What a tremendous disruption this would be – during its construction and after completed! In an effort to learn why this new route was considered, I decided to read the entire SDEIS report.

First, I learned there is not much basis for rejecting the route down Main St./21st Ave.

Secondly, I learned an incredible injustice has been done to the people of this region who have waited so long for a light rail – we are left now with only two alternatives – either accept the currently planned route or not build light rail at all!

Thirdly, I learned, the line isn’t going to go down McLoughlin Blvd. beyond Milwaukee – now what good it that?

Next, I realized the data presented is outdated, based on growth patterns in the 80’s/90’s, and fails to recognize the higher demand for alleviating traffic congestion is no longer along McLoughlin Blvd. (and on the way to Oregon City)

But, more importantly, I finally took a deep and serious look at all the environmental impacts and all the financial costs of bringing light rail through downtown Milwaukee – and then sadly realized, in particular that the cost of extending it to Park Ave., is unjustifiable. The congestion on the stretch between Lake Rd. and Park Ave. is hardly noticeable and the number of impacts is simply not worth the minor benefits gained towards the intended purposes, needs and goals.

The more I learned about the costs/impacts, the more I realized there is so little data to support such an astronomical project – which only holds the “potential” to improve the area – no guarantees. Where is the evidence that the demand is so high? Is this worth it? NO!

As I continued to sift through all the alternatives considered, the many maps and figures, and projections – I discovered – two lines are eventually planned – BOTH headed to Oregon City. Two lines, headed South, parallel to each other, only a few miles apart from each other? This is incredulous! Twice the costs, twice the environmental impacts, twice the wait – for what?

We clearly don’t need two lines heading South.....so now which one is more important? I recognized, from the study, we do need a line from downtown PDX to Milwaukee. I went back to the idea which was rejected of a Park n’ Ride at the Southgate Cinema site in the McLoughlin Industrial area – that still seemed like a good idea? I went back to reviewing how much less this
would cost both financially and environmentally – as a significant portion of the higher impacts/added costs/displacements occur through downtown Milwaukie to Lake Rd./Park Ave.

Then, one day, at 4 p.m. I was trying to feverishly to get from my office in downtown Milwaukie to 82nd & Johnson Rd. I found myself trying to decide – Hwy 224 to I-205? (no, too many stoplights) Railroad Ave. to Harmony Rd.? (no, it gets too congested near the Clackamas Town Center) McLoughlin Blvd. to Johnson Creek? (no, the single lane of traffic moves too slow) Curse! None of these West/East routes are going to get me there in 20 minutes at this hour! I'd be able to get to a place in downtown PDX faster from this point!

This is when I realized – downtown Milwaukie does not need a light rail THROUGH it! However, is does definitely still need a light rail TO it! After it reaches Milwaukie, instead of having two stops to the South,(as proposed) it needs to turn east and have a station near the Providence Medical Center(s) and Oak St. Square/Milwaukie Marketplace - then another station near the Milwaukie Industrial Park....Plus, it could bring tourists to Bob’s Red Mill, and staff/families to Clackamas County’s ESD. (how unfortunate the Department of Human Services have already moved to Clackamas from Milwaukie ....)

Now, I went back home, to re-visit Figure1, 2-1 - 2040 Growth Concept. As I scrutinized the current/proposed routes, what had previously made perfect sense to me for almost my entire life (running light rail down McLoughlin Blvd.) made absolutely NO sense at all anymore!

Rather, it needs to run along Hwy 224, Lake Rd. and/or Railroad Ave. and connect in some way to the line at the Clackamas Town Center, where it could continue to Oregon City. It needs to avoid historic downtown Oregon City, as well as downtown historic Milwaukie.

Rather, a light rail system should connect Portland State University to both of the expanding Clackamas Community campuses, in a seamless fashion – along Harmony Rd. then along I-205, then up the hill along Hwy 213, not only for students/staff, but to more effectively serve the populated, new growth area of (upper) Oregon City. It needs to have a Park n’ Ride near the Clackamas Community (OC campus) for the people of Carus, Beavercreek, Clarks, Colton, Mulino, Molalla, and NE Canby to access the light rail – being able to ride it to the airport, or to downtown PDX and beyond.....And, yes, it could still serve Gladstone, Milwaukie and Clackamas, as well – but from a different route.

Then, I examined at the growth in Damascus, Happy Valley, Mt. Scott, Sunnyside – the places I mentioned earlier that we didn’t want to live now due to awful traffic conditions, and I wondered how much worse it will become by the year 2020, let alone 2040! I recalled - isn’t one of the first purpose(s) of light rail to maintain livability in the metropolitan region? Shouldn’t the light rail eventually extend eastward beyond the Clackamas Town Center to these outlying, fast-growing communities? Doesn’t it make more sense – for increased ridership, reduced traffic congestion to move in this direction? And, perhaps someday it could unite with the Gresham station, creating a loop, in much the same way one is projected for the Beaverton/Washington Square area? Why not mirror the West and East sides – in both urban and suburban areas?
Furthermore, why build a light rail system which is completely inconsistent with all the other existing light rail lines already developed and in use within the Portland Metro area? The first line ran along I-84 to downtown PDX (we should learn our lessons from this route, as it made NE Burnside Ave. a poor route for cars, an unsafe route for bicyclist/pedestrians. And, in retrospect wouldn’t it have been ideal have the light rail run on the other side of I-84 for easier access to Portland Providence Medical Center. Maybe it could have avoided downtown PDX, if we’d have known how conveniently streetcars can move people through several developed neighborhoods/shopping areas without building stations for hopping on/off). The next light rail line ran from downtown PDX to Hillsboro along Hwy 26. The next line ran from the airport along I-205, and will continue to Clackamas Town Center along I-205. The new Interstate Ave. line runs, in effect, along I-5 N, and will eventually connect Vancouver to PDX, essentially a parallel route to I-5. Again, these are all consistently planned routes along major transportation corridors. All of these routes ARE run through current major transportation corridors, none are referred to as “old ______” like McLoughlin Blvd, is referred to as “old 99E”.

With all things taken into account, it seems that ramming a light rail beyond downtown historic Milwaukee, then on to and through a less traveled, old highway to yet another historic downtown (Oregon City) makes absolutely NO sense at all! As much as I have desired it, for as long as I have wished for it, I cannot justify it - in my own mind, it is illogical, irrational, and irresponsible.

For as long as I can remember, I was a fervent supporter of light rail coming to Milwaukee and continuing south along McLoughlin Blvd. Yet now, after analyzing the SDEIS report, and giving careful consideration, I am even more adamantly opposed, than I was previously in favor!

Please re-read S.3 Purpose and Need, S.3.1 Project Goals and Objectives, and Chapter 2 - in a new light.

Please try to imagine other alternatives - keep working towards identifying an effective transit system for the South Corridor, which could be more fiscally responsible, more environmentally conscientious – and ultimately, would serve more people.

Please respond to the growth that has apparently already taken place in the past 10 years, while our Milwaukee-McLoughlin Blvd. light rail project has been on hold for 20 years.

Things have changed dramatically in the South Corridor, and the light rail project should reflect these changes –from this point forward and into the future.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinions and observations, as a concerned citizen.

Sincerely,

Valerie E. Aschbacher
June 18, 2008

Cyndia Ashkar
15790 S. Springwater Rd.
Oregon City, OR (residence-no mail delivery here)
PO Box 1634, Clackamas, OR = mailing address

Joseph Ossi
Department of Transportation
Federal Transit Administration
Office of Planning
400 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20590-0003

Dear Mr. Ossi

Thank you for your work for public transportation for our country.
I am, however, extremely dismayed by how the work is being done here in Milwaukee, Oregon. I and countless others have attended numerous Milwaukee City Council and Metro/
TriMet sessions and sent emails informing and expressing the need for alternative alignments in
the SDEIS to meet the purpose and need set forth for the proposed South Corridor Portland-to-
Milwaukee project. Yet the published SDEIS contains only one alternative alignment through
central Milwaukee, the Tillamook Branch Railroad Line.

This is unfortunate because, as Milwaukee’s Community Involvement liaison, Kenny Asher
stated at last Tuesday’s City Council Meeting, “this proposed project through Milwaukee is
unusual and unique...hasn’t been done before.”

I am opposed to the Tillamook branch railroad right of way alignment through central,
Historic Milwaukee because of the way it impacts:

1. The health of children and adults
   a. Frequent crossing bells/train horns stress cardiovascular system (see
   Health_Final.pdf)
   b. Increased pollution of air, Spring Creek, soil of gardens, play, and learning
      environment, and a freshwater spring’s source
   c. Heightened sense of danger and possibility of witnessing a violent death in close
      proximity = psychological stress.

2. The safety of students
   a. Such close proximity light rail becomes an "attractive nuisance" for students. (RR right-
      of-way comes 6’ from High School Bldg)
   b. Diverse and multiple mitigation needs compete with each other (eg., a wall could help
      reduce health impacts, but "open sightlines" are needed for safety and security...establishing a
      "quiet zone" helps protect children’s cardiovascular health, but increases danger for pedestrians
      and motorists...)
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338
c. The existing active freight train track may be moved closer to the school's building (RR right of way is 6' from the building)

d. Current freight train pass by is 1x per day on average. Teachers often stop their lessons, both indoors and out, until it is gone because of the noise. Light rail would increase this impact dramatically.

3. The security of students and adults

a. The Portland Waldorf School (PWS) has an unusual set of many impacts circumstances that will be very difficult to mitigate sufficiently. There is an agreement with the city to share the grounds with the community when school is not in session.

b. The possibility still exists that a station would be built too close, despite the city's recommendation that it be blocks away.

4. The financial health of the Portland Waldorf School

a. PWS depends on tuition for it's revenue. Loss of new kindergarten students (before, during, and after construction) would have long-reaching effects as that class moves up to 12th grade.

b. Many parents are very concerned already, and some would leave the school.

c. It would be very expensive to adequately mitigate this setting for this K-12 school.

5. There are as yet many other unrevealed future and cumulative impacts along this line that affect more than people...

I respectfully request that you include the following viable alternatives for the Milwaukee section in the SDEIS study in a comparative form, such as a table:

- McLoughlin Blvd. (Hwy 99E) light rail
- Milwaukee Expressway (Hwy 212/224) light rail (and bus service in Historic Milwaukee)
- Bus Rapid Transit on McLoughlin (as the Riverfront Board doesn't want light rail there)
- Van Pools
- No Build

These requested alternatives would benefit Milwaukee through

1. Offering enhanced public transportation options in already established public transportation corridors.

   a. The Historic Milwaukee downtown area stays quieter, safer, with less disruption (no train horns/crossing bells/frequent vibration)

   b. The Historic Milwaukee Neighborhood stays whole.

2. Providing for those less able

   a. The disabled could ride Max to Milwaukee's most impressive Riverfront Park, and light rail there would cause fairly minimal impact to the park

3. Serving the downtown plan created for Milwaukee's Historic Downtown district

   a. The City's plan shows the Tillamook branch line with a bike path along the seldom
used, single active freight train track. Avoiding placing light rail there would leave room for the bike path.

b. One of the most important 4 of the "14 Points" agreed upon by citizens with local government was "no light rail in neighborhoods"

As the eventual goal (missing from this SDEIS) is to terminate in Oregon City, any one of these options make more sense. And, they fulfill NEPA's request for avoidance as the first priority for mitigation.

*avoids impacting neighborhoods, including the Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood.
*avoids impacting two K-12 schools, and one 9-12 school.
*avoids impacting financial viability of Portland Waldorf School (PWS).
*avoids impacting children's health and well-being.
*avoids vibration impacts to Milwaukie's two most significant historic and visually beautiful buildings.
*avoids impacts of Federal Train Horn Rule (inc. possible future impacts if Quiet Zone is granted, but later the Horn Rule is reinstated).
*avoids the annoyance caused by crossing bells.
*avoids impacting a fresh water spring
*avoids future significant impact to Kronberg park and it's habitat with endangered salmonoid species.

Thank-you in advance for your consideration of this matter,

cc
Rich Krochalis
Metro
Milwaukie City Hall
REED NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
4803 SE Woodstock Blvd. Suite 503, Portland,
Oregon 97206

June 18, 2008

Portland-Milwaukie LRT SDEISMetro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232

On behalf of the Reed Neighborhood Association, the Reed Neighborhood Association Board strongly supports the current Metro effort to extend Light Rail from Portland to Milwaukie. Since it will directly serve our neighborhood, we ask that you strongly consider retaining a station at Harold Street in the project plan.

The Reed Neighborhood has as its boundaries, Holgate and Woodstock to the north and south, and 24th through 39th to the west and east. Our constituency includes single family residences, as well as multi-unit apartments, retirement and care centers, as well as the Reed College campus.

We wholeheartedly agree that the light rail will provide an efficient and economical way for persons from our neighborhood to commute to and from Milwaukie and Portland, to points in between, and those further on. The light rail service has been anticipated for some time and is consistent with City and Metro objectives that we support—encouraging more persons to travel by means other than cars, reducing commute time and congestion on McLoughlin Blvd., and reducing traffic across the Sellwood Bridge. As it has in other areas, the SE light rail project will undoubtedly encourage housing and land improvements along the suggested rail line. In addition, it will address the issues of insufficient infrastructure for conventional transportation that is resulting from increased inner city infill.

The Board requests that you especially consider the placement of a Light Rail stop at Harold Street. That location is in very close proximity to the Reed College and at the gateway to our residential community. Access to the neighborhood from the light rail line at Harold, via a pedestrian bridge over the railyards, where it narrows, at Reedway, is a practical and obvious solution to making the trains easily available to residents. Stops at Bybee and Holgate are really too far a walk for most to choose. A station at Harold would provide students, elders, and those who do not choose to drive the easy option of a short walk, on a safe route, to use the line. As well, it will encourage increased ridership from those who are now driving.

As the light rail is able to accommodate bicycles, we also see this as additional safe way to make a commute to the city, bypassing areas in SE Portland which, at present, do not provide a safe corridor for bicyclists. A station at Harold would be far safer than the bike ride down Holgate to that station.

The ability afforded other areas of the community to go from doorstep to the city, or doorstep to the airport, is something that should be extended to the entire metro population. Southeast Portland is waiting for its turn.

The Reed Neighborhood Association has hosted Metro at its general meetings and looks forward with anticipation to the completion of this project. But without the Harold Station, we may be the few who are left “outside the loop.”

Thank you for considering our request.

board@reedneighborhood.org
June 12, 2008

Metro Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

To those who are making these decisions.

Before you even consider this project you should address all the safety concerns that the rest of the light rail faces, the drugs, the thugs, the harassment etc. that riders face daily.

I once used public transportation to the airport, to downtown and other destinations but now I would rather pay the $4.00 plus per gallon and feel safer than I do on the busses or light rail and therefore I would not be using this line.

The safety of your customers should be in place before you go any further with this project.

Also, considering the location with the station on the corner of Washington Street in the vicinity of four schools is lunacy. The traffic would be some of the worst congestion you can even imagine, both for the riders and the students, their parents, the teachers and others who work at these schools.

It seems every election we are urged to raise taxes etc for the children. How about the government considering the children. Hope someone who reads this has some common sense and can convince the rest to really think this thing thru.

Sincerely

Elizabeth Bartholomew

Elizabeth Bartholomew
June 12, 2008

Bridget Wieghart
Project Manager
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

Re: Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

Dear Bridget:

On behalf of the Hosford-Abernethy Neighborhood Development Association (HAND), we want to express strong support for the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Project.

HAND supports the project as a critical link in the regional transit system, connecting neighborhoods and people, and improving access across the river. The proposed Clinton Street station, which will be in the Hosford-Abernethy neighborhood, has received much consideration and support. In particular, HAND

- Emphasizes that pedestrian crossings and bikeways must be developed not just in the immediate station area, but in the surrounding neighborhood as well, in order to connect the neighborhood and the region. Bus lines must also be extended, particularly to the east and south, and linked to the station in order to increase accessibility to the regional transit system;

- Suggests that retail opportunities are developed adjacent to the station, while retaining the area’s light industrial character. With services available near the station, commuters will be able to conveniently accomplish errands, increasing ridership and simultaneously enhancing the station’s safety and security;

- Urges that parking issues are appropriately addressed. As many potential riders will wish to drive to the station, and because a park and ride facility is impractical, another solution must be found in order to mitigate impacts on neighborhood parking. This solution, perhaps a neighborhood parking permit, must be affordable for low-income residents and should not sacrifice ridership;

- Recommends that a strategy is developed to incorporate the neighborhood’s projected residential growth into the station area plan.

In closing, we thank you for your consideration of our support and recommendations and look forward to watching the project move forward.

Sincerely,

Alex Bassos, Chair
June 11, 2008

Portland to Milwaukie
Light Rail Project
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

The Board of Directors of the Clackamas County Business Alliance has voted unanimously to support extension of the Milwaukie light rail project to Park Avenue, and request that the extension be included in the project. The Board believes that the extension will:

- Provide light rail access into the McLoughlin Avenue corridor and act as a catalyst for redevelopment of the area. This corridor represents a major redevelopment opportunity for Clackamas County and has been identified as a significant economic engine for the County.
- Increase ridership for the project and for Clackamas County. It is our understanding that the extension will serve at least 1000 additional riders within walking distance to the Park Avenue station.
- Allow for the creation of additional parking for commuters to use the system. Parking is limited in downtown Milwaukie, and the extension would create the possibility of as many as 1,000 additional parking spaces. We believe this will help maximize use of the new light rail line.
- Provide a link for the eventual extension of the light rail system down McLoughlin Avenue and into Oregon City. This will better connect these areas to other parts of the Portland region and help reduce vehicle miles traveled.

We also strongly support the Tillamook route. That route, which is also supported by area businesses, will not require the demolition of existing companies, which currently provide hundreds of jobs. Also, the Tillamook route will provide cost savings estimated to exceed $30 million.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jeff Bennett, President

148 B Avenue, Suite 100 • Lake Oswego, OR 97034
Office: 503.607.0679 • Fax: 503.607.0686 • Email: info@ccba.biz • www.ccba.biz
TESTIMONY REGARDING THE
DRAFT EIS PORTLAND-MILWAUKIE LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

June 23, 2008

Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project
Metro, 600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland OR 97232
(Transmitted via email: trans@oregonmetro.gov)

Sam Adams          City of Portland
Jim Bernard         City of Milwaukie
Fred Hansen         TriMet
Robert Liberty      Metro Council
Brian Newman        Metro Council
Alice Norris        City of Oregon City
Lynn Peterson       Clackamas County
Jason Tell          ODOT
Maria Rojo de Steffey Multnomah County

To Members of the Steering Committee,

I am writing in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project. The following written testimony is focused on the two alignments proposed through Milwaukie. Pendleton Woolen Mills supports the Tillamook Branch alignment proposed as an alternate route. At the same time, we are concerned that the Main Street Alignment would create a significant impact to Milwaukie’s North Industrial district.

Pendleton owns two properties that will be impacted by the Main Street Alignment. The Pendleton Woolen Mill Store and warehouse at 8550 Southeast McLoughlin and a distribution center located at 2515 Mailwell Drive. Although the Tillamook Branch Alignment avoids impact to both properties, the Main Street Alignment would create unrecoverable hardships to both properties.
If the Main Street alignment is pursued, Pendleton’s retail store would lose direct pedestrian access from the sidewalk and decreased auto access due to degraded intersections. Since access is critical for the success of the retail store and warehouse, it is possible this alignment could force closure of these operations.

A similar concern occurs with the property at 2515 Mallwell Drive. Since the use is manufacturing and distribution, pedestrian access is not as important, however freight access would be heavily impacted due to the degraded intersections and tighter turning radius. This will not only impact the current use, but its future and long-term use as a distribution center. These issues are not isolated to just Pendleton’s properties; other properties in the area would have similar impact and in at least one case would be condemned. At the same time, the Tillamook Alignment avoids these issues.

Pendleton supports light rail and its intent to be part of a solution addressing transit issues faced by the region. But there is concern that Light Rail alignments are selected based on their potential to promote development. Transit solutions including their alignments should attempt to preserve and support areas that already have economic vitality such as the North Industrial property in Milwaukie. Industrial land is a resource and not a land bank for future mixed-use development.

Land designated for industrial use is limited in the region. Where as some industrial lands may be underutilized or vacant, the North Industrial property in Milwaukie remains vibrant and provides substantial economic benefit to the city, region and state.

We agree with the City of Milwaukie’s recommendation to support the Tillamook Branch Alignment instead of the Main Street Alignment. The Tillamook Branch avoids the substantial traffic intersection mitigation that would be required to address issues created by the Main Street Alignment. It is probable that the proposed Main Street Mitigations will further degrade intersections that in some cases are already below standard. As noted by the City of Milwaukie’s May 29, 2008 letter to the PMG and TAC; the traffic engineers used standard methods for determining impact to the two major intersections supporting freight, yet “this standard is problematic for measuring impact to the North Industrial Area”, suggesting the impact would likely be greater than projected. Further the significant out-of-direction mitigation proposal at Millport and McLoughlin add an additional 2-minute delay – decreasing the intersection to a grade “F” rating.

Other points in support of the Tillamook Branch:
1) The Tillamook Branch reduces the Light Rail travel time. According to TriMet staff, reduced travel time increases rider-ship.
2) The Tillamook Branch alignment avoids impacting the historic ODOT property on McLoughlin Boulevard.

3) The Tillamook Branch avoids the impact to freight access and mobility that would be created by the Main Street Alignment.

4) The Tillamook Branch avoids the loss of on street parking and creation of new parking lots that would be required by the Main Street Alignment.

5) The Tillamook Branch avoids the substantial impact and loss of business that would be created if the Main Street Alignment were implemented.

6) The Tillamook Branch is approximately $25.6M less to construct than the Main Street Alignment. Based on Metro’s reports and 2008 dollars – this number would likely be higher with inflation.

7) The Tillamook Branch alignment has the support of the city staff and council of Milwaukie and property owners of the North Industrial area businesses. In addition testimony of the Citizens Advisory Committee and South Corridor Steering Committee appear to have majority support.

8) Lastly the Tillamook Branch avoids a majority of the impact to the North Industrial District and a specifically avoids the impacts to our properties.

Please consider the negative impact the Main Street Alignment will have to the vibrant and profitable businesses that reside in the North Industrial area. Please support the alternate Tillamook Alignment. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Charles B. Bishop
Vice President, Mill Production
Pendleton Woolen Mills, Inc.
June 4, 2008

Metro Council
Metro Regional Center
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

RE: Letter of Support for the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project - Milwaukie Alignment and Southern Terminus Recommendation

Dear Councilors:

Oregon City's Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) fully supports the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project. Specifically, the TAC supports the Tillamook Branch option with the Park Avenue terminus. We continue to support the City's ultimate goal of having light rail extended all the way to Oregon City.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this request. I can be reached by e-mail at ocfinder@aol.com if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Bill Blanchard, Chair
Transportation Advisory Committee
June 22, 2008

To the Metro Staff and the FTA,

I would like to complement the people who worked on the SDEIS. It is very detailed, the maps and tables are very informative. I appreciate that this document took a lot of time and effort to bring to fruition. It should also be noted that TriMet and Metro staff have been very helpful and timely with their responses to my requests for information.

My personal deductions, after spending many hours looking at the SDEIS are that it is incomplete and also inaccurate. The SDEIS is incomplete because it does not bring in alternatives that may better serve the region, and have lower impacts to the community.

I am only familiar with a small section of the light rail line. However I can find many inaccuracies and impacts not addressed. If the same number of inaccuracies exists in the rest of the document then we should be concerned.

Before I get to my comments, since the SDEIS was published and prior to the end of the public comment period four major decisions have be made.

#1 TriMet has told the City of Milwaukie that they will not be building the “Milwaukie park and ride” planned for the Southgate site.

#2 The Milwaukie City Council has voted to have only one rail station. That station will be located at Lake Rd.

#3 The CAC has finalized their recommendation for the alignment.

#4 South Corridor Steering Committee has been given the recommendations for the LUFA decision.

The SDEIS continues the process initiated in 1993, some 15 years ago. Much has changed in the South Corridor since the original studies were done. If this project is to be built, the basic analysis that it is based on will be 20 years old when the project opens. After looking at the detailed information included in this document, I am convinced and I think you will be also, that this region needs a fresh look and its priorities for light rail service. At the very least some of the wider options should at least be studied, analyzed and brought forward in this SDEIS.

My understanding of the NEEPA process is that alternatives should be studied. Not minor variations whether the tracks go straight or turn east, but substantial alternatives that reflect the additions to the region’s urban growth boundary and the rising cost of energy. What potential routes out there will serve the greatest number of people? What options will get the most value for the dollars that we spend? Unfortunately we do not know the answers because we are not asking the questions in this document.

There are several good reasons to take a broader look at the South corridor before we choose an alignment for the next light rail line.

- Substantial additions to the urban growth boundary in the South corridor,
Changes in property use, especially at our local level, what was hoped to be a Milwaukie community center when the LPA was approved is now a school.

One track through downtown Milwaukie has morphed into two tracks and three if the project ends here.

Updated projections for population and job growth:

Much of the growth in the Oregon City area is not even served by McLoughlin Blvd, rather it is served by Hwy 205.

It is required by NEEPA law:

The 205 rail project was preferred over this project in 2002 SDEIS.

Below are my findings on the inaccurate details of the SDEIS.

Executive Summary

Page S-16, Table S-3, “Neighborhood impacts are said to be equal to the no build alternative.” This is simply not true! There will be impacts to every neighborhood that the train travels through. There will be significantly more impacts to neighborhoods with transit stations. These impacts include but are not limited to noise, lighting, increased traffic, crime, safety of pedestrians, delays in walking, biking, and driving. My understanding is that the SDEIS is supposed to factually state the impacts and potential mitigations. Impacts and mitigation have been identified and reported in TriMet’s Safety and Security Task Force report. I would like to see those impacts that were acknowledged by the law enforcement professionals who participated in task force be reported, and mitigated in this document so they can be followed through from design to construction.

Page S-18, Community impacts; The existing transportation corridor the train will be traveling through in Milwaukie is a freight rail road that has only a hand full of trains per day. Light rail trains will be traveling every three minutes at peak hours, and they will have impacts to the neighborhood. Access to the downtown will be delayed and drivers will cut through the neighborhood to avoid the traffic back ups that are documented in this SDEIS. People will park in the neighborhoods that are close to a station in order to ride the train. These impacts will definitely impact the quality of life in neighborhoods. The impacts should be documented and mitigated where possible.

Purpose and Need

Page 1-4 “Historic and projected population growth and employment in the corridor.” This is the first reason listed to justify this project. The corridor is increasing in population and will continue to do so because of the changes to the Urban Growth Boundary. Unfortunately the SDEIS did not take into account where in the corridor these changes are occurring. The proposed project travels through mostly built out neighborhoods and does not address the location current and future growth in the South.
corridor. The project in Milwaukie is basically designed to give South corridor residents a place to park, so they can ride to their final destinations.

Page 1-6; A look at the 2040 concept on page 1-6 would suggest the Regional Center Oregon City should have a convenient transit connection to Clackamas, downtown Portland and other regional centers. During the discussion of alternative alignments through downtown Milwaukie, none are being studied. TriMet engineers and planners told us they could not find a functional way to get light rail through the busy intersections of McLoughlin Blvd (Hwy 99) That highway is the only direct route from Milwaukie to Oregon City. If that is the case then there will certainly be insurmountable problems to carry the line further south to Oregon City. If light rail was to come to Milwaukie, it cold turn East on 224, then South on 205 to Oregon City. This route would give transit users in the South Corridor many more convenient options.

Page 1-11, Figure 1.4-1, shows that the communities that light rail will travel through on the East side of the Willamette River; Areas 4 & 5 will experience very little population growth in the next 25 years. The same map omits the areas to East that are still in the South corridor and will have a huge increase in population and demand for transit. The light rail line under construction from Clackamas North to Gateway is not a very convenient trip. It will take much longer to reach downtown Portland, making the choice of routes in this study more important.

Comparing Figure 1.4-1 with 1.4-2, the section on the East side with the most disproportionate population growth to job growth is section 8, Oregon City. Those future residents will need transit.

These facts are why I am convinced that the SDEIS should have taken a broader look at the region rather than to revise a 15 year old idea.

Chapter 2 Alternatives Considered.

Page 2-1 “This SDEIS continues the NEEPA process initiated in 1993” That is 15 years ago and the larger, broader picture including additions to the urban growth boundary should be considered, studied and included in this document for public comment.

2-39 City Council heard testimony “the council heard testimony that ran 4-1” is factually inaccurate. The minutes reflecting those who testified are located on the City of Milwaukie’s web site. In fact, this meeting was held after a public meeting looking at only a Main Street alignment. Those opposing a Main Street alignment were not 4-1 in opposition. This meeting did not hear comments regarding McLoughlin Blvd or any other alignments, such as running the train East on Hwy 224. In fact prior to this city council meeting, two nights of testimony were given to the planning commission. The majority of those that testified favored studying alternative routes.

In my opinion this is where the project went wrong, no one should be in opposition to studying a route, and the project should not have been narrowed so early. The alternatives
should have been studied, the public should have had time to comment, and then the best options should have been chosen.

Page 2-41, Light Rail Terminus ending North of Downtown Milwaukee at Hwy 224, does not separate Milwaukee from a northern terminus because there is an underpass. In fact the distance from North Main Village (Milwaukee’s only TODD development) to the North side of 224 is not much further than the distance to the preferred station location recently chosen by the Milwaukee City Council at Lake Rd. on the southern most end of downtown. There is a viable walking, biking or trolley route under the 224 Highway. The demand for service from the South and East referred in the SDEIS are people either driving or already on transit. They will have no problem connecting to light rail. In fact it is that demand for service that makes many informed residents prefer a terminus North of downtown with plenty of parking available. We believe that a light rail station in downtown Milwaukee will result in cut through traffic through our neighborhoods and that commuters will park in front of our homes and schools.

Environmental Analysis

Page 3-82, Robert Kronberg Park is an existing park. It has more potential than for use, but visitors do use the park, it is signed, and it has been adopted, by the Historic Milwaukee NDA. Neighborhood grant money has been spent to control invasive blackberries. There is no way that impacts to a park transected by a train can be adequately summarized as visual.

Page 3-80, Light rail would not be at the southern end of the Robert Kronberg Park. It will be at the Northern end

Page 3-81 Kronberg park .05-.10 acre is the maximum area that the train could take of the Park. The trestle on the North end of the park is about 300 feet long. If the train was to take only .10 acre that would mean the width of the project would only be 14.5 feet.

Page 3-178, The SDEIS concludes that response times for Fire District #1 could slow due to congestion at grade crossings, however the SDEIS states that police response times will not be affected. This can not be true. If an officer is on route to an emergency call and the train comes by at the same time, response time will be affected.

Transportation
Page 4-8, the on street parking study was done in August 2007 while school is not in session. There are three schools in the area, many students, staff and visitors use the local streets for parking. Any meaningful parking study would have be done while school was in session.

Page 4-23, Since the SDEIS was published, the Milwaukee City Council had decided that they want only one station in Milwaukee and it will be at Lake Rd. Table 4.2-9 indicates that "only 2 or 3% of transit riders will walk" to the Lake Road stop and 14% will drive.

Approximately 5000 on off's and 14% auto trips would require at least 350 parking spaces. Only a 275 space parking garage is proposed. Certainly, with only one station chosen, additional auto trips will also occur.

Page 4-29, lost parking spaces will be mitigated by a surface lot on SE Main. The SDEIS does not say where on Main St the lot will be, but in the downtown area, where the spaces will be lost, surface parking lots are not allowed by our planning and zoning ordinances.

Page 4-30, The SDEIS states that all suburban areas except 17th have adequate supply of off-street parking... As mentioned previously, the parking studies were done in the wrong month of the year to adequately reflect the normal situation in Milwaukee. Not addressed in the SDEIS are those who will park in the neighborhood and walk to the train.

Page 4-43, Outlines the impacts to intersections. The mitigation proposed for Washington Street and McLoughlin Blvd is to make traffic on McLoughlin stop for longer. This is not likely.

Page 4-45, No mitigation is mentioned for traffic backups at light rail crossing of Washington and Monroe streets.

Chapter 5 Financial Analysis and Evaluation of Alternatives

Page 5-18, TriMet does not plan to build a 330 space park and ride at Milwaukee Transit Center. No transit center exits. That decision was announced during the comment period of this SDEIS. Despite many requests and many promises TriMet has failed to deliver an off-street transit center to Milwaukee.

We all know that any transit project of this size and scope is going to bring significant challenges and changes to any community that it transverses. I would prefer that this SDEIS admit that and deal with the problems rather than to gloss over or omit them.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. Even though the recommendations for alignments have been made, I hope the issues omitted or addressed incompletely will be addressed in the final proposal. Most of all, I hope that someone at the FTA will look at our region and ask if we should rethink a 15 year old idea.
Sincerely,
Ray Bryan

Day 503-655-0908
Home 503-974-9354
June 23, 2008

Mark Turpel
Metro
Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project
SDEIS Manager
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

RE: Comments on South Corridor Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Turpel:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the South Corridor Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). Most of my comments are focused on construction of a proposed Harold Street light rail station as I am a homeowner in the vicinity and purchased my home in anticipation a station would be built nearby.

First of all, I strongly support the light rail alternative as I would regularly use the line and I am generally supportive of light rail and other public transit integral to the Metro 2040 planning exercise.

General Comments

I support the Porter-Sherman crossing alternative as it runs closest to the heart of the new South Waterfront neighborhood and OMSI. I support the cable-stayed bridge option with two supporting cable towers. While it is a bit more expensive than the other options, I believe the bridge clearance height for water traffic should match that of the Sellwood Bridge. I am also one of the citizens that "prefer[s] the more dramatic profile from an aesthetic standpoint" (SDEIS p. 2-13). The nearby OHSU tram provides an excellent lesson in the importance of aesthetics. While the aesthetics of the tram increased the cost of the tram, the final result changed the minds of several Portlanders about the tram project. It is now an essential part of the skyline and a source of local pride.

I support the Tillamook Branch alignment for several reasons. For the most part, I am happy to defer to the City of Milwaukie stakeholder process thoroughly described in the SDEIS and because it runs a point farther south than downtown Milwaukie. It seems important commuters be able to use a park and ride south of Milwaukie without clogging the downtown area with cars. It would have been unfortunate if a light rail line decreased the acreage of Milwaukie's new waterfront park, which I believe to be a centerpiece of the city's downtown revitalization. Further, I am pleased to see analysis that the project will not further degrade the Kellogg Creek watershed nor impact future watershed restoration of Kellogg Creek.

Page 1—Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail SDEIS Comments, June 23, 2008
I am not concerned about potential affects on wetlands or creeks in the planning area. In fact, I think the construction phase is a great time to coordinate with the Johnson Creek Watershed Council and various government agencies to engage in restoration work along with mitigation work to achieve financial efficiencies in environmental work. The various LRT stops between Lake Road and Harold Street then offer an additional benefit in attracting LRT riders traveling to observe environmental restoration work.

Comments Related to the Proposed Harold Street Station

I strongly support the construction of a Harold Street Station for the reasons set forth below. In the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Station Assessment: Potential Harold Station Area (Metro, November 2007) found on the Metro project website, almost all comments listed in the document were positive.

A Harold Street Station is the closest access point to Reed College, the Crystal Springs Rhododendron Garden, the Reed-Eastmoreland neighborhood (not to be confused with the Eastmoreland neighborhood), and the north entrance to the Oaks Bottom Wildlife Refuge and associated access to the Springwater Corridor. While some of this access is outside the ¼ mile radius studied by Metro, all of these destinations are still a quick walk from Harold and much closer than either the Bybee or Holgate stations. Development of the Harold Street Station would inevitably lead to a pedestrian bridge over the railroad tracks at the northwest corner of the Eastmoreland Golf Course. Currently, the only pedestrian access to the McLoughlin Boulevard Corridor and the new light rail in this area is either on Holgate Boulevard or Bybee Boulevard, streets which are approximately 1.5 miles apart. Further, pedestrians and bicyclists in the Reed-Eastmoreland area would feel much safer walking to the Harold Street Station than through the stretch of Holgate Boulevard that crosses the Brooklyn railroad. On that stretch of Holgate, automobiles regularly drive 15-25 miles per hour over the posted 30 mph speed limit.

There are mixed use development opportunities near the optional station. The land near the optional Harold Street Station appears to be the only land near a proposed station along the McLoughlin corridor zoned RHc with an adjacent Commercial General zone. Because many homes and lots are smaller near or on Harold Street than other parts of Sellwood-Moreland, it will be easier to replace single family homes with higher density housing such as townhouses or apartments. While most Portland neighborhoods are generally resistant to higher density housing, it is important to strategically locate more high density housing close to the city center.

I cannot find the basis for the SDEIS estimate of only 400 riders using the station or the 200 riders who otherwise will not use the system discouraged by one extra minute of ride time (SDEIS p. 5-41). Metro staff suggested to me that some of that analysis is very new. I find the 400/200 numbers questionable, and difficult to analyze because the methodology used to produce the numbers cannot be found in the SDEIS, various 2002 South Corridor Project Transportation Alternatives reports, or other documents provided me at Metro headquarters.

Metro staff explained to me that the analysis for the proposed Harold Street Station is so new that it is not explained in the May 2008 SDEIS. This is understandable considering recent pressure to include this station. However, the combination of not including the data (or at least an explanation of the analysis) for the Harold Street “local option” and the cursory paragraph in the SDEIS implying the station not be built will likely lead to a recommendation that Metro seems to have already made. As
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someone who has professionally reviewed environmental impact statements for over a decade, the breadth of discussion of a project facet can directly influence public comments. In this case, little discussion, unsupported analysis, and language implying the station is a waste of time and money will likely lead to few comments outside of neighborhood residents that have been closely following the project. By comparing the thorough discussion of the downtown Milwaukie LRT alignment public involvement and stakeholder process (albeit one of the largest project issues) with almost no mention of the Harold Street debate, the SDEIS treatment of the Harold Street Station “local option” seems arbitrary and capricious.

The closest available numbers for comparison are the projected year 2030 on/off ridership numbers for various stops found in Table 4.2-9 (SDEIS p. 4-23). That table, for example using the LPA with the Tidamook Branch alternative, estimates the average weekday on/off riders for the Holgate, Bybee, and Tacoma stations near Harold Street are 1949, 3507, and 4324 passengers, respectively. Compared to these numbers, and the fact that Harold Street station is the only proposed stop for roughly 1.5 miles between Holgate and Bybee, the estimate of 400 additional riders is highly questionable. The SDEIS does not state whether the number was analyzed with or without construction of a pedestrian bridge connecting the Harold Street Station to the Reed neighborhood. It is reasonable to estimate that the analysis did not do this, as one supporting report noted little pedestrian activity at Harold Street (South Corridor Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Local Traffic Impacts Results report, p. 4-22, Parametrix and Metro, May 2008).

I have heard that a recent Metro study supported by a computer model appears to conclude that ridership/households served near Harold Street would not provide an adequate project return on investment due to low ridership (see, e.g., www.southeastmax.org). I understand the return on investment calculation is critical to receiving federal transportation funds. However, without the analysis or information on assumptions used in the computer model, I am left to speculate whether there would be in fact a return on investment. My best guess is that the assumptions are faulty for the reasons stated above. Further evidence of potentially inaccurate modeling is found in recent newspaper articles on the proposal to build a new I-5 bridge over the Columbia River (see Willamette Week, “A Bridge over the River Why”, Vol. 34-28, September 21, 2008, and “Murmurs”, Vol. 34-32, June 18, 2008). The implication of the two stories is that the forecasting model to show road demand does not sufficiently take into account rising gas prices, and thus exaggerates demand for auto trips. For the light rail project, the inverse is probably true. Demand for public transit in 2030 is likely higher than forecasted, as it is probable the same basic travel forecast model used for the Columbia River Crossing analysis was used for this light rail proposal. A higher demand for light rail would ultimately change the return on investment calculation. While this is only speculation, the rapidly escalating cost of gasoline will likely increase demand for light rail beyond that forecasted in the SDEIS and slow the increase in road use. While this will hopefully be addressed in the project’s Final EIS, common sense suggests building as many stations as practical.

The Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League (SMILE) negotiated for years with Metro, the City for Portland, and Tri-Met for a station, and signed off on high density zoning around the proposed station location consistent with light rail. This is never discussed in the SDEIS. SMILE believed they had negotiated a deal under which the Harold Street station would be included in the SDEIS LPA and needed to lobby no further for the station. Failing to include a station after promising local leaders is bad policymaking. Nearly as troubling is labeling the proposed station as a “local option” which appears to the casual reader as a last-minute addition as opposed to misunderstandings between neighborhood and project leaders over previous negotiations. The Sellwood Bee neighborhood newspaper ran several articles chronicling the negotiations and subsequent actions by Metro and Tri-
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Met that I believe have already been shared with project staff. I have similar concerns about the failure of regional government to live up to their promises as discussed in these articles.

By not building a Harold Station, this inconveniences regular riders of the four buslines that will be discontinued north of the City of Milwaukie once the project is completed (SDEIS p. 2-16). For example, instead of walking a few blocks to catch the #33 bus, I personally will have to walk at least a half mile to the nearest LRT stop to quickly get downtown.

The estimated station cost and associated cost is $7.5 million. (SDEIS page 5-41). Assuming the LPA plus the Tillamook Branch is selected, the cost to build a Harold Street station is only 0.82 percent of the $916,889,000 estimated project cost (see Table 2.2-1, SDEIS p. 2-22). This marginal increase is acceptable considering that for less than a one-percent increase in overall cost, the number of stations increases by almost ten percent.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the project. I look forward to future involvement in the project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

LANCE R. CLARK
Attorney at Law

Page 4—Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail SDEIS Comments, June 23, 2008
June 16, 2008

Bridget Wieghart (Metro)
Transit Project Manager
Planning Department
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Dear Ms. Wieghart,

Thank you for the meeting you held regarding South Corridor Light Rail on June 4, 2008. As you witnessed, the meeting was very well attended and there was substantial opposition to the proposed alignment and the proposed station locations.

The process Metro and the FTA have used to develop the SDEIS is flawed. Metro’s South corridor Light Rail Steering Committee used an alignment recommendation provided by Milwaukee city officials. As was explained at the June 4th meeting, there are viable alternative routes, that are both technically feasible and community supported, that have never been seriously considered by the city, Metro or the FTA. Milwaukee area citizens and organizations have made repeated requests for consideration of these alternative routes. I enclose a 2008 letter to Metro from St. John’s Church and school as an example of this. The only “consideration” of these alternative alignments in the SDEIS is limited to a brief statement of why Metro and FTA did not evaluate such alternatives. We continue to disagree with this approach of “inclusion-by-dismissal” and have told Metro of our disagreement (including at the meeting held June 4, 2008).

Our understanding of the South corridor Light Rail Project process is that the FTA is currently accepting public comments on the published SDEIS and that FTA will review and respond to those comments in its Final SDEIS. We may submit additional comments once we have studied the SDEIS further. Please inform us of when those comments are due (and if any extensions are granted later, the nature and extent of such extensions). Also, please notify us as to when FTA anticipates issuing the Final SDEIS.

Within Milwaukee, the DEIS only evaluates different termini along on route; it does not evaluate any alignments and simply accepts the City’s proposed alignment. We respectfully request that, as part of your work on the Final DEIS, that FTA and Metro conduct detailed environmental impact studies on the alternative routes that have been proposed through the downtown Milwaukee area.

When, and only when, this has been done will FTA and Metro have a project that is worthy of taxpayer investment, is NEPA compliant, and can be properly evaluated by the constituents affected by this project.

Respectfully,

Rev. Mary D’Costa, Pastor
Pastor, St. John the Baptist Catholic Church

Dr. Julie Vogel, Principal
Principal, St. John the Baptist Catholic School

cc:
10955 SE 25th Avenue • Milwaukee, Oregon 97222 • 503-654-5449 • Fax 503-653-9567
Mr. Joseph Ossi, Director
Department of Transportation
Federal Transit Administration
Office of Planning
400 7th Street, S.W.
Washington DC 20590-0003

Rich Krochalis
Regional Administrator for Region 10
Federal Transit Administration
Jackson Federal Building
915 Second Ave., Suite 3142
Seattle, WA 98174

David Unsworth (TriMet)
Manager of Project Development
710 NE Holladay St.
Portland, OR 97232-2168

Bridget Wieghart (Metro)
Transit Project Manager
Planning Department
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
Ms. Bridget Wieghart  
Project Manager  
Metro  
600 SE Grand Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97232

May 9, 2008

Re: 2000 Hanna Harvester Drive

Dear Ms. Wieghart,

Our Subsidiary, STX Oregon Property Management Corp., owns the above referenced property together with an easement on the South side of the Southgate Theater site.

The City of Milwaukee shows a Vegetated Corridor between our property and the Southgate Property. I do not see it reflected in Section 3 of the EIS.

Sincerely,

Howard N. Dietrich  
Property Manager
Ms Bridget Wieghart
Project Manager
Metro
600 SE Grand Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232

May 9, 2008

Re: 2000 Hanna Harvester Drive

Dear Ms. Wieghart,

Our Subsidiary, STX Oregon Property Management Corp., owns the above referenced property together with an easement on the South side of the Southgate Theater site.

I have read the Draft EIS and cannot determine how our property will be effected.

Could you please send to me the detail so I can comment on the proposals.

1. How much of the land will be taken by each design.
   a. How much of the easement will be taken by each Design?
   b. How much of the West parking lot will be taken by each design?
   c. How much land on the east side of the property between the building and the Harder facility will be taken by each design?
   c. How will the street and our curb cuts be changed on the South side of the property along Hanna Harvester Drive.

2. Traffic and Access
   a. Are there any Turning restrictions from any lanes of traffic onto or off of the property from Main street or Hanna Harvester drive.

How will the transit facility effect the Zoning and Land use of this property?

How will Hanna Harvester Drive be improved.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Howard N. Dietrich
Property Manager

P.O. Box 82098 • Portland, OR 97282, USA
Phone: 503-786-1234 • Fax: 503-786-2022
Ms. Bridget Wieghart
Project Manager
Metro
600 SE Grand Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232

Re: 8300 S.E. McLoughlin Blvd.

Dear Ms. Wieghart,

We own the property referred to above. One of the proposals leaves a pad of 67,000 sq. ft. to be developed. Does that mean that we have the option to keep that parcel?

Sincerely,

Howard N. Distich
Property Manager
June 19, 2008

Richard F. Krochalik
Regional Administrator for Region 10 FTA
Jackson Federal Building
915 Second Avenue, Suite 3142
Seattle, WA 98174

Mark Turpel, AICP
Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project
SDEIS Manager
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232

RE: NEPA Process For SDEIS for the South Corridor Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project
Comments on SDEIS

Our Clients: Milwaukie Transportation Coalition (MTC) & Amajin Consulting
Our File No.: 8813/10709

Dear Gentlemen:

This office represents Amajin Consulting and the Milwaukie Transportation Coalition (MTC), which represent 755 individuals and organizations.

By letter dated October 12, 2007, we set forth a series of concerns that we asked FTA to consider in preparing its supplemental draft EIS on this project. A copy of that letter is enclosed for your convenience. Having reviewed the SDEIS, it appears that all of the concerns and issues we raised previously continue to be issues as the SDEIS fails to adequately address or resolve them. Please consider the October 12, 2007 letter as a critique of the recently released SDEIS and address those issues when preparing the final EIS.
We wish to add the following comments for your agency’s consideration:

1. **The SDEIS Fails To Consider Alternative Alignments. It Only Addresses Termini Alternatives. The SDEIS Promotes An Illusion of FTA Evaluating Alternatives, Without Actually Doing So.** The SDEIS is based entirely on one alignment, the Tillamook Branch. Although many members of the public have suggested specific alternatives, the SDEIS summarily dismisses them, without meaningful consideration. This factor is not adequately addressed by the SDEIS.

2. **The Termini Alternatives, Other Than The Park Avenue Station, Conflict With the EIS Issued in 2002.** The 2002 EIS identified Oregon City as the logical terminus for the South Corridor Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project. The Park Avenue Station is the only terminus alternative that could provide service to Oregon City. In light of this, it appears that the other two termini that are allegedly being considered, suffer the defect of being inconsistent with the prior determination. There is insufficient information to show how those two termini are viable alternatives. Again, the SDEIS provides an illusion of addressing alternatives without meaningfully doing so. This factor is not adequately addressed by the SDEIS.

3. **Reliance On The Locally Preferred Alternative Is Misplaced For A Variety Of Reasons. It Is Especially Misplaced In Light Of The Mayor Of Milwaukie’s Recent Declaration Of A Financial Conflict Of Interest.** The Mayor of the City of Milwaukie recently expressly declared the existence of a conflict of interest as he owns commercial property close to the Tillamook Branch. The value of his property would likely increase if the Tillamook Branch alignment is used. So, the Mayor has a pecuniary interest in the sole alignment FTA is considering. The Mayor has long been active in promoting the Tillamook Branch but, until now, has failed adequately to disclose the existence of that conflict of interest. The Mayor’s conflict undermines the City’s recommendation of the Tillamook Branch, which is sufficient reason for FTA to consider other alignments. This factor is not adequately addressed by the SDEIS.

4. **Funding Is Driving The Alignment Choice.** The voters of the City of Milwaukie have twice rejected funding light rail. Because of this, the City does not have funds to pay the 40% of required matching funds. For the Tillamook Branch, however, Metro has access to $250 million in funding from the Oregon Lottery to address the funding issue. It appears that Metro and FTA intend to ignore the will of local voters and to impose light rail on the citizens of Milwaukie despite their repeated rejection of proposals to extend...
light rail to their city. The SDEIS should, but fails to consider, non-light rail alternatives that would better accomplish the desired goal of increasing transit ridership. This factor is not adequately addressed by the SDEIS. Since FTA and Metro have demonstrated a willingness in this SDEIS to re-examine issues addressed in earlier EIS's (such as alternate terminiis), there is no reason not to extend this re-examination to bus alternatives.

5. The Costs of Extending Light Rail To Milwaukie Are Significant, But The Benefits Of Doing So Are Modest (At Best). The Small Benefits Fail To Justify The Large Cost. As others have noted, improving bus service to Milwaukie would achieve substantially the same transportation benefits at a small fraction of the cost of light rail. This factor is not adequately addressed by the SDEIS.

6. The Proposal To Significantly Re-Configure Kellogg Lake Would Jeopardize Salmon Habitat. Maintenance and improvement of salmon habitat in the northwest is a high priority of both federal and state governments. Certain species in certain ranges have been declared endangered. Salmon are present in Kellogg Lake and would be adversely affected by proposals to significantly re-configure the lake. This factor is not adequately addressed by the SDEIS.

Please include these comments in the record of your decision and please provide me with printed and CD copies of the Final Supplemental EIS. Also, please put me on your notice list for this project, so I can be kept apprised of its status. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

HUTCHINSON, COX, COONS
DuPRIEST, ORR & SHERLOCK, P.C.

[Signature]

Douglas M. DuPriest

DMD/erl
Enclosure

cc: FTA, Washington, D.C.
    Joel Morton, Metro Office of Legal Counsel
    City of Milwaukie
    Clients
June 10, 2008

Dear Sir:

This letter is to convey to your office that we feel that the City of Milwaukie, Oregon, does not need Light Rail from the Portland Area. We have adequate bus transportation for the size of the town and funding is limited. This city at this time does not have money for our roads and taking care of some issues related to the train going through our city.

If Light Rail is something that we need to deal with, we much prefer it being located along the Milwaukie Expressway with a parking facility in the Industrial Area. There are many industries in that area that could benefit from transportation. There is also a large amount of traffic coming from Highway 205 and the Oregon City area that could benefit from Light Rail.

The City of Milwaukie, Oregon, is basically a one street town, a few businesses and a transit mall. We already have many criminal activities going on in the area of the bus mall and adding light rail to the downtown area will increase the problems. Also, the City Council selected Lake Road as the area for a Park and Ride Station. This is a residential area and will cause many traffic problems in the area.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Harold and Jeanette Eckman
12309 SE 41st Court
Milwaukie Oregon

C: Rich Krochalis Regional Adm for Region 10 US Dept Transportation
   Metro
   Milwaukie City Hall
   John Otsyula
June 23, 2008

Reply To: EPTA – 088 Ref.: 98-028-FTA

Linda Gehrke, Deputy Regional Administrator
Federal Transit Administration
Jackson Federal Building, Suite 3142
915 Second Ave.
Seattle, WA 98174

Dear Ms. Gehrke:

The EPA has reviewed the fourth Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the proposed South Corridor Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project (CEQ No. 20080180) in accordance with our responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. Section 309 specifically directs EPA to review and comment in writing on the environmental impacts associated with all major federal actions. Under our policies and procedures, we also evaluate the document’s adequacy in meeting NEPA requirements.

The SDEIS evaluates potential environmental impacts of a proposal to develop a light rail transit system connecting downtown Portland, the City of Milwaukie and north Clackamas and Multnomah Counties, OR and Clark County, WA. Because of higher concentration of population and facilities (public and private) within the project corridor, there is need to provide a dependable way for people to travel conveniently, safely, and economically in the area. When complete, the project will improve the quality of transit service and help to meet significant travel needs expected within the project corridor due to projected high population and employment growth in the near future. In South Portland area, for example, there will be 221% change in forecasted households from 2005-2030 (p. 1-11), and the percent change in employment will be 59% over the same period.

In analyzing the impacts of the Light Rail project, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and its partners, Metro and Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon, considered a No-Build Alternative and Light Rail Alternatives based on the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) that was identified in the 2003 SDEIS. In addition to the LPA, FTA developed two alternatives for Light Rail corridor alignments (Fig. 2.1-3), four Willamette River crossing alternatives (Fig. 2.1-2), and three bridge designs (Fig. 2.1-4). Data presented in this document and resulting public comments will be used to identify a Preferred Alternative for the proposed Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail project.
In general, EPA supports mass transit services that reduce pollution, conserve energy, and minimize environmental degradation, while ensuring safety and security, so we are generally supportive of the project. However we have concerns about aspects that have potential to further degrade water quality, impact fisheries, and disturb and release pollutants from hazardous material sites and sites with contaminated sediments. We recommend selection of a bridge design with as few piers as possible to minimize disturbance of potentially contaminated sediment and minimize the impact to fisheries. We encourage FTA and project partners to continue to work with the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) to obtain the Clean Water Act Section 401 Certificate and assure that the state of Oregon water quality standards are met. FTA should also coordinate with ODEQ as contaminated sites in the project area are identified and remedial actions are developed and implemented. Detailed comments are attached.

Because of concerns about water quality, hazardous materials and sites, and missing or unclear information, we have assigned a rating of EC-2 (Environmental Concerns - Insufficient information) to the draft EIS. This rating and a summary of our comments will be published in the Federal Register. For your reference, a copy of our rating system used in conducting our review is enclosed.

EPA commends FTA for working with a variety of stakeholders, coordinating with affected Tribes, establishing and working with a Citizen Advisory Committee for the project, and considering other public comments in developing and analyzing the impacts of the proposed project.

If you have questions or would like to discuss our comments in detail, please feel free to contact Theo Mbabaliye at (206) 553-6322 or me at (206) 553-1601.

Sincerely,

/s/
Christine Reichgott, Manager
NEPA Review Unit

Enclosure

cc:
EPA Oregon Operations Office
The US Coast Guard in Portland, OR
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
EPA Detailed Comments on the Proposed
Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

Water quality and hydrology

Water quality degradation is one of EPA's primary concerns. Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) requires States (and Tribes with approved standards) to identify water bodies that do not meet water quality standards and to develop water quality restoration plans to meet established water quality criteria and associated beneficial uses. The SDEIS indicates that the project would cross up to eight waterways, including the Willamette River, Kellogg Lake and, depending on the alignment option selected, six more creeks (p. 3-122). Most of these waterways are on the state of Oregon most current EPA-approved 303(d) list of impaired waterbodies due to their exceedances of water quality criteria such as temperature, mercury, and bacteria. Nearly all the waterways in the project corridor support populations of anadromous and resident fish species, some of which are listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act or are species of concern. For example, the Willamette River and Kellogg Lake/creek support both Coho salmon and Steelhead, which are listed as threatened by the federal government and as endangered by the state.

The project is expected to result in an increase of about 31-34 acres of impervious surfaces and almost 2-3 acres of potential floodplain fill. Such an increase could result in greater stormwater volumes and higher pollutant loading to 303(d)-listed streams. The project would also create in-water new structures (piers and bridge footings). We are concerned that construction of these structures could disturb and resuspend contaminated sediment. We are also concerned that the structures, once constructed, could serve as cover for predators of listed fish species, thereby exacerbating threats to these species.

Recommendations:

1. We encourage FTA to select options to minimize the extent of impervious surfaces and consider use of Low Impact Development (LID) techniques that reduce the volume of stormwater and mimic natural conditions as closely as possible. Information about LID practices can be found at: http://www.psaw.wa.gov/Programs/LID/lid_cdrbrochure.pdf and http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/stormwater.htm.

2. We recommend selection of a bridge design with as few piers as possible to minimize disturbance of potentially contaminated sediment and minimize the impact to fisheries.

The final EIS should also include information about the status of the Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification process, and if possible, specific requirements to meet state water quality standards and Water Quality Monitoring Plan to address water quality problems. FTA should also coordinate with ODEQ as the TMDL for the Willamette River is implemented and other plans to restore water quality in other water quality limited waterbodies are also developed and implemented.
Hazardous materials

The SDEIS indicates that construction of the Light Rail project may encounter 80-95 contaminated sites within the project corridor, of which 35-42 would be of high concern. During construction, petroleum products may be accidentally spilled to the ground and contaminate soils and groundwater. Paint, acids, solvents, asphalts, and other chemical pollutants may also be used at construction sites and be carried in stormwater runoff. Removal of structures containing contaminants such as lead, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and asbestos may also be necessary. Construction of river and stream crossings has the potential to stir up in-water sediments and riverbank soils contaminated with metals, PCBs, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. EPA is concerned about the project potential to mobilize contaminants currently in soils and sediments, impeding ongoing and planned remedial actions for the contaminated sites. As a result, the project would possibly exacerbate water quality problems within listed waterbodies, resulting in impacts to aquatic life and fish.

Recommendations:

1. FTA should coordinate with ODEQ as contaminated sites are identified; and cleanup plans are developed and implemented to minimize impacts resulting from possible release of hazardous materials in the environment and disturbance of contaminated sites.

2. The final EIS should include detailed information regarding specific measures that will be taken to reduce impacts of potential release of hazardous materials in the environment and disturbance of contaminated sites by the project. As an example, the final EIS could include information addressing Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) plans for the project.

Monitoring

The proposed project has the potential to impact a variety of resources for an extended period of time. As a result, we recommend that the project be designed to include an environmental inspection and mitigation monitoring program to ensure compliance with all mitigation measures and assess their effectiveness. The EIS document should describe the monitoring program and how it will be used as an effective feedback mechanism so that any needed adjustments can be made to the project to meet environmental objectives during the project operation and maintenance.
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave
Portland, Oregon

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised, as a resident of Milwaukie, I still want the alternatives
For the Placement of Milwaukie Light Rail that were prematurely dismissed.

Thankyou for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Geni Figini
June 23, 2008

Ms. Bridget Wieghart
Metro
600 Northeast Grant Avenue
Portland, OR
97232-2736

RE: Coordination of the Trolley Trail and Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail projects

Dear Ms. Wieghart:

Thank you for your letter and on-going communication about the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail project.

As you are aware, the North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District (NCPRD) is currently working on the design of the Trolley Trail, a six-mile multiuse trail that will run from Milwaukie to Gladstone along the former Portland Traction Company street car right of way. NCPRD has just completed a set of preliminary plans, with the goal of beginning construction of the entire trail by no later than spring 2010. Funding for construction of the trail has been awarded and is from federal transportation funds administered through the Oregon Department of Transportation.

We do have some questions and concerns about the affect light rail could have on the trail (e.g., project timing, safety, noise, user experience, etc.); however, with think that with close coordination and thoughtful mitigation some of these issues could be resolved. We will continue to coordinate the Trolley Trail project with the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail project by attending team meetings; reviewing project information and supporting documents; and inviting light rail project staff to attend NCPRD Advisory Board and Trolley Trail project meetings. We understand that if the final decision is to extend the light rail project to Park Avenue, Metro and Tri-Met will coordinate design, phasing, and mitigation strategies with us to ensure the successful completion of both projects.

Thank you for keeping us informed of your progress.

Sincerely,

Michelle Healy
Senior Planner
Business and Community Services/
North Clackamas Parks & Recreation District
The proposals for the alignment and station locations south of Tacoma Street all have their own pros and cons. It is most important that we impact as little as possible the traffic flow and existing industrial and commercial entities.

I would definitely like to see the line extended to Park with an above grade crossing of McLoughlin, but without a station at Bluebird. I would prefer the Washington station location unless the line ends at Lake Road, in which case I believe Lake should be the only station in downtown Milwaukie. Having said this, I support the alignments and station locations that Milwaukie city staff has put forward. I have the other preferences but I can see the logic in the choices they have made.

It is my personal belief that many of the citizens of Milwaukie really do and will support having light rail come into downtown, as long as we can resolve issues of public safety and the development around the station(s) is made attractive and useful. It is also my belief that a majority of the households don’t think they will be impacted one way or the other and are therefore indifferent to the issue.

I hope that we can overcome the resistance of some of the “old-timers” who don’t want progress and have continued to fight light rail despite growing congestion, gas prices and the clear message that we must have public transportation in the form of light rail to cope with future traffic issues.

Linda M Hedges
Milwaukie, OR
Secretary, Hector Campbell Neighborhood Association
Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR  97232

Dear Madam or Sir,

I am a resident of Milwaukie, Oregon. My house is approximately 6 blocks from any of the proposed Milwaukie Light Rail alignments. My son attends the Portland Waldorf School, which is approximately 50 feet from Tillamook Branch alignment. This is a K-12 school where the pre-school and kindergarten playground is adjacent to the existing Tillamook Branch train tracks. The High School annex, where my son will be starting next fall, is also adjacent to the Tillamook Branch train tracks.

I am opposed to the Tillamook Branch alignment because it would disrupt the small-town feel of Milwaukie, and it would disrupt many activities at the Portland Waldorf School.

I think the best choice of alignments through Milwaukie would be along McLoughlin Blvd. This alignment would be the least disruptive to the city of Milwaukie. McLoughlin Blvd is already a traffic zone, so it would not be a change in land use. The City of Milwaukie has a beautiful waterfront revitalization project underway that involved redesigning and rebuilding McLoughlin Blvd just a few years ago. This was a major expense for the city and I can understand why the Mayor and other members of Milwaukie's city council would not support more construction on McLoughlin Blvd. However, I think that the impact of building a light rail line either on the Tillamook alignment or the 21st/Main Street alignment would be far greater and longer-lasting than the construction of Light Rail (or streetcar) tracks along McLoughlin Blvd. I think the Light Rail along McLoughlin Blvd would actually enhance the waterfront revitalization project by creating a more user-friendly destination there and reducing congestion along McLoughlin as commuters could use light rail instead of their own cars.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter and please take my comments into consideration in any decisions that you make regarding the routing of Light Rail through Milwaukie.

Sincerely,

Anne Hillyer

cc: Rick Krochalis, Joseph Ossi, Milwaukie City Hall, John Otsuya
Date: June 23, 2008
To: Metro/Tri-Met
From: Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood Association

Public Comment on Milwaukie/Portland Light Rail

A large portion of the historic Milwaukie neighborhood residential section is situated directly to the east of the proposed MAX line through Milwaukie, running approximately seven blocks through our neighborhood.

In March 2001, Milwaukie's neighborhoods outlined 14 conditions under which they would support a transportation system, including light rail. (Abbreviated form attached.) This list was developed after a long period of meetings with both Metro and Tri-Met regarding light rail, and it was praised highly by both entities. It was not a legal document, but a gentlemen's agreement that gave our neighborhoods hope that we would be given every consideration if light rail were to come to Milwaukie.

In the SDEIS, section S.6.3, Community Impacts; it states that most of the project is located along existing transportation corridors, avoiding the division of neighborhoods. The first and most important item on the 14 points is "no light rail through Milwaukie neighborhoods." In perusing the document it can be seen that starting with the first point barring light rail through neighborhoods, most points in the agreement have been ignored.

With the current proposed alignment using the Tillamook line, light rail would travel immediately adjacent to three schools and within three blocks of another. The noise, vibration and undesirable social elements would be disruptive and dangerous to these schools. Furthermore, one-quarter mile is the minimal reasonable walking distance for stations and between stations. It should be noted that this is the exact radius the Gresham, Oregon mayor opted for extra police protection because of heightened major crime at and near light rail stations. Think of the impact on our neighborhood and schools in that same radius.

The following is a list of objections and questions from our neighborhood:

- Federal law requires that light rail trains traveling in the same corridor as freight trains must sound their horn. For our neighborhood, that is horns blowing for four blocks next to schools, businesses, and residences; every 3.5 minutes during rush hour, every 10 minutes the rest of the day. Tri-Met has no guarantees that they will get a federal waiver for the quiet zone. This rail line should not, cannot, be built without a quiet zone in place, this must be mandatory or "no build."

- It has been pointed out that crossing safety arms are noisy and should be part of the federal waiver for the quiet zone.
- Disruption of east-west traffic along the line as the trains pass through. As presently aligned, the train will block four main intersections in town many times during the day, creating another major problem for downtown businesses, schools and residences.

- The study is incomplete and inaccurate. Changes have occurred since the original data was obtained beginning in 1993, prior to when the urban growth boundary was expanded East in North Clackamas County. More study is needed to account for the changes and shifting population. Light rail to the regional center of Oregon City from Southgate along Highways 224 and 205 would be much more efficient. The population shift to that area of the county practically demands it.

- Alternative routes through Milwaukie are being ignored. In Spring 2007, 650 signatures were gathered to support other alignments, but in August 2007 the Milwaukie City Council ruled against the inclusion of other alternative alignments in the SDEIS. Was this legal?

- Parking studies were conducted in August when school is out, completely skewing the accuracy of the figures. Also, the loss of 40 parking spaces on 21st Ave. are replaced by 65 spaces on a non-existent or even planned for, surface lot on Main St.

- A station at Southgate, which received 43% of the public vote during meetings evaluating station locations in Milwaukie, was taken out of consideration in favor of station sites with 19% and 12% support.

- Now that Southgate Park and Ride is out of the mix, if the line doesn’t go to Park St., Lake Rd. Park and Ride should be limited to 275 cars, if any. No other Park and Rides should be considered in Milwaukie.

- We want full disclosure on the complete status of funding.

- We want to be shown another town that is only 2 blocks wide and 7 blocks long that is still thriving after being violated by light rail. The proposed line is completely out of scale for Milwaukie’s small downtown.

- One of the more significant concerns we have is that our mayor has told the Metro South Corridor Steering Committee at least twice in open forum, and in numerous other forums, that everyone in Milwaukie wants light rail. This is a complete distortion of the facts: the last two times it was on the ballot it was defeated. Citizen attitude is still the same; we want this issue placed on the ballot.
• Furthermore, the mayor has an actual conflict of interest – the line will pass 60' from his business/other property.

• In the past 22 years, Tri-Met has not been able to control crime on the Max lines or its stations. Tri-Met has not demonstrated that it can sustain improvements made to address security concerns.

• If light rail can’t be diverted from Milwaukie at Southgate, and routed southeast along Hwy 224, then it should be routed along McLoughlin or not built at all.

• “No build” is our overwhelming preference given the current alignment through the historic Milwaukie neighborhood.

Historic Milwaukie NDA

Dion Shepard, Chair
Ed Zumwalt, Vice Chair
Ray Bryan, Secretary and Treasurer
Greg Seagler, Member at Large
Ron Rasch, Member at Large
Milwaukie Neighborhood Associations

14 Points for Acceptance of Light Rail into Milwaukie
March 2001

1. No Light Rail through Milwaukie Neighborhoods.
2. No station community planning/social engineering.
3. Consider connectivity within and around Milwaukie
   for future extensions.
4. No future connections that would necessitate a Park
   & Ride at Linwood and Harmony.
5. Dismiss the idea of a Light Rail and bus transfer center
   at Safeway. Move transit center to Milwaukie's
   Northern Industrial area.
7. ODOT, Metro and Tri-Met should collaborate and coordinate
   their efforts.
8. Recognize and address the fiscal impact of long-term
   parking generation.
9. Consider a Light Rail station behind the Milwaukie Jr.
   High, and help cultivate funding to support its purchase.
10. Consider future extension to the east from the Northern
    Industrial area, not Downtown Milwaukie. Keep
    extensions along Highway 224, not through the Neighborhoods.
11. Consider future extension to the west via circumferential
    rail on the forgotten bridge that spans the
    Willamette River.
12. Consider future extension to the south via McLoughlin
    Boulevard.
14. The City should retain control of the Safeway property.
June 23, 2008

Mr. Joseph Ossi, Department of Transportation
Federal Transit Administration
400 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590-0003

Re: SDEIS for the South Corridor Light Rail project, Milwaukie Oregon

Dear Mr. Ossi,

The SDEIS for the above referenced project is not following the intent and purpose of NEPA, and causes me great concern. I am an employee of Portland Waldorf School, a site located adjacent to the proposed light rail line. The line is in such unprecedented proximity to our buildings and play areas and, if built, will seriously compromise our facility, our programs and our educational mission. Instead of following a heavily used transportation corridor (Oregon Route 99E or 224), local planners seem to prefer that the line run through a quiet neighborhood and through school yards. There has been exhaustive discussion about this and it will continue.

Regarding the NEPA process, Portland Waldorf School previously suggested alternatives that would avoid the harms to our school and 2 other schools along this proposed route. The alternatives were not studied in detail, nor have they been evaluated in a comparative way that the general public would readily understand.

Furthermore, the SDEIS does not outline the two times that Milwaukie voters emphatically rejected this project (going so far to recall the mayor and members of the City Council). My understanding is that NEPA requires a detailed disclosure of past rejections of a project and the reasons behind that rejection.

Finally, the taxes to be imposed are not clearly stated – how will the 40% of local funds be generated? Citizens of Milwaukie should know to allow them to evaluate and comment on the project.

Sincerely,

Lauren Johnson
cc:
FTA Region 10
Metro (trans@oregonmetro.gov)
City of Milwaukie
Lauren Johnson
cc:
FTA Region 10
Metro (trans@oregonmetro.gov)
City of Milwaukie
June 23, 2008

Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

To whom it may concern:

I support a terminus North of Kellogg Lake. In referring to the terminus maps it could be either A or C. I believe this a Milwaukie decision. I would say a larger P&R in downtown Milwaukie has many advantages including allowing Milwaukie river front park to be built with less parking spaces and more green areas while sharing parking with Light Rail.

My opposition is extending the line south of Kellogg Lake include:

There has been very little discussion in the Oak Grove area. Metro held a community meeting in mid-March but apart from that meeting minimal discussions have occurred. Neither Metro nor the County has met with businesses along the McLoughlin Corridor. Many of the businesses clientele is local and have the concern the arrival of Light Rail would upset that equation. One reason Oak Grove has this limited market is the west side is the Willamette River.

People are confused by what is happening because of what appears to have been a lack of communication that all prior Plans are off the table and we are starting a new Plan. During the past 10 years the community has seen the end of Light Rail from Clackamas County (Milwaukie to the Clackamas Town Center) to Clark County. The McLoughlin Corridor Plan followed this where County staff said McLoughlin was too narrow for accommodate Light Rail. As the McLoughlin Corridor Plan concluded Metro started a new Plan without Light Rail called the South Corridor Plan. In the end it was recommended Light rail to Milwaukie and bus south of Milwaukie. Now with the advent of Light Rail the question people are asking, when does Oak Grove get to weigh in? This has been absent!!

It seems in the process before making the decision to extend the line south of Milwaukie the question should be asked is it more cost effective to go to Oregon City from Milwaukie or the Clackamas Town Center (CTC)? The length of the line would be shorter between the CTC and Oregon City. The Community College has campuses both in Oregon City and near the CTC. The level of projected investment in the CTC area is many times higher than Oak Grove and Milwaukie. Projected growth is nearer a Light Rail Line from the CTC than McLoughlin.

Construction of a P&R structure at Park Av. present opportunity for people will bad ideas to access the Trolley Trail and less than a ½ mile along it is grade school with children
who walk to and from school along the Trolley Trail. Public safety and security needs be addressed.

The ROW to be used for the Light Rail south of Kellogg Lake was purchased using the 1995 Open Space bond levy for a trail. If the Light Rail shares the 40 ft. ROW there will be 14 feet for the trail that will need be shared with the PGE electric line. On one side of the trail will be a cyclone fence and on the other 14 foot plus retaining wall and zero trees. This does not sound like a real Open space park area. The Trolley Trail was not just a project rather an identified purpose for the levy.

Access to a Park Ave P&R will cause a lot of congestion problems. People coming from the east will travel down Lake Rd to Oatfield to Park and cross McLoughlin on Park Ave. Oatfield is two lanes and there is no opportunity for widening it especially at Aldercrest where a lot of cross traffic occurs. Instead of a P&R at Park it would appear a more regional P&R at Tacoma has a lot of merit while using current infrastructure.

I background in this process is quite broad. I chair the Oak Lodge Community Council. I have been active both in the acquisition and development of the Trolley Trail. I served on the McLoughlin Corridor Committee. During the initial South Corridor Committee work I served on Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement (MCCI) and was at that time the Chair of the Transportation Subcommittee.

Thanks for evaluating my comments,

Dick Jones

3205 SE Vineyard Rd.
Oak Grove Or. 97267
e-mail Bulldogjones@comcast.net
Comments on South Corridor,
Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project SDEIS

The SDEIS ignored the following alternatives:
1. Expanding road capacity (no tolls, no HOV, just ordinary lanes.)
2. Running transit buses on expanded roads

The following SDEIS assumptions appear to be unrealistic:
1. Table 4.2-8, no-build 2030 mode split is projected at 23% transit compared to present 16%. This ignores the fact that, with few exceptions, transit mode split has been in a downturn for decades (except for temporary increases during recessions and gas price shocks.) Are the planners expecting a deep depression in 2030?
2. A mode share of up to 27% is projected for transit under the build scenarios. This is unsupported by comparison to other cities.

The SDEIS shows no advantage to building this project:
1. According to the SDEIS (tables 3.12-2 & 3), the light rail will not save any energy until after 14 years of operation. At that point it will reduce energy consumption 0.11% (one-tenth of one percent) Such tiny differences are well beyond the accuracy of projections. So there is no certain energy saving, and it may well result in a net energy consumption increase.
2. There is likely NO air pollution reduction. Table 3.11-2 lists build and no-build air pollutant emissions for three pollutants and CO2, a trace gas vital for life. In all cases the projected reduction is under 1% and likely within the unstated error bands. There is no certain reduction in pollutant or CO2 emissions and there may actually be an increase since the projected reduction is too small to be sure it is real.
3. Table 4.2-6 shows up to a 4% increase in transit ridership over no-build. This is appalling small for a billion dollar project and likely is less than the errors inherent in projection 25 years into the future.
4. Table 4.2-10 projects a reduction of up to 460 vehicle-hours of delay. This is only a 1% reduction. Again this is much less than the error of projection 25 years into the future and may in fact cause an increase in vehicle-hours of delay.
5. Table 4.2-10 shows a regional roadway VMT reduction of up to 69,200 from a no build of 58,445,500. This is a savings of 0.11%, again so small compared to errors inherent in projections, that it may actually be an increase in VMT.
6. Table 4.2-11 shows up to a 600 vehicle reduction in 2030 average weekday p.m. peak vehicle volume on SE McLoughlin Blvd., etc. From a no-build of 20,500 this is only a 3% reduction. Again this is almost certainly less than the errors inherent in projection 25 years into the future and may well give and increase in peak vehicle volumes.
7. A number of Tables starting at 4.2-16 show degradation in level of service on many area roads due to this project.
8. The number of cars taken off of the road appears to be equivalent to about 1/5 of one lane of highway, but one lane pair could be added to McLoughlin for a mere fraction of the expected local match, leaving many dollars left to replace the Sellwood bridge and various congestion relief projects in the area.

This project appears to offer no transportation or environmental improvement and procures far less transportation improvement than far cheaper road improvement options.

Page 1 of 2
The project does not meet it’s stated purpose and need

The project’s purpose and need is stated on page S-4:

To implement a major transit improvement in the South Corridor that maintains livability in the metropolitan region, supports land use goals, optimizes the transportation system, is environmentally sensitive, reflects community values, and is fiscally responsive.

Taking each clause:

To implement a major transit improvement in the South Corridor

This is preselecting transit as the best way to meet some need and has no place in a purpose and need statement. Inserting this in the purpose and need statement shows that the real goal is not transportation.

that maintains livability in the metropolitan region,

What is livable about spending a billion dollars for no (or dubious) improvement?

supports land use goals,

This is a transportation project, not an experiment in social engineering. Land use goals have no place is meeting the public’s needs. (Land use goals only aid planner’s in implementing their goals which are usually different than the public’s real needs.)

optimizes the transportation system,

This project degrades the LOS on many local streets

This project does not reduce traffic on McLoughlin when projection errors are considered.

is environmentally sensitive,

This project does not save energy when projection errors are considered.

This project does not reduce air pollution when projection errors are considered.

reflects community values,

This project does not reflect community values of the majority who drive cars. It may, however, reflect the values of a tiny minority of the population who falsely believe that increasing transit usage provides some benefit.

and is fiscally responsive,

This project is FINANCIALLY IRRESPONSIBLE as it costs several times what road improvement would cost for the same transport capacity.

This is a project that will only benefit a tiny minority of the population - the transit dependent, most of who would experience an increase in their standard of living if they could receive help to get a car.

Jim Karlock
3311 n.e 35 th ave.
portland or 97212
503-284-5644
June 23, 2008

Dear Members of the Steering Committee,

As the current Chair of the Brooklyn Action Corps (BAC) neighborhood association, I am submitting this letter in support for the proposed MAX light rail extension between Portland and Milwaukie.

Our neighborhood has a strong history of support for public transportation. In fact, we already have some of the highest transit ridership rates in the region. The 2000 Census found that about 20% of all trips in Brooklyn are done by using public transportation. With the rapidly increasing price of gas and diesel, this percentage has certainly grown over the past eight years.

The introduction of MAX light rail is highly supported by a vast majority of Brooklyn residents. Most residents support alternative modes of transportation, and see this project as an excellent opportunity for the continued economic investment and revitalization of the neighborhood.

The following proposed stations are of particular importance to the future growth of the Brooklyn neighborhood:

1. **OMSI**
   This station will provide direct access from Brooklyn to OMSI, the Portland Opera headquarters, the soon to be constructed Portland City Storage facility, and the planned Oregon Rail Heritage Foundation Museum. Just as important, area residents will have improved access to both the Willamette River and the Springwater Corridor Trail.

2. **SE Clinton and Gideon**
   This station will serve the high number of transit riders that currently transfer bus lines in this area. A station in this area will also support the historic commercial center of Brooklyn at the nearby intersection of Milwaukie Avenue and Powell Boulevard. It will also promote redevelopment of the nearby Northwest Natural property to the west.
3. **SE Rhine**  
A station at this location will serve workers at Winterhaven School, TRIMET, and PGE. Fred Meyer employees will be able to access this station through the reconstruction of the Lafayette Street pedestrian overpass. This overpass over the rail yards is currently in a very poor condition and should be upgraded so that it is compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act. A station in this area will also serve the existing residential neighborhood to the west.

4. **SE Holgate**  
A station at this location is ESSENTIAL to the redevelopment of the SE 17TH Avenue Corridor. Many existing commercial and industrial properties in this area will have to be acquired and demolished for construction of this project. Providing a station in this area is of vital importance if the surrounding area is to be rebuilt and redeveloped as a transit-oriented community.

5. **SE Harold**  
A station at this location would provide a much needed connection to Reed College and the Reed neighborhood. This portion of the Brooklyn Rail Yards has zero legal pedestrian and bicycle crossings. Area residents must currently travel up to a mile away to use the existing crossings at Holgate and Bybee Boulevards. A station at this location would serve the southern most portion of Brooklyn, and would serve a portion of the Sellwood-Moreland neighborhood that can not easily access the station at SE Holgate.

The impacts on the Brooklyn Neighborhood will be considerable. The following issues need to be addressed in the months and years to come.

1. Single-family, residential properties on SE 16th Avenue should be retained and buffered from the impacts along SE 17th Avenue as much as possible. Sound walls and landscaping should be used to shield these homes from the added light and noise that will come from an expanded SE 17th Avenue right of way.

2. Increased parking regulation and enforcement should be studied more closely. A significant number of regional commuters are already using neighborhood streets for park-and-ride purposes. Several local businesses have already voiced concerns about on-street parking spots near them being used by both TRIMET drivers and by people seeking to park near easy transit access. The loss of off-street parking near TRIMET’s headquarters must be mitigated. Nearby residential and commercial areas may need to form a parking permit district in order to help limit the use of area streets for park-and-ride purposes.

3. Aesthetic and safety improvements must be made where SE Powell Boulevard travels under SE 17th Avenue and the Brooklyn Rail Yard. The introduction of light rail to this area could make a very unattractive and dysfunctional area even more so.
4. Heavy truck access to and from the Brooklyn Rail Yard needs to be planned for and better accommodated by this project. Trucks currently have to use a very narrow and busy intersection at SE 17th and Schiller in order to access McLoughlin. A traffic signal and a wider turning radius should be added to this intersection.

5. Increased signalization along SE 17th Avenue would go a long ways towards calming the chaotic traffic environment that exists here currently. Heavy congestion during peak commute times makes it very difficult to access 17th from side streets. During non-peak travel times, vehicles travel up and down SE 17th at very high rates of speed due to there only being one signal in this mile long corridor. The placement of additional signals and/or stop signs along this corridor would go a long ways towards addressing these issues.

6. Safety improvements are desperately needed at the intersection of SE 17th and McLoughlin Boulevard. This intersection had a fatal pedestrian accident last year, and car on car collisions are a regular occurrence. A crosswalk needs to be added to the west side of the intersection. Pedestrian crossings here are now illegal, even though by many standards this is the safest place to cross. Pedestrians currently seeking to cross McLoughlin can only cross on the east side, and must share the walk signal with cars that are turning left off of 17th at a very high rate of speed.

Overall, the introduction of MAX light rail is a welcome addition to the historic Brooklyn neighborhood. We hope that what has long been an underutilized commercial and industrial corridor along SE 17th Avenue will soon be an attractive and thriving mixed-use area that incorporates industrial, commercial and residential uses.

Sincerely,

Lance Lindahl
Chair, Brooklyn Action Corps
20 June 2008

Councilor Robert Liberty
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, Oregon 97232

Re: Proposed Milwaukee Light Rail Project

Dear Councilor Liberty,

Portland Community College is pleased to provide these comments in support of the proposed Milwaukee Light Rail project.

We see this project as a key part of the regional portfolio of needed investments that has the potential to increase access to, and effectiveness of, regional transportation systems. As you know, Portland Community College is actively integrating access to non-SOV transportation methods into our long-term strategic planning. Effective, timely transportation is more and more frequently heard from our students as a key determinant in their academic plans. We see this project as enhancing transit access to and for the Central East Side and PCC’s Central Portland Workforce Training Center.

We also believe that sensible and principled planning needs to be done at the outset, particularly to avoid “incidental” negative impacts that can strip away the benefits of what would otherwise be a strategically positive investment. We suggest that guiding principles to be embraced at this planning point must include:

1. Transit network linkage with the West Side is important and desired;
2. Any river crossing solution must allow for current levels of river commerce;
3. To the extent an existing business is “destroyed” by this project, or the industrial preserve in the Central East Side is diminished, replacement facilities or property of suitable character (size, zoning, accessibility, logistics sufficiency, etc.) must be provided.
4. Substantial effort be made to identify and articulate for further discussion the intended impacts of this project and the potential de facto decisions that going forward might represent. Those things will certainly exist in this project, as they will in any project of similar importance. What’s important, in our view, is that they be identified and discussed so that “win-win” solutions can be identified.

Portland Community College appreciates the opportunity to comment on this regionally important matter. We thank you for your continued leadership in these important conversations.

Sincerely,

R. J. McEwen
Vice President
June 19, 2008

Mr. Mark Turpel, AICP
Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project SDEIS Manager
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

Re: Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Turpel:

Masons Supply Headquarters - Portland, Oregon

Masons Supply is a Portland family-owned and operated business, which was established in Portland in 1920. Today our Portland site, at 2637 SE 12th Avenue, which is our headquarters for 14 facilities in Oregon and Washington, employs about 50 people. (At this location we also own the properties at 2527-2529 SE 12th Avenue, 2536 SE 11th Avenue, and 1246 SE Clinton, which are part of our headquarters operation.)

Our Employees

Our Portland employees, and all our employees, earn family-support wages. Company wide we employ 150 people for a variety of jobs from truck drivers and laborers to craftsmen, project managers, and sales professionals. Masons supplies the equipment to build massive concrete construction components, such as support columns, bridge girders, and tilt-up walls for retail and office buildings. We also provide a variety of concrete products for small-scale projects.

Purpose of This Letter

We would like to remain in business at our Portland headquarters. All of our current interior and exterior space, and all the vehicle access and parking, we currently have at our Portland headquarters, is essential to our operation.

We are a growing business and a fundamental commercial/light industrial operation in Portland’s Central Eastside Industrial District (CEID). Our existing central location is vital for our success. We have spent decades developing our facility and customer base at this site. Finding another location that meets our needs would be extremely difficult. We want to ensure that our business is allowed to function, including the necessary vehicular access to and from our site, as we do currently.

We support the goals and objectives of the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project. One of the stated project “Objectives” in the SDEIS is: “Promote regionally agreed upon land use patterns and development in the corridor.”

Our property on the west side of SE 12th is zoned, and designated on Portland’s Comprehensive Plan, Central Employment; and on the east side of SE 12th the zoning and plan designation is General Employment. Our land use is allowed by these zoning and plan designations. In order for our business to continue to operate at this location, the
following are required:

1. The existing on-street parking on SE 12th Avenue, adjacent to our site must be fully retained. (Most of our customers coming to the site use pick ups or larger trucks to transport our products.)
2. Our existing driveways on both sides of SE 12th Avenue must be retained.
3. Our operations must not be negatively impacted by the additional signalization/traffic controls that will be located at the intersection of SE 12th Avenue and the light-rail alignment.

These requirements include the time periods during construction of the light rail project, as well as when the project construction is completed.

One of the cited "Measures" of the objective identified above is "Support the activity centers like Oregon Museum of Science and Industry." While we are not a regional museum, we are almost an institution in Portland, and the metropolitan area, because we are a large and long-time supplier of masonry building supplies.

The SDEIS addresses the property acquisitions that are required and identified as "Disadvantages." Should our business not be allowed to operate as described above, this should also be identified in the final EIS as a disadvantage. One advantage to the proposed project is that our land use is not likely to be negatively affected by the light rail's noise and vibration impacts. Our existing buildings will buffer some of those impacts to more sensitive land uses in the area.

Conclusion

We have been communicating with the partners of the light rail project -- Metro, TriMet, and the City of Portland on an ongoing basis since its inception to track how the project will affect our property. We understand that final engineering plans are yet to be completed. Our concerns need to be addressed in these engineering plans.

We support the proposed Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project. While our customers are not likely to be light rail users to access our site, our employees are.

We hope we can continue to be an active, vibrant business headquarters at this location. Our business compliments other builders' suppliers in the CEID. We are conveniently located for the many businesses and individuals who purchase our products on a regular basis.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the SDEIS.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Nick Merriman Sr.
Nick Merriman Jr.
Owners of Masons Supply Company
June 19, 2008

Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project,
Metro,
600 NE Grand Avenue,
Portland, OR 97232

Re: SMILE Support of Proposed Harold Street Station

To Whom It May Concern:

By a vote of 6-4, the SMILE Board endorsed the proposed Harold Street Light rail station for the South Corridor Phase II: Portland – Milwaukie Light Rail Project. The majority of our board believes that a station at SE Harold Street will increase light rail ridership and offer a livable alternative to driving throughout the Portland metro area. As population increases, the South Corridor Phase II: Portland – Milwaukie Light Rail project will promote greater, less congestive options to commuting or general driving.

The Board had several concerns and comments about the proposed light rail station, including:

- The Harold street station will require pedestrian bridges connecting both the west side and east sides to neighborhoods in order to be safe.
- If budget cuts limit the station, then building a platform now, with the option to "turn up the station" at a later date would be a compromise.
- Security is a big issue for Sellwood. Having Light Rail security presence, especially fare checkers and policing the stations will be a determining factor in whether the light rail is successful or increases crime.
- The Harold street station should not be a precursor for increasing zoning density.

The vote had a lot of emotion attached to it with those opposed bringing up valid concerns.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Paul Notti
SMILE
Sellwood Moreland Improvement League
8210 SE 13th Avenue
Portland, OR 97202

President, Sellwood Moreland Improvement League
Email: president@sellwood.org

Cc: SMILE Board of Directors
ODOT Region 1  
123 NW Flanders St.  
Portland, OR 97209

June 23, 2008

Subject: Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project SDEIS

Bridget Wiegert  
METRO Regional Headquarters  
600 SE Grand Avenue  
Portland, OR 97232

Dear Bridget,

We appreciate the efforts Metro Staff, TriMet, and our Regional Partners have made in compiling the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the South Corridor Phase II Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project. We are pleased to see the progress being made on this expansion of the region’s mass transit system. We look forward to implementation and to realizing the project’s anticipated improvement of mobility and reduction of traffic congestion in the corridor.

Comments from the ODOT staff, including both Rail and Highway Divisions, are attached to this letter, which we sincerely hope will be helpful in the further pursuit of the project’s goals. I believe our concerns are well known to you, which are primarily focused on continuing the most efficient operation possible of SE McLoughlin Boulevard. In particular, for both safety and operational reasons we oppose at-grade light rail crossing of SE McLoughlin and would also oppose a signalized transit-only left turn at SE 8th Avenue and Powell Boulevard. In completing the FEIS and preliminary engineering for the project ODOT will need to review and approve all impacts and mitigations to our highway system. Our Region 1 Traffic review of the SDEIS and supporting documents is complete and is available to assist you in that analysis. We look forward to working with you on both issues to develop viable alternative accommodations for transit operations.

Concurrently, we strongly support the concept of a Tillamook Branch alignment, the Porter-Sherman river crossing location, the proposed station locations, the recommended downtown Milwaukie alignment and the Park Avenue terminus. We look forward to our continued work in pursuing this valuable transportation project. If you have any questions regarding the attached comments, please do not hesitate to call me or any of the ODOT staff.

Sincerely,

Jason Tend  
Manager

cc: Neil McFarlane
ODOT Comments on the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project SDEIS
June 20, 2008

Subject: Rail Crossing Locations and Crossing Orders Required

The attached spreadsheet outlines what I understand to be the crossing locations that may or may not be regulated by ODOT Rail. Where possible, I have indicated the locations that will require a crossing ORDER, if the recommended Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) is chosen as currently anticipated in the Draft PMG Findings and Recommendations to the South Corridor Steering Committee report dated June 10, 2008.

Here are the specific concerns of ODOT Rail about the proposed LRT corridor alongside Union Pacific Railroad’s Brooklyn Subdivision main tracks:

- The construction of LRT tracks parallel to UPRR will create extremely wide crossings (100 feet or more between the outside tracks). The existing UPRR rail segment has double main line tracks between SE 8th and Brooklyn Yard. UPRR is reportedly requiring the LRT tracks to be a minimum of 50 feet from the nearest track.
- Vehicle traffic at these crossings must be cleared before train arrival by using all available traffic engineering technology and methods. These include Advance Preemption of traffic signal phases to clear the crossing conflict area of all vehicles and use of Queue-cutter signals, Pre-signals, etc. to assure that additional vehicles are not allowed to enter the crossing conflict area.
- All at-grade crossings shall be equipped with Flashing-light signals and automatic gates. The crossing signals shall be interconnected with adjacent vehicle traffic signals, where they exist or where they are required for crossing safety. All at-grade crossings shall have medians or median curb to prevent road users from driving around lowered crossing gates.
- In spite of all available traffic control devices needed to warn the public of approaching trains, nearby railroad switching operations in Brooklyn yard currently impact existing at-grade crossings. It is common to observe “false activations” of the crossing signals at crossings near the yard that are often caused by railroad switching in the yard. Yard activities “trip” the train detection circuitry and activate the crossing signals and train preemption. These occurrences are uncontrollable using conventional technologies.

From ODOT Rail’s perspective, we are highly skeptical that such at-grade crossings can be successfully and safely constructed. Nonetheless, we are committed to work these issues with TriMet and stakeholders to assure the crossings are safe. Where this is not possible, the solution is grade separation or crossing closures.

Commenter: C. David Lanning
Compliance Specialist
Crossing Safety Section
Oregon DOT Rail Division
503.986.4267 (ph)
503.986.3183 (fax)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SW Moody</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Shared Transbay</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - 5</td>
<td>Washcote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CPR Trunk</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
<td>Shared Transbay</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - Creme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Holladay Pkwy, Rd</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
<td>Shared Transbay</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - Creme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BLK 2898</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Shared Transbay</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>C-769,04-A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stangell Spur</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
<td>Shared Transbay</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>C-769.88</td>
<td>7597821</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Remove spur?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SE 8th</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>C-769.60</td>
<td>7597247</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SE Division Place</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
<td>LRT - Close crossing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>C-769.95</td>
<td>7597244</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SE 9th</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - Clinton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SE Clinton</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
<td>LRT - Close crossing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>C-769.15</td>
<td>7597348</td>
<td>Yes - Clinton Station Location?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SE 12th</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>C-769.43</td>
<td>7597249</td>
<td>Yes - Clinton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SE 13th</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>C-769.30-4E</td>
<td>7597349</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SE 14th</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
<td>LRT on Modified Bridge</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>C-769.19-B</td>
<td>7597249</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SE 15th</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - PF 159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SE 16th</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - PF 159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SE 17th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - PF 159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SE 18th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - PF 159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SE 19th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - PF 159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SE 20th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - PF 159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>SE 21st</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - PF 159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>SE 22nd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>LRT - 165 vehicles</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SE 23rd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>SE 24th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>SE 25th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>SE 26th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>YES * - installation of Flashing light signals and automatic gates. All locations, the devices must be interconnected with adjacent vehicle signals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 1   PDX/SW Crossings_LRT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Crossing Location</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Controlled?</td>
<td>Order Required?</td>
<td>Type Facility - Explanation</td>
<td>Adjacent to UP/R?</td>
<td>ODOT No.</td>
<td>USDOT Near Station?</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tacoma Station Drive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>YES *</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>741.04</td>
<td>7411048</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mahweel Dr Overpass</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FDL</td>
<td>74140-A</td>
<td>7411055</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Milwaukee Expressway Overpass</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FDL</td>
<td>74150-C</td>
<td>7411055</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>SE Madison</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>YES *</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FDL</td>
<td>741150-C</td>
<td>7411055</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>SE Washington</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>YES *</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FDL</td>
<td>741150-C</td>
<td>7411055</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>SE First</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>YES *</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FDL</td>
<td>741150-C</td>
<td>7411055</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>SE Adams</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>YES *</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FDL</td>
<td>741150-C</td>
<td>7411055</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Lake Road</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FDL</td>
<td>74110-B</td>
<td>7411917</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>SE McLoughlin Blvd</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FDL</td>
<td>74110-B</td>
<td>7411917</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*YES* = Installation of flashing-light signals and automatic gates. At many locations, these devices must be interconnected with adjacent vehicle traffic signals.
ODOT Comments on the Portland-Milwaukee Light Rail Project SDEIS
June 20, 2008

Subject: Historic Resources

It appears that the Tillamook Branch alignment satisfies Section 4(f) requirements to choose the feasible and prudent alternative that avoids the "use" of a resource (the old State Highway Division office at 9002 SE McLoughlin Blvd.) The only consequence is that the project would require property from the parcel containing the "potentially NR eligible" house at 2326 SE Monroe St. This would be a Section 4(f) use, but one that appears to be minimal.

It would have been nice to see the Section 106 documentation that demonstrates that the house is indeed potentially eligible. We have not seen this particular property, but would like to know how the researcher concluded that the house was potentially eligible. For instance, how many of the seven "aspects of integrity" does it possess? How is it potentially "significant" under the National Register criteria?

Please note that as of April 11, 2008, all references to Section 4(f) in the Code of Federal Regulations must cite 23 CFR 774 rather than 23 CFR 771. "While Section 4(f) remains codified in law at Title 49 United States Code (USC) § 303 and 23 USC § 138, the regulation implementing this law has been moved from 23 CFR 771, FHWA's NEPA implementation regulation, to 23 CFR 774, in order to highlight that Section 4(f) is one of numerous social, economic, and environmental issues that must be considered under the "umbrella" of the environmental review process. In addition to being assigned a new location, the regulation has been reorganized to improve clarity and readability." See http://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/eirming/newsletters/mar08nl.asp

Specific comments on Appendix K; Section 4(f).

Somewhere, at the beginning of the Section 4(f) Evaluation, please define "de minimis."

On pages K-18 to K-21 of the Section 4(f) Evaluation: Why is there a discussion here in the Section 4(f) Evaluation about Section 106 levels of effect on historic properties? It should be discussing Section 4(f) "use" of historic properties and whether or not the use is de minimis. For instance, in the Tillamook Branch alternative, the discussion should address whether the alternative's Section 4(f) use of 2326 SE Monroe Street can satisfy de minimis. Does the project have at most a Section 106 No Adverse Effect on the property and is the Section 4(f) use considered to be "minimal" (de minimis)? If so, then it is likely de minimis Section 4(f). The authors need to be very diligent about using the appropriate vocabulary when discussing Section 4(f).

One general comment. The authors of the SDEIS repeat the fault common found in many documents written about roads in Oregon, where highway numbers and route numbers are interchanged. In this document, "Highway 26" should read "US 26." Likewise, "Highway 224" should read "Oregon 224." Finally, "Highway 99E" should read "Oregon 99E."

Commenter: Robert W. Hadlow, Ph.D.
Interim Environmental Manager
Oregon Department of Transportation, Region 1
123 NW Flanders Street
Portland, OR 97209-4012
503-731-8455
robert.w.hadlow@odot.state.or.us
ODOT Comments on the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project SDEIS
June 20, 2008

Subject: Williamette River Bridge

According to page 2-10 and Figures H.2-1 and H.2-2 in Appendix H, the conceptual bridge design calls for two 12-foot shared bicycle/pedestrian lanes.

The Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan calls for min 10' wide multi-use paths, with 12' in high use areas plus 3' shy distance on both sides. Where a path is parallel to a roadway, there should be a min 5' separation between the path and the edge of pavement, or a physical barrier of sufficient height. This bridge should be considered to be in a high-use area. There does not seem to be any shy distance assumed in the conceptual design.

The City of Portland's minimum and desirable bridge design standards are as follows: Shared use path: min 16' clear of obstructions for 2-way path (12' plus 2' shy distance on both sides) - desirable 20' clear of obstructions; Bikeway: min 5' desirable 6.5' Sidewalk: min 8' clear of obstructions (6' through zone + 2' furnishings/curb zone) - desirable 12' clear of obstructions (6' through zone + 2.5' furnishings/curb zone + 1.5' frontage zone adjacent to outside bridge rail).

Commenter: Lidwien Rahman
Principal Planner
Oregon Department of Transportation, Region 1
123 NW Flanders Street
Portland, OR 97209-4012
503-731-8229
lidwien.rahman@odot.state.or.us
Re: Proposed at grade crossing of McLoughlin Blvd by Milwaukee light rail extension.

ODOT Rail Division is opposed to an at grade crossing of McLoughlin Blvd by the light rail line because of the safety risk associated with the volume, including trucks, and speed of vehicles on this highway.

In addition to the primary objection stated above, there are numerous additional safety risks associated with the particular location proposed. They include the following:

1. The proposed crossing is at the bottom of a long hill. This compounds the speed issue especially with regard to large trucks and inclement weather.
2. Visibility is severely restricted to northbound motorists in the SE quadrant.
3. Visibility is severely limited to southbound motorists because of the roadway curvature and railroad overpass north of the proposed crossing.
4. The proposed crossing traverses the highway at an acute angle which creates an extreme hazard to motorcyclists and can cause even four wheeled vehicles to fishtail while going around the curve in wet weather.
5. The angle of the crossing makes it very long and wide which in turn makes the distance between crossing gates excessive, increasing the opportunity for gate runarounds.
6. There is a signaled intersection to the south of the proposed crossing which will create queues across the tracks.

This letter is a follow up to a meeting held with Metro, Trimet and ODOT Region 1 on January 11, 2008.

Charles S Kettenring, PE
Mgr Crossing Safety

Cc Kelly Taylor, Administrator, ODOT Rail Division
  David Kim, ODOT, Area Mgr, Region 1
Portland-Milwaukee Light Rail Project
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

Dear People:

Please consider these comments in your analysis of the draft environmental impact statement for the Portland-Milwaukee light-rail project.

The DEIS reveals that the proposed light-rail line produces disappointingly tiny benefits for a staggeringly high price. The construction cost of $1.2 to $1.4 billion (table 5.1-1) combined with the added operating costs of $5.5 to $6.8 million per year (table 5.1-3) represent dollars that could do many positive things for the Portland area. Building a light-rail line to Milwaukee is apparently not one of them.

According to table 4.2-6, the most expensive light-rail alternative considered in the DEIS will increase corridor transit ridership by a meager 3.9 percent. The other alternatives will increase it by only about 3.0 percent. Table 4.2-11 says that this trivial increase in ridership will be associated with a similarly trivial 2.9 percent (at most) reduction in peak-hour traffic. Relatively minor and very inexpensive improvements in bus service should easily be able to achieve these ridership levels and reductions in auto traffic.

Unfortunately, the DEIS failed to include any alternatives that attempted to accomplish the same benefits as light rail using buses only. The National Environmental Policy Act, under which environmental impact statements are written, requires agencies to consider a full range of alternatives. In this case, this includes alternatives that can attain similar benefits without using light rail to see if those alternatives have lower financial and environmental costs.

The environmental costs of the Milwaukee light-rail proposal are almost as staggering as the financial costs. Table 3.12-3 indicates that building the light-rail line will consume nearly 2.8 trillion BTUs of energy.

The DEIS fails to calculate the CO₂ emissions that will accompany this prodigious use of energy. Unlike the energy used to operate the light rail most of the energy used to build it is likely to come from fossil fuels. Burning fossil fuels generates about 150 to 200 pounds of CO₂ per million BTUs of energy, for a total of around 200,000 tons of greenhouse gas emissions.

The project will generate greenhouse gases in other ways as well. Concrete used in ties, rail stations, and other parts of the project emits about 400 pounds of CO₂ per cubic yard. The final EIS must analyze and consider this impact on the environment.

The DEIS claims that light-rail operations will save a small amount of energy compared with the no-build alternative (table 3.12-2). However, the DEIS incorrectly calculated
future energy usage by automobiles. Page 3-151 says that planners presumed that future energy consumption will remain proportional to miles of driving. This is wrong.

Under the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, the average miles per gallon of new car fleets must increase from 27.5 mpg today to 35 mpg by 2020. As the auto fleet turns over, auto energy consumption will decline by about one-third between now and 2030, from about 3,800 BTUs per passenger mile today to about 2,600 in 2030. This decrease can be expected to continue for years after that. The decline in energy consumption will be even more if people respond to today’s higher fuel prices by buying more fuel-efficient cars even faster than contemplated by the Energy Independence Act.

The Milwaukee light-rail line will almost certainly fail to match this. Portland’s other light-rail operations average about 2,500 BTUs per passenger mile today, but when the construction cost is added, the total cost per passenger mile is much higher. As a result, the Milwaukee line will be a net energy loser.

Although table 3.11-12 of the DEIS projects that operating the Milwaukee light-rail line will reduce greenhouse gas emissions, this is also based on the incorrect assumption about future auto energy efficiencies. Since CO₂ emissions from autos are proportional to fuel consumption, the estimates of auto emissions in the DEIS are, like the energy estimates, about a third too high. When combined with the huge emissions required for construction, it is likely that the Milwaukee light-rail line will be a net contributor to the atmosphere’s CO₂ load.

One of the reasons why light rail does not particularly reduce greenhouse gas emissions is that light rail does not replace bus service; it merely reroutes it. Many people imagine that the clean electricity used to power light rail becomes a substitute for the CO₂ emitting Diesel engines used to power buses. But table 3.12-2 shows that, under the light-rail alternatives, buses in the Milwaukee corridor continue to use more than 99 percent as much energy as in the no-build alternative. Many of these buses will be feeder buses, which typically attract fewer riders because many people will prefer to drive to light-rail stations. Fewer riders on the buses means more energy and greenhouse gas emissions per passenger mile. People driving to the stations who might otherwise have walked to a bus stop means the same.

In short, the Milwaukee light-rail project represents a gigantic financial investment, a huge energy investment, and huge emissions of greenhouse gases, all for tiny or non-existent increases in transit ridership, reductions in driving, and reductions in environmental impacts. To comply with NEPA requirements for a full range of alternatives, Metro must prepare a bus alternative that achieves the same ridership levels as the rail alternative and show whether there is any reason why the region should invest in the rail alternative when buses can produce the same benefits at a much lower cost.

Yours truly,

Randal O’Toole
June 20, 2008

Metro, Tri-Met, Federal Transit Administration
sent via email: trans@oregonmetro.gov

Re: Comments on Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Study for the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

To Representatives of Metro, Tri-Met, and the Federal Transit Administration

The Board of Trustees of the Portland Waldorf School (PWS Board) hereby offers its comments on the recently published Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Study (SDEIS) related to the South Corridor Light Rail Project. Portland Waldorf School is a private school helping develop the minds, wills, and bodies of children from pre-kindergarten through 12th grade. The school resides in an historic building located at 2300 SE Harrison in Milwaukie, Oregon. This site sits directly adjacent to the freight rail corridor along which the only currently considered alignment of the South Corridor Light Rail Project runs. The lone alignment being evaluated in the SDEIS runs along the western property line of the school, within 50-100 feet of the school property and its high school building and early childhood outdoor learning area.

The PWS Board has been actively involved in the process to date and its participation has included many verbal and/or written communications with Metro and Tri-Met representatives, Milwaukie city government officials, and Mr. Krockalis with the FTA. We have been consistent in our support of mass transit (including light rail) as an environmentally friendly alternative for commuters in and around the Portland area. However, the PWS Board has also been consistent in its concerns about:

1. The all too narrow focus on a single alignment through downtown Milwaukie;
2. The resulting SDEIS, that is inadequate in its study of reasonable and viable, alternative alignments, rendering the SDEIS flawed in its goal to evaluate relative impacts of alternatives in an effort to find the best transit solution. It has also been suggested that this inadequate study of reasonable and viable alternatives renders the process non-conforming to NEPA guidelines;
3. The impacts on our school should this project be built as recommended in the SDEIS.

FTA, Metro, and Tri-Met contend in Section 2 of the SDEIS that alternatives through downtown Milwaukie were considered, but warranted no further consideration in the SDEIS. This lack of consideration of previously suggested reasonable and viable alternatives significantly influences the PWS Boards' comments on the SDEIS. The primary concerns for our school arising from the possibility of having a mass transit light rail line very close to the school are safety, security (crime), noise, vibration, and visual distractions in the learning environment. The PWS Board believes these are all negative impacts that would be significantly lessened by re-aligning the project along McLoughlin, Main, or 21st or by ending light rail north of Milwaukie and

www.portlandwaldorfschool.org
implementing alternative transit connections from the terminus. Conversely, the benefits of light rail to our school, such as access to the school from the broader community and vice-versa, would not be significantly degraded by re-aligning this project as described above. The SDEIS, however, does not allow an objective analysis of that belief nor does it allow us, or any other affected school, business, or individual to prove the merits of these alternatives.

Notwithstanding, and in addition to, our concerns about the validity of the SDEIS, the PWS Board has concerns about the criteria used to evaluate what effects are impactful to our school. We are concerned that federal guidelines are not adequate to gauge the impact on our students of incremental crime, noise, vibration, visual distractions, and safety hazards. We consider any adverse changes to our environment a potential risk to our mission of developing the intellect, spirit, imagination, and social awareness of our students. We consider the broad mitigation concepts too vague to alleviate any concerns.

The PWS Board hopes the comments contained herein will influence a decision to step back and conduct a more thorough impact study of various transit alternatives that is NEPA compliant. In this way, Portland, Milwaukie and the surrounding communities will benefit from a mass transit solution developed with transparency and consciousness.

Sincerely,
Portland Waldorf School Board of Trustees
June 19, 2008

To: trans@oregonmetro.gov,
    Metro; Portland-Milwaukee Light Rail Project
    600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland, Oregon, 97232

From: Capt. Peter L. Richards
      Chairman, Columbia Region Harbor Safety Committee (CRHSC)

Re: Public Comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) Evaluation and the South Corridor, Portland-Milwaukee Light Rail Project

cc: Capt. Fred Myer, COTP, USCG Sector Portland (via Lt. William Taylor)
    Capt. Paul Amos, President Columbia River Pilots, Vice Chair CRHSC
    Ms. Heather Moats, Port Manager - Incheakey Shipping Services, Secretary Treasurer, CRHSC
    Lt. William Taylor, USCG Liaison, CRHSC
    MST1 Lucia Mack, USCG Liaison, CRHSC
    Members of the CRHSC Bridges Sub-Committee

To whom it may concern:

The CRHSC is comprised of commercial and private waterway users; federal, state and local waterway regulators and others interested in the preservation and use of the waterways in our area of responsibility.

Goals of the CRHSC include:
- Ensuring the continuation and improvement of safe, reliable, cost-effective maritime transportation,
- Enhancing the safety of waterway recreation, and
- Promoting prudent management practices for our waterways.

The CRHSC works to accomplish its goals by providing a forum for the cooperative coordination of actions by all concerned, committed and informed stakeholders. The CRHSC Bridges Sub-Committee evaluates and acts on issues of concern relating to bridges over our navigable waterways under the direction of the CRHSC Managing Board. The South Corridor, Portland-Milwaukee Light Rail Project has become a focus of attention of the Bridges Sub-Committee.

This letter is to notify you of our specific and continuing interest in providing meaningful public comment during all stages of planning and implementation of the project. Therefore, as the project moves forward, please keep us informed in advance of all:
1. Progress concerning the project,
2. Opportunities for us to partner with your planners, and
3. Opportunities to provide public comment.

We also invite you to nominate a representative from your organization to the Bridges Sub-Committee. Please let us know if you will take us up on this offer. Our comments follow.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Capt. Peter L. Richards

Chairman; Columbia Region Harbor Safety Committee
805 Broadway, Suite 410
Vancouver, Wa 98660
peter.richards@portsamerica.com
Office: 360 759 0595
Cell: 503 519 2161
June 6, 2008

To: The Managing Board of the Columbia Region Harbor Safety Committee
From: The Bridges Sub-Committee

Re: Initial Public Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) Evaluation and the South Corridor, Portland-Milwaukee Light Rail Project

Public Comment

Our focus for the Portland-Milwaukee Light Rail project is the proposed Willamette River Crossing and its impact on river users. We are not offering specific comments on the proposed bridge design since there is no design as yet. We do offer our general comments and also request that we be involved in the design and planning, particularly in relation to the following:

1. Bridge Height

The SDEIS has proposed a bridge clearance of 75 feet, although the current standard for this area is 120 feet. Many of our members have raised objections to the 75 foot height, because it constrains the current use of the river south of this point. The SDEIS eliminates a large number of current and future river users. We are specifically concerned about the commercial use for large vessels, tugs and crane barges for such situations as emergency response to floating homes and bridges, and was the need during the flood of 1996; construction projects, such as the repair or replacement of the Sellwood Bridge, and standard daily business during high water periods.

An advertised air draft of 75 feet does not mean that a vessel with an air draft of 75 feet can safely navigate the bridge. Navigational bridge clearance must factor in tide and a reasonable clearance margin above the vessel. Such factors would impact many of the vessels on the SDEIS survey that are currently considered as unaffected.

At this time the CRHSC will not support a bridge clearance of 75 feet and recommends exploring other options such as a draw bridge, a swing bridge or a taller bridge.

2. Channel Alignment and Width

The channel alignment and width between the bridge pilings are highly important factors in safe navigation and will need to be addressed fully and satisfactorily with the river users during the design phase.

3. Expanded River User List

The SDEIS River User List represents vessels in different height categories, but does not take into account all potential current and future vessels within those categories. There are currently more tug and crane barges in service than are represented on the SDEIS list. This increases the number of vessels impacted by the proposed height of 75 feet.

Other areas to consider would be an increase of taller personal watercraft such as sailboats with the development of the Portland South Waterfront and new technologies for vessel propulsion, including solar panels and wind turbines which can make vessels taller.

4. Rising River Level

The SDEIS does not consider the potential impact of Global Warning and rising river levels. This could have a long term impact on river use. Higher river levels reduce the number of vessels able to use the river.

5. Construction Impact

Finally, we believe it is important to conduct an analysis of the impact during the construction of the bridge upon river users that addresses river closures, traffic disruptions and clearance height and width restrictions.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Corwin
Bridges Sub-Committee Chairperson
Dear Metro,

The city of Milwaukee is over 100 years old and I have been living in the Milwaukee area for over 50 years. If light rail comes through downtown Milwaukee, it will destroy the home you can city for good. The majority of people in Milwaukee do not want this rail through town. We should at least get to vote on this project.

The 4 schools that are in Milwaukee will see an increase in bad behavior for the kids. Also, the crime rate has increased in other lines, as I am sure this will happen here too. The cross traffic on Harrison, Washington, and Lake Rds will be drastically effected by stopping to wait for the trains to come during school hrs and church hrs. You will not be able to get on Lake Shore St. to drive home.

Please consider stopping the rail before it gets into downtown Milwaukee. Thank you.

Sincerely, [Signature]
Why Light Rail Is Wrong for Clackamas County

Published by ORTEM. For more information, see ortem.org and americandreamcoalition.org.

Light Rail Does Not Reduce Congestion

Portland's light rail carries only about 1 percent of passenger travel in the Portland area, which is not enough to make a difference on our crowded roads. If anything, new light-rail lines add to congestion when they run in or across streets.

Rail advocates love to brag that Portland's transit ridership grew by almost 60 percent in the 1990s. What they fail to mention is that TriMet ridership grew by 180 percent in the 1970s, when the agency was running only buses. This is because TriMet was able to improve bus service throughout the region.

Light rail is an extremely expensive way to improve service in only a few corridors. Due to the high cost of light rail, TriMet cannot make many improvements in bus service, and at times has had to reduce bus service to pay for rail cost overruns.

In 1980, 9.8 percent of all commuters in the Portland area rode transit to work. Today, thanks to the high cost of light rail, only 7.6 percent of Portland-area commuters ride transit to work. How does that relieve congestion?

Light Rail Does Not Save Energy

A light-rail car may use less energy per passenger than an equally loaded bus. But light rail does not reduce the number of miles of bus operations. Instead, TriMet changes corridor buses that once took people directly to their destinations to feeder buses, which require people to change to the light-rail line.

These feeder buses are necessary for transit-dependent people. But most people end up driving to the light-rail stations, so the feeder buses run emptier than the corridor buses they replaced. The result is that the transit system as a whole consumes more energy and emits more greenhouse gases than before the light-rail line opened.

- After TriMet opened the light-rail line to Gresham, its energy consumption per passenger mile increased by 5 percent, and its CO₂ emissions per passenger mile increased by 13 percent.
- After TriMet opened the light-rail line to Hillsboro, its energy consumption per passenger mile increased by 7 percent, and its CO₂ emissions per passenger mile increased by 11 percent.

This does not even count the huge energy cost required to build light rail. It costs energy to build roads, too, but because roads are so much more heavily used than transit, the energy cost of roads per passenger mile is far lower than for rail transit.

Light Rail Does Not Stimulate Development

Rail advocates claim that light rail stimulates billions of dollars of improvements and redevelopment. Even if you want five-story apartment buildings and mixed-use developments in your neighborhood—which most people do not—light rail does not do a very good job of stimulating such development.

In 1986, when Portland opened its first light-rail line, the city rezoned all the land near light-rail stations for high-density, transit-oriented development. Ten years later, planners reported to the city council that not a single development of this sort had been built.

"It is a myth to think that the market will take care of development along transit corridors," said Portland City Commissioner Charles Hales. Hales proposed to subsidize such developments with property tax breaks and a variety of other subsidies.

To date, Portland has given close to $2 billion in subsidies to developers in the Pearl District, the South Waterfront District, the airport, on Interstate Avenue, and in other areas served by light rail or streetcars. Gresham, Beaverton, and other cities have also subsidized development near light-rail stations. It is these subsidies, not the rail lines, that have stimulated development.

Light Rail Is Not High-Capacity Transit

Rail advocates like to claim that rail lines can carry as many people as an eight-lane freeway. But, other than New York subways, no rail line in the country comes close to carrying as many people as even one freeway lane.

The average mile of Portland-area light-rail line carries less than 20 percent as many people per day as the average mile of Portland-area freeway lane. Yet light rail costs far more to build than a freeway lane.

Buses Are Better than Rail

Portland replaced its streetcar system in the 1950s for a good reason: buses are faster, more flexible, and cost less than rail. Studies show that transit riders don't care
whether the vehicle they are riding on has rubber tires or steel wheels. They care instead about the quality of service. When TriMet improved bus service on the #33 McLoughlin bus in 2000, it gained 20 percent more riders.

Buses can run more frequently than rail, they can run as fast or faster than rail, and they can serve more neighborhoods than rail, all at a far lower cost. Buses can also move more people: a bus lane can move ten times as many people as a light-rail line.

Light Rail Is a Tragic Waste of Money

The Sellwood Bridge is so badly deteriorated that it has been closed to bus and truck traffic; several other bridges in the Portland area are also overdue for replacement, and Metro claims it doesn't have the money to relieve congestion at some of the worst bottlenecks in the Portland area. At times like these, spending money on light rail is a tragic misplacement of priorities.

Because of the high cost of light rail, Portland is spending well over half of its transportation dollars on a transit system that carries less than 2.5 percent of all travel (including both buses and rail). The result is that your time is wasted in traffic and your car wastes fuel and emits more pollution. Portland should spend money on actions that will relieve congestion, not make it worse.

Sources

Data in this fact sheet come from the U.S. Department of Transportation's reports, Highway Statistics and National Transit Database, and from the U.S. Department of Energy report, Transportation Energy Data Book. All of these reports are available online.
Portland-Milwaukee Light Rail Project

Wednesday, March 19, 2008
6:00 pm to 8:30 pm
Milwaukee High School commons
11300 SE 23rd Ave., Milwaukie

Join the Portland-Milwaukee Light Rail Project community process and discuss the trade-offs between potential light rail station locations in the North downtown Milwaukee.

This meeting will focus on gathering community input about what makes a good station and/or park and ride, what good things are already present in the community, what downtown stations work best and why and what folks would like the area to look like in 20 years. Information will also be available on the Milwaukee station and park and ride in the North Industrial area of Milwaukee and the potential Bluebird Street Station south of downtown. For more information, please call City of Milwaukee Information Coordinator, Grady Wheeler, at (503) 786-7503, or visit the project's website at www.metro-region.org/southcorridor.

Light Rail Is a Tragic Waste of Money

The Sellwood Bridge has been closed to bus and truck traffic and Metro claims it doesn't have the money to relieve congestion at some of the worst bottlenecks in the region. At times like these, spending money on light rail is a tragic misplacement of priorities.

Portland is spending over half of its transportation dollars on a transit system that carries less than 2.5 percent of all travel (including both buses and rail). The result is that your time is wasted in traffic and your car wastes fuel and emits more pollution. Portland should spend money on actions that will relieve congestion, not make it worse.

Light Rail Does Not Save Energy

When Tri-Met opens a new light-rail line, it changes corridor buses that once took people directly to their destinations into feeder buses, which require people to transfer to the light rail. But most people end up driving to the light-rail stations, so the feeder buses run emptier than the corridor buses they replaced. The result is that the Tri-Met system as a whole consumes more energy and emits more greenhouse gases than before the light-rail line opened.

* After Tri-Met opened the light-rail line to Gresham, its energy consumption per passenger mile increased by 5 percent, and its CO2 emissions per passenger mile increased by 13 percent.
* After TriMet opened the light-rail line to Hillsboro, its energy consumption per passenger mile increased by 7 percent, and its CO2 emissions per passenger mile increased by 11 percent.

This does not even count the huge energy cost required to build light rail. Since few people ride it, the energy cost per rider is very high relative to roads.

For More Information

Data in this fact sheet come from the U.S. Department of Transportation's Highway Statistics and National Transit Database, and from the U.S. Department of Energy report, Transportation Energy Data Book. All of these reports are available online. Also see americandreamcoalition.org, ti.org/antiplanner, debunkingportland.com, and ortem.org.
Why Light Rail Is Wrong for Clackamas County

**Light Rail Does Not Reduce Congestion**

If light rail comes to Milwaukie, be prepared for more congestion. Portland’s light rail carries only about 1 percent of passenger travel in the Portland area, which is not enough to make a difference on our crowded roads. Instead, new light-rail lines add to congestion and parking problems when they run in or cross streets.

Light rail expensively improves service in only a few corridors. Due to the high cost of light rail, Tri-Met cannot make many improvements in bus service, and at times has had to reduce bus service to pay for rail cost overruns.

In 1980, 9.8 percent of all commuters in the Portland area rode transit to work. Today, thanks to the high cost of light rail, only 7.6 percent of Portland-area commuters ride transit to work. How does that relieve congestion?

**Light Rail Does Not Stimulate Development**

If light rail comes to Milwaukie, expect more density and subsidies. Even if you want five-story apartment buildings and mixed-use developments in your neighborhood which most people do not-light rail does not stimulate such developments.

Instead, Portland and its suburbs have given close to $2 billion in subsidies to developers on the light-rail and streetcar lines—subsidies that take money from schools, fire, police, and other essential services. It is these subsidies, not the rail lines, that stimulated development.

**Light Rail Is Not High-Capacity Transit**

Rail advocates like to claim that rail lines can carry as many people as an eight-lane freeway. That’s only true if people ride it. The average mile of Portland-area light-rail line carries less than 20 percent as many people per day as the average mile of Portland-area freeway lane. Yet light rail costs far more to build than a freeway lane.

**Buses Are Better than Rail**

Transit riders don’t care whether the vehicle they are riding on has rubber tires or steel wheels. They care instead about the quality of service. When Tri-Met improved bus service on the #33 McLoughlin bus in 2000, it gained 20 percent more riders.

Buses can run faster, more frequently, and serve more neighborhoods than rail, all at a far lower cost. Buses can also move more people: a bus lane can move ten times as many people as a light-rail line.

**Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project**

*Wednesday, March 19, 2008
6:00 pm to 8:30 pm
Milwaukie High School Commons
11300 SE 23rd Ave., Milwaukie*
DEAR DAVID Bragdon-ORE. Metro,

My biggest concern is with light rail coming into downtown Milwaukee. I have lived in the Milwaukee area for over 50 yrs, and have enjoyed the quiet & peaceful neighborhood. The impact on the 4 schools in Milwaukee, which have over 1,000 kids will be bad news & unsafe. Also the noise factor will be an influence for learning on these children. The cross traffic by cars will backup during school & church functions. I feel we should stop light rail before it gets into downtown. South Gate or Tacoma stops would be good alternatives.

Please help keep light rail out of downtown Milwaukee for our kids safe learning experience.

Thanks for your time & consideration.

Sincerely,

Member
ST. JOHN'S
PARISH

Mr. Ralph Ripken
2475 SE Silver Springs Blvd
Portland, Or 97222-9720
June 20, 2008

Robert Liberty, Metro Council
METRO
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232-2736

Subject: Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Testimony

Dear Councilmember Liberty:

Oregon Health & Science University is pleased to submit written testimony regarding the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project.

Oregon Health & Science University, with over 12,000 employees and 2,400 students, is one of the many property owners that will be directly impacted by the proposed light rail project. Metro, Tri Met, the City of Portland and all of the other public agencies have done an outstanding job of seeking and listening to diverse public input.

We wish to acknowledge that each of the local jurisdictions and public agencies involved in the decision making process have a difficult task ahead of them. Not only do they have to make sure that the project meets all of the criteria outlined by the Federal Transit Administration, but they are accountable to a higher community standard: to insure that the new light rail alignment offers the greatest public and economic benefit to the citizens of this region.

OHSU is not a transportation agency, and does not propose to know the answers to the multitude of challenging questions that will need to be addressed during this process. For this reason our testimony will only address the segment of the proposed light rail line which impacts OHSU as a property owner.

OHSU's role in the community is to remain focused on fulfilling our mission as a public corporation: OHSU is dedicated to health and quality of life for all Oregonians through excellence, innovation and leadership in health care, education and research. OHSU is a public university and like other public universities in Oregon it does not make any profit. As Oregon's only health and research university, OHSU provides care to those with the most difficult health challenges.
OHSU also has a unique responsibility to help Oregon address another very serious challenge, and that is a critical shortage of health care workers. The demographic bulge of aging baby boomers will produce an exponential increase in demand for health care services. The same demographic bulge also means greater numbers of physicians, nurses, dentists and other health care workers are retiring themselves – a double whammy. The educational system is not keeping up with the demand for health care workers. OHSU does not have the physical infrastructure it needs to adequately respond to the health care workforce crisis. Addressing the health care workforce crisis will require new partnerships and working with the community to leverage existing resources and investments.

The Schnitzer family’s generous gift of 19 acres of land in the south waterfront area has allowed OHSU to begin planning a unique integrated health care teaching facility that, over time, will help increase the number of health care workers. Campus master planning efforts were accelerated to accommodate the light rail planning needs. The vision incorporates green building methods that maximize view corridors, solar potential and greenway enhancement.

As one of the property owners potentially affected by the Light Rail bridge crossing OHSU was asked to participate in the Willamette River Partnership Committee chaired by former Mayor Vera Katz. The process took an objective look at the 2003 LPA and the four alternative crossings and evaluated all of the options. The primary consideration of this committee was to determine which alignment offers the greatest public benefit. The options on the west side of the Willamette showed the alignment and new bridge crossing in one of two places; either through the middle of the campus on Meade Avenue, or on the southern edge of the campus along the Schnitzer-Zidell property line.

The “Sherman Porter” alignment (south of OMSI on the east side and on the Zidell and OHSU shared property line on the west side) emerged as the crossing that did the best job of maximizing transit connections, providing Science and Technology Quarter linkages between the east and west side of the Willamette, enabling expansion by OMSI and the Opera on the east side and preserving the river’s fish habitat — and therefore offered the greatest public benefit.

Metro determined that all four of the new options being looked at as part of the SDEIS would cost more than the original LPA alignment selected in 2003; depending on the alignment, between $20 million and $30 million more.

A property swap, of equal sized parcels of land, between OHSU and Zidell, emerged as one solution. The property swap would allow the bridge length to be shortened by moving the bridge landing on the west side of the Willamette River slightly north, closer to Meade. The alignment would then angle to the south so that transit station offers riders the best connection to the Tram. We are also hoping that the “refined Sherman-Porter crossing” will also reduce the cost slightly compared to the original Sherman-Porter crossing studied in the SDEIS.
Other modifications were made in the OHSU revised Schnitzer Campus Master Plan to accommodate the City Planning Bureau's preferred street alignment, enhance urban design by moving parking underground, and increasing sustainability by maximizing solar gain and incorporating stormwater and regenerative landscape.

As planning proceeded another potential partnership has emerged. Next month the Board of Higher Education will consider a proposal for a Collaborative Life Sciences Project between the Oregon University System and OHSU. If approved, the OUS Capital Budget Request to the Oregon Legislature will include funds for a new building to be built on the south edge of the Schnitzer Campus close to the light rail station. If funding is approved, the building construction is expected to coincide nicely with the building of the Portland-Milwaukie light rail line.

OHSU recognizes that building the Portland-Milwaukie Light rail project will be a costly venture but we believe one which has the potential to benefit the community for years to come and supports our commitment to a healthier, greener environment. In light of our public mission, OHSU does not have the financial means to contribute to the project but will continue to work in partnership with the public agencies to see that the OHSU resources devoted to the development of the Schnitzer campus take the light rail development into consideration. With all of the property owners committed to working together, we anticipate opportunities for shared costs and mutual benefit to emerge.

In conclusion, OHSU agrees with the Willamette River Partnership Committee recommendation; the "refined Sherman-Porter crossing" offers the greatest public benefit to our community. It is projected that it will increase transit ridership by 10,000 to 12,000, which is important to our community.

This alignment maximizes transit connections and public investment in the Tram. Although light rail won't serve OHSU's direct needs like the Tram does, light rail will provide broad public benefits. It will link the community with the educational resources that will be developed on the Schnitzer Campus and will provide additional attractive transit options for the patients and 12,000 employees who travel to OHSU.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Joseph E. Robertson, Jr., M.D., M.B.A.
President
June 23, 2008

To: Metro Transportation Planning

From: Richard N Ross, AICP
2041 SE Elliott Ave.
Portland Or 97214
richardnross@earthlink.net

RE: Comments on Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Supplemental DEIS

Following are my comments on the Supplemental DEIS, based upon 40 years residence in the Portland neighborhoods served by this line and 25 years of transportation/land use planning work.

1. Willamette Crossing

The Willamette River Partnership proposal makes sense to optimize regional access and land use integration with the OHSU campus and South Waterfront.

2. Connections to Future Streetcar Lines

The Central City Loop should allow Streetcar access to MAX in both directions, West and South (not just West) to allow for future system continuity. While it is in preliminary stages, Portland’s Streetcar System Plan, set for adoption in Spring 09, is considering routes in Southeast that could connect to MAX at Tacoma or Milwaukie-12th-Clinton.

The Final EIS should consider planned Streetcar routes as well as bus routes.

3. Connections to Existing and Future Multi-Use Paths, Bike Boulevards

The Final EIS should evaluate bike and ped traffic and access to OMSI, Tacoma, Park Ave. MAX stations via the Springwater Corridor and future Trolley Trail to Oregon City. Bike and Ride facilities should be part of the Tacoma and Park Ave Stations/Park and Rides. Clinton St station, which is a terminus for a planned Bike Boulevard across Southeast, should include Bike and Ride facilities.

4. Portland Stations

The OMSI station on Sherman should integrate with pedestrian/bike access from OMSI, Esplanade-Springwater Corridor. The Clinton station could anchor a new mixed-use center between Powell and Clinton in underused industrial properties. The Harold station is not needed: It’s isolated at the north end of Westmoreland, has no access from the East,
and has limited mixed-use potential. The Bybee station is essential for central access to MAX from the Woodstock, Reed, Eastmoreland and Westmoreland neighborhoods.

5. 2003 Locally Preferred Alternative with Terminus at Park Ave

This alternative (over the Tillamook Branch route) provides better regional highway access to MAX and spacing of Park and Rides at Tacoma (1000 spaces), north Milwaukie (600 spaces) and Park Ave (1000 spaces), than the 2003 LPA route or Tillamook Branch options. The line should extend to Park Ave to serve riders from Oak Grove and the McLoughlin Corridor, rather than congesting the core of Milwaukie with a Park and Ride. The north Milwaukie Park and Ride has great access to Hwy 224-212. The Final EIS should evaluate the induced traffic from the Tacoma Park and Ride on Johnson Cr Blvd, an overloaded city Street, and whether regional park and ride spaces can be shifted from Tacoma station to north Milwaukie.

6. Transit Security Design

The SDEIS addresses this item, which was inadequate in earlier MAX lines. The Recommendations in the SDEIS are sound, for using Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, but need to be backed up by proactive station design and station area planning, that is done with eyes wide open. Many of the planned stations are in isolated highway, railroad or industrial locations that have proved problematic in the current MAX system. They need 24/7 land uses to keep them safe.
June 13, 2008

Metro
Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project
600 N.E. Grand Avenue
Portland, Or 97232

RE: SDEIS Comment

Dear Sir:

The Port of Portland supports the development and expansion of light rail transit in the Portland metropolitan region. The expansion of light rail service into the Milwaukie corridor will have significant and positive impacts on the region’s overall transit options.

There is only one facet of this project in which the Port of Portland considers itself to be a direct stakeholder: The project’s potential impact on commercial navigation on the Willamette River. Specifically, we believe that a thoughtful and considered decision concerning the design and placement of the Willamette River rail crossing should consider the following to fully address river navigation:

1. General Environmental Benefits: Much like rail-based mass transit, there are clear environmental benefits to commercial navigation when compared to the various alternatives. A ton of cargo requires many times less fuel per mile if moved on a barge, as opposed to moving the same cargo by truck or even by rail. Commercial navigation is both environmentally and economically sound. Any construction contemplated in the Willamette should be cognizant of both the environmental and economic benefits of commercial navigation.
2. Vertical Clearance: Any fixed-span crossing of the Willamette must provide sufficient vertical clearance to accommodate the reasonable needs of commercial navigation. It goes without saying that these decisions will affect vessel safety. Moreover, where rivers are available, they usually prove to be the most economical and fuel efficient means to transport large or heavy cargoes, commodities, or pieces of equipment. We are aware that every additional foot of span height will have an immediate cost to the project, similarly any unreasonable restriction in vertical clearance may have a long term adverse impact on commercial navigation and on the regional economy as a whole. For that reason, we appreciate Metro and TriMet taking deliberate steps to find the correct balance.

3. Horizontal Clearance: The question of horizontal clearance under any new span is just as important as that of vertical clearance. Several of the alignments under discussion may result in a final configuration in which a) the bridge is not perpendicular to the established channel and b) the current may also set strongly across the channel under some conditions. Without sufficient horizontal clearance, both these factors could make maneuvering a tug and barge hazardous, especially when maneuvering downriver in a strong seasonal current. Individually and together, these factors argue in favor of the widest practicable horizontal clearance.

4. Bridge Pier Placement: We appreciate the aesthetic appeal of all the bridge concepts presented in the SDEIS. However, solely from the perspective of commercial navigability, we would like to express our concern about one proposed bridge design. Depending on the eventual design details, the single pier/single pylon cable-stayed span could result in a major new obstruction being created either in, or immediately adjacent to, the Willamette’s navigation channel. We believe this sort of new obstruction could constitute a direct hazard to navigation, and if so, a significant environmental hazard as well. By contrast, the twin pier, cable stayed bridge concept (as presented) appears to offer the best combination of total horizontal clearance and maximum offset distance from the channel centerline to the likely pier locations.

5. Future Commercial Navigation on the Willamette: As noted in the SDEIS, the U.S. Coast Guard has designated the Willamette River a navigable waterway from its confluence with the Columbia up to River Mile 182.3. Access to the upper reaches of the Willamette River is controlled by the operational (though infrequently used) locks at.
Oregon City. In light of the rapidly increasing cost of energy, it is in the best interest of the region to preserve viable navigable waterways as an alternative for moving heavy equipment and some commodities. Therefore, any new crossings of the Willamette River should be designed with likely river traffic in mind.

We appreciate the opportunity to participate in the refinement of the alternatives through the Columbia Region Harbor Safety Committee, and through the U.S. Coast Guard’s own bridge evaluation process. Please contact Eric Burnette, Sr. Waterways Planner (503) 944 7791 or eric.burnette@portofportland.com with any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Sam Ruda
Director, Marine & Industrial Development

cc: Austin Pratt, U.S. Coast Guard
    Steve Greenwood, Oregon Solutions
    Pete Richards, Columbia Region Harbor Safety Committee
    Captain Fred Myer, U.S. Coast Guard
    Jeremy Weber, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
June 4, 2008

To Metro South Corridor SDEIS
600NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232

From Fred Sawyer
14725 SE Linden Ln
Milwaukee, OR 97267-1250

I support the Tillamook terminus at Park Avenue. The SDEIS does not adequately discuss the impacts of an LRT crossing at SE McLoughlin Blvd.

The SDEIS does not provide an estimate for the cost of replacing the RR overcrossing structure and the cost of an southbound through lane and a southbound right turn lane. How long do these lanes need to be? What is the impact of the additional 12' wide southbound through lane and the required width for an southbound right turn lane? The southbound through lane may need to start just south of Kellogg Creek and end at the beginning of the right turn lane at Park Ave. The believe the impacts of an LRT crossing of McLoughlin are too great and the crossing must be grade separated.
June 19, 2008

Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

To whom it may concern:

I support the light rail line from the Portland city center to the city of Milwaukie. However, I strongly oppose extending the line beyond downtown Milwaukie and into Oak Grove. I am vigorously opposed to locating the proposed 1,000 car park and ride facility at the intersection of McLoughlin Blvd. and Park Ave. in Oak Grove. Various interests in Milwaukie have opposed this facility and have pushed it right through town and into Oak Grove. In the process, Milwaukie has passed all the negative aspects of this facility onto Oak Grove while reaping all the benefits light rail will bring to their downtown redevelopment. Milwaukie gets the gain and Oak Grove gets the pain. I believe, for now, the line needs to terminate in Milwaukie. Once this project has started to take shape, we can discuss how and where the line should be extended. By setting a course into Oak Grove, a signal is being sent that the line will continue south through the McLoughlin corridor to Oregon City. This idea may not be acceptable to Oak Grove.

Metro has engaged Milwaukie and its citizens for nearly two years. Many meetings have been held, and Milwaukie’s citizens have voiced their opinions. The very first light rail meeting held in Oak Grove was in March 2008, barely 90 days ago. Before any more consideration is given to the Park Avenue option, Metro needs to engage Oak Grove to the extent it has with other communities along the line.

Here are my concerns with the Park Avenue Extension Option:

• The estimated cost of 140 million dollars or more for a mile of track to a parking garage is an outrageous expense.

• The loss of mature trees and landscape along the only remaining “wild” section of McLoughlin Blvd., and the construction of a huge concrete retaining wall to replace the verdant embankment is unacceptable. The wall will stretch for nearly a half mile and will be a visual eyesore.

• Oak Grove will lose about 6 businesses and as many as 30 residential properties will be affected significantly or eliminated. Because all the commercial property is being used up by the park & ride, there will be little, if any development adjacent to the parking facility. The only reason to go there will be to park, not to shop. The Oak Lodge Sanitary District has a pumping station located in the middle of this proposed location. The structure will be five stories high in an area where nothing is higher than one story, so it will stick out. I don’t want to see the gateway to Oak Grove be an unattractive concrete monolith. I’ve never seen a pretty parking structure.
• Oak Grove gets the traffic. We get an additional 1500 to 2000 car trips a day added to an already busy intersection. There will also be additional traffic on River Road and Outfield Road as people take the "back way" to get to the park & ride. I believe the train crosses Park Ave. at grade adding to the traffic problem. During peak times of the day there will be significant traffic congestion on McLoughlin Blvd.

• Tri-Met is having significant fare collection and security issues at this time. I'm concerned about "bad actors" frequenting the park & ride and using it as a jumping off point to access the northern part of Oak Grove. They can get off the train and walk down the Trolley Trail right into central Oak Grove. This proposed facility is in the center of the Clackamas County Sheriff's Office B-1 Patrol district, which has one of the highest crime rates in the county. I am very concerned about the criminal element and how law enforcement will control crime in the future given the problems we already have in this area. The crime rate needs to be significantly reduced before any more consideration is given to locating this facility at Park Ave.

Milwaukie needs to solve their park & ride problems with a solution that sites the facility within the Milwaukie city limits. I feel the park & ride should be built in the northern industrial area or in the south end of Milwaukie. I am also concerned that Milwaukie's mayor owns property in the south downtown area, and I see a huge conflict of interest on the Mayor's part. Before light rail moves beyond Milwaukie, there needs to be more public involvement, especially with the citizens of Oak Grove.

If the Park Avenue Extension Option is approved, you better start calling it "Oak Grove Light Rail" because that's what it will be. Metro needs to prove there is a benefit to Oak Grove, which they have not done.

Submitted,

Henry Schmidt
14201 SE Bunnell Street
Oak Grove, OR 97267

Cc: Dick Jones, Oak Lodge Community Council
May 12, 2008

Metro
710 NE Holladay Street
Portland, OR 97232

Attn: Ms. Bridget Wieghart Project Manager

Re: Potential Milwaukie Light Rail Alignment Environmental Impact Study

Ms. Wieghart:

I am writing to provide information for the above-referenced study. Harder Mechanical Contractors, Inc. currently operates a pipe fabrication shop at 2323 SE Hanna Harvester Drive in Milwaukie. The building was purchased in December 2000. A very significant financial and labor investment was made in renovating the old Cornell Pump Manufacturing Company property into a modern fabrication shop. Large cranes and pipe handling equipment were modified and upgraded, and we erected a class-100-cleanroom fabrication area which is one of the largest in the Northwest. This allows us to fabricate pipe and other items for the most sophisticated high-tech companies in the world including Intel. To create an environment for fabrication with virtually no particulates or impurities in order to meet the exacting standards for the high-tech industry is a complicated and expensive proposition. Relocating such a facility will also be extremely difficult, if possible at all, and very expensive.

The Harder fabrication shop employs between 40 and 60 union craftsmen. The current hourly wage for a journeyman is $34.99 plus fringe benefits of $16.54 with foremen and supervisors receiving even higher pay. We have 57,000 square feet of warehouse/shop plus 8,700 square feet of office space which houses the offices of up to 10 administrative people including safety officers, quality control people, project engineers and computer aided design specialists. These are also well-paying jobs by local standards. It will be difficult, at best, to relocate anywhere near the present location, and this current economic benefit to the city of Milwaukie, Clackamas County and, probably, even the State of Oregon will be lost.

Our former fabrication shop was in Vancouver, Washington at the Columbia Industrial Park. We looked for a place to relocate for several years before finding the building in Milwaukie. It is very difficult to find suitable property due to the industrial nature of the work which creates a certain amount of noise, truck traffic, etc. Our shop in Milwaukie is ideal and we
have had no complaints from neighbors etc. Traffic access is also good.

With industrial property in short supply it will be very difficult to replace our facility. Additionally we have been quite busy in the shop with some major projects just beginning and we anticipate remaining so. The other problem is that we are under deadlines to complete certain fabrications. A relocation and rebuilding of our current operation will inevitably cause delays and operational difficulties. Much of our equipment is such a part of the real estate that moving it is a time consuming and expensive endeavor. This will likely mean at least a six to eight week interruption in our fabrication work. We would probably have to subcontract some of the work to our competitors, work overtime, resulting in both higher costs to us and loss of profits. We will need to be very careful to meet all of our project production deadlines or face liquidated damages or other penalties or breach of contract problems without customers.

In summary, moving this large, busy facility will be a difficult, very expensive and somewhat financially risky proposition. We want Metro to be aware of this in the consideration of the various routes. If we are forced out, we will likely move back to Vancouver which obviously is not a good thing for the city of Milwaukie or the State of Oregon. If meetings are to take place with the business owners impacted by the light rail I would request that we be notified and invited to attend. Although we support light rail and believe it to be a benefit for the city, the serious negative consequence of choosing an alignment which would eliminate a successful high-tech facility can be equally detrimental to the city. I would ask you to please consider these impacts when making a final decision on the route of the new light rail to Milwaukie.

Very Truly Yours,

Harder Mechanical Contractors, Inc.

[Signature]

James E. Stilwell
Corporate Treasurer
June 23, 2008

Councilor Robert Liberty
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232

Dear Councilor Liberty:

I am writing to give my support for the proposed Milwaukie Light Rail system and the Sherman alignment.

The Oregon Museum of Science and Industry (OMSI) has made a major commitment to the eastside with its location south of the Hawthorne Bridge. The Milwaukie Light Rail system will give OMSI and the district an enormous increase in access that can spur major development for the central city. OMSI is currently working on a master plan for our future development in cooperation with the district property owners, Metro, TriMet, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland State University, the City of Portland and others.

OMSI currently serves over one million visitors per year. The addition of light rail and the Sherman alignment will make the area much more successful for OMSI and local businesses.

We believe that the proposed light rail system and Sherman alignment will have great benefit for the community.

Sincerely,

Nancy Stueber
President
Metro
Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project
600 NE Grand Ave
Portland OR 97232

Dear Sirs:

Thank you for presenting the Light Rail meeting at St. John the Baptist. It was very educational for me and I have now changed my thinking and I agree with you on the long term of moving people in the future. I think this light rail will be an asset. In reviewing the proposed plan for the line, I feel strongly that we should not run it by our schools. I understand that you have done a lot of testing and it is acceptable to today's standards.

Our children are the most precious possession that we have. It is so hard for them to concentrate and I feel that this line by the schools will distract them either by noise, sight or vibration.

Our country has the ability to go to the moon and back. I would think with this technology that we have, we would be able to reroute this line away from the schools even if the cost is higher. Our children our worth it!

Thank you for reviewing this comment and I hope you will consider making this change and I would like to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list.

Sincerely,

Ray Talarkey
June 23, 2008
Metro Transportation Planning
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232

Dear Metro,

The Willamette Pedestrian Coalition (WPC) is a non-profit grassroots advocacy organization, founded in 1991, that works to make the conditions for walking safe and attractive in the greater Portland region.

WPC supports Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail for the following reasons; and, with the following qualifications. Reasons WPC supports Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail:
- Provides a transit alternative for more people, which enables more trips by foot.
- Provides transportation alternative for persons with disabilities who cannot drive or bike.
- Provides a new bridge allowing pedestrians to cross the Willamette.
- Includes pedestrian-scale facilities around stations.
- Includes safety features for pedestrians.
- Improves air quality in dense urban areas, where people often like to walk.

WPC has several concerns with the bridge design: adequate width for pedestrian area, height, length, access from each approach and security.

Adequate Width
According to page 2-10 and Figures H.2-1 and H.2-2 in Appendix H, the conceptual bridge design calls for two 12 foot shared bicycle/pedestrian lanes on the outermost side of the bridge. This width is inadequate for shared bike/ped use. The Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan calls for minimum 10' wide multi-use paths, with 12' in high use areas plus 3' shy distance on both sides. Where a path is parallel to a roadway, there should be a minimum 5' separation between the path and the edge of pavement, or a physical barrier of sufficient height. Clearly this bridge should be considered to be in a high-use area. There does not seem to be any shy distance assumed in the conceptual design.

The City of Portland's minimum and desirable bridge design standards are as follows:
- Shared use path: minimum 16' clear of obstructions for 2-way path (12' plus 2' shy distance on both sides) - desirable 20' clear of obstructions;
- Bikelane minimum 5', desirable 6.5';
- Sidewalk minimum 8' clear of obstructions (6' through zone + 2' furnishings/curb zone) - desirable 12' clear of obstructions (6' through zone + 2.5' furnishings/curb zone + 1.5' frontage zone adjacent to outside bridge rail).

WPC is part of the advisory committee for the Sellwood Bridge study. For the Sellwood Bridge, the cross-sections that were deemed to perform best from a
side and two 6.5' bicycle lanes, one on each side, and a cross-section consisting of a 20' shared use path on one side, 8' shared use path on the other side, and two 6.5' bikelanes, one on each side. Separation of bicycles and pedestrians was considered more desirable than shared use.

**Height**
A bridge that is 75 feet above the river has advantages and disadvantages for pedestrians. The advantages are:
- The bridge would be a reliable crossing without interruption from boat traffic underneath.
- The height affords a scenic viewpoint – an attractive destination for recreational walks.

The disadvantages are:
- A 4.75% grade means that pedestrians have a hill to climb much greater than the Hawthorne, Ross Island or Sellwood bridges. WPC reviewed the height and believes pedestrians would climb 40' or approximately 4 stories.
- Bicyclists will be able to travel at well over 20 miles per hour going downhill, which is a safety hazard for pedestrians unless the space is clearly separated.

**Length**
WPC understands that the length of the bridge is determined by the height and angle. The bridge angle is determined to be ideal for serving the most transit customers, connecting to South Waterfront and OMSI. These factors reduce the attractiveness of the bridge to pedestrians interested in destinations farther northwest, on the west side of the bridge, and farther southeast on the east side of the bridge. All things being equal, the most useful bridge to pedestrians is a shorter bridge option than the Porter-Sherman option.

**Access From Each Approach**
WPC did not find specific plans for pedestrian access to and from the bridge in the SDEIS. In general, pedestrian access routes that are at grade are preferred, whenever possible. Sloped access or ramps are likely preferable to stairs and elevators. WPC would like to review the bridge connections to the local street grid, Springwater Trail/Eastbank Esplanade and Willamette Greenway/Esplanade.

**Security**
The factors that may contribute to a less secure environment for pedestrians are:
- Bridge length.
- Visibility barriers.
WPC is interested in a design that allows direct law enforcement surveillance for both criminal deterrence and incident response. WPC recommends:
- 911 callboxes.
- Security cameras.
- Police patrols, especially after transit operating hours.

**General Comments**
As with any construction project, the impact of closed sidewalks and paths can add substantial distance, danger and delay. WPC would like construction schedules and staging to reduce these impacts as much as possible.
WPC is grateful to David Unsworth of TriMet, who presented the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project.

While some may suggest pedestrians could simply board the Streetcar or MAX to cross the river, WPC believes that it is essential that any bridge crossing the Willamette provide an optimum crossing for pedestrians. Walking is healthy, offers nearly unlimited capacity for people-movement strengthens the identity of Portland and the livability of the region.

WPC believes the bridge will be highly used by pedestrians. WPC is aware that the bridge design currently requires a supportive structure for rail, streetcar and bus in the center; therefore, pedestrian/bike facilities are placed on the outer sides of the bridge. Since a 20’ shared path does not seem possible based on current engineering sketches, WPC recommends adding 2.5’ to both sides of the bridge. The cross section could then include 8’ sidewalk with grade-separated 6.5’ one-way bike lane on both sides of the bridge.

WPC believes a bridge shorter in length and height would be more attractive and safer for pedestrians. A shorter-height bridge would slow bicyclists and therefore provide a safer environment for pedestrians. WPC would be opposed to a bridge any taller than the proposed bridge because it would pose a barrier to travel by pedestrians, especially the young, old and pedestrians with disabilities.

WPC is interested in reviewing more about the pedestrian approaches and security plans for the Willamette River bridge.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Portland-Milwaukie SDEIS. WPC is interested in reviewing more Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail plans and designs as they become available.

Sincerely,

WPC Board
(Board comments synthesized by Caleb Winter, WPC Board Member)
June 16, 2008

Mr. Mark Turpel, AICP
Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project
SDEIS Manager
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

Re: Comments on May 2008 SDEIS South Corridor Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail

Mr. Turpel,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. I am resident of the Brooklyn Neighborhood, and have been for the past eight years. During that time, I have been active in community volunteer efforts in a variety of ways that have exposed me to some of the history and current needs of the neighborhood. After participating in an open house in the fall of 2007, reading the current SDEIS, and bicycling nearby the proposed route from the east bank to SE Bybee Boulevard, I have some thoughts to share.

In general I have been one voice of many in the neighborhood to welcome light rail as an alternative to additional roadway improvements of the type that have detracted from the livability of the neighborhood in the past. (Please see the Brooklyn Neighborhood Development Highlights Sheet attached for reference.) The neighborhood goal to support light rail has not changed much since the 1991 Neighborhood Plan was adopted including support for "an eastside light rail line, with a station easily accessible from Brooklyn, which does not harm quality of life, and does not further restrict Brooklyn's access to the Willamette River." The effectiveness of the light rail to meet those goals, with mitigation for the features that would otherwise have a negative effect on the neighborhood, depends a great deal on the development detail that must have been completed to some level to establish the alignments shown in the SDEIS, but is not published.

Page 3-40 in the SDEIS includes a Brooklyn paragraph summarizing the anticipated loss of vehicular traffic flow and convenience into/out of the neighborhood from 17th Ave, the loss of the commercial buffer between the light rail and some of the neighborhood's strongest housing fabric, and the undersupply of parking spilling into the neighborhood after the removal of street and off-street parking affected by the alignment. The paragraph goes on to say that "these effects would not be likely to change the overall character and function of the neighborhood." The changes proposed in the SDEIS have the same potential to have a very great negative effect on the neighborhood as transportation improvements in the past. The neighborhood has not completely
recovered decades later from past improvements, and a high level of care is needed for detailing of buffer and mitigation conditions for the light rail proposed.

I imagine each of the home owners and renters within about 2 blocks of the light rail alignment along 17th Ave. will appreciate the visual, vehicle and pedestrian circulation, sound, and landscape buffer opportunities for mitigation that are suggested during future open houses and steering committee meetings. And if you lived in one of those houses, I'm sure you would agree that every reasonable attempt should be made to maintain their current level of livability.

The parking overflow onto residential streets from Tri-Met off-street parking that is removed is as unacceptable as parking overflow from the drivers who will inevitably try and park in the neighborhood to catch the light rail into the city. A portion of the residences rely solely on street parking because the housing density does not provide for private driveways. I estimate that approximately half of the street parking is needed for neighborhood residents, and should be maintained via signage, residential parking permits or other creative means. Tri-Met can be a good neighbor by offering an internally-run shuttle from an alternate nearby off-street parking to replace the one removed by the proposed alignment.

Appendix G, Figure G.1-3 in the SDEIS shows clearly that the Brooklyn Neighborhood has a disproportionately large number of businesses affected by the proposed alignment. I appreciated the efforts in the fall 2007 open house to address the concerns of those property owners. Since such a long swath of businesses are affected along 17th Ave., it is particularly important to promote alternative sites for business growth around those stations where it is consistent with the goals of the station.

Mitigation of the effects of noise, vibration, light pollution, theft from added pedestrian traffic etc. can take many forms. Some of our neighborhood suggestions for mitigation may not seem to be directly mitigation, but rather as added amenity to offset detrimental effects on livability. I hope those suggestions are given careful thought. For example, Brooklyn has a large proportion of artists living in the neighborhood. A call for suggested screened art work on the station glazing (similar to some bus stops) would be well received by the neighborhood, and it may produce samples that fit within city guidelines and are helpful way-finding to identify stations and neighborhoods.

Thank you for your consideration,

Dawn Woods
1205 SE Reynolds St.
Portland, OR 97202
Brooklyn Neighborhood Development Highlights


- Tibbett's Donation Land Law Claim as a farm and grist mill
- Oregon Central Railway Right of Way through Brooklyn
- Tibbett's first development plat of 36 blocks for a "town"
  - Brooklyn (Tibbett's Addition) incorporated into Portland
  - Inman-Pulsen Lumber Mill Built just north of Ross Island
  - Brooklyn neighborhood served by streetcar
  - Brooklyn Public School and Community Building Built
  - Ross Island used as park courtesy of Ross's Farm

- Ross Island Bridge Built
  - Powell Blvd Cut Brooklyn Neighborhood in Half
  - Brooklyn's public square and fountain, as well as commercial and residential property were removed

- Ross Island Sand and Gravel operation started
  - and recreation opportunity was unavailable
  - McLoughlin Blvd / 99E was completed
  - Eliminating Brooklyn's access to the river,
  - and restoration of alternate access was deferred
  - for later consideration and funding

- Brooklyn's Victory Gardens were an extension
  - of the farmer's market type industry long-standing in the neighborhood

- Trolley service stopped

Brooklyn Action Corps Neighborhood Association Established
- Tom Potter was a police officer in the neighborhood

Brooklyn School began charging BAC to use school space for community meetings
- Brooklyn Public School students diverted to Grout Elementary School

Eastbank Esplanade Improvements
- No direct connection from Brooklyn Neighborhood provided and both younger older residents must be transported 1+ miles to use the park

Powell Blvd Improvements
- Street Trees were not included, and when requested by Brooklyn were deferred to a later date for consideration and funding

Light Rail through Brooklyn Neighborhood in review
June 16, 2008

Mark Turpel, AICP
Portland-Milwaukee Light Rail Project
SDEIS Manager
600 NE Grand Ave
Portland, Oregon 97232

Linda Gehrkke
Deputy Regional Manager
Region 10
Jackson Federal Building, Suite 3142
915 Second Avenue
Seattle, WA 98174

Subject: South Corridor, Portland-Milwaukee Light Rail Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Mr. Turpel and Ms. Gehrkke:

The Central Eastside Industrial Council (CEIC) represents over 1,200 companies and about 19,000 jobs in Portland inner city. The CEIC has been actively involved in Portland-Milwaukee Light Rail Project for many years. We have had CEIC board members on the Citizens Advisory Committee since inception of the committee and have participated on the Willamette River Crossing Partnership. The light rail line and bridge are an important segment of the Central Eastside district and we appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on the South Corridor, Portland-Milwaukee Light Rail Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS).

Our comments focus on three aspects of the SDEIS:

1) The proposed traffic signal at SE 8th and SE Powell.

The proposed traffic signal at SE 8th and SE Powell is a solution for buses that creates a host of new problems that are serious for traffic/freight flow and system safety. Currently there is no signal at SE 8th and SE Powell and the intersection is designed to move traffic from Woodward Avenue seamlessly up and over the Ross Island Bridge via SE 8th. This route is a major freight route for our industrial district and a primary connector to I-5 South. Putting a signal at the intersection of 8th and Powell would require the loss of two way traffic on 8th, and force buses to stop between Powell and Woodward while waiting for a green signal.

Stopped buses would prevent the continuous flow of traffic from looping on Woodward to Powell via 8th due to traffic congestion. As it stands today, large trucks make the hairpin turn by using all lanes between Powell and Woodward on 8th to get onto Powell then cross the Ross Island Bridge to access I-5 South. With a bus waiting for a green signal, a truck will be forced to wait for the bus to clear and block all traffic trying to access Powell. This will cause a back up on Woodward and 99E.
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northbound.

This is too important a freight access point to block as there are no reasonable alternatives for freight access to I-5 South. A signal at 8th and Powell will also force eastbound traffic to be steered on the Ross Island Bridge, backing up traffic on Frent Avenue and Barbur Boulevard - both major commuting routes. The CEIC recommends that bus traffic be routed farther east to connect with Powell and avoid the 8th and Powell intersection. A comprehensive traffic analysis should be completed prior to adopting any bus route plan in the Central Eastside.

2) Bridge height and design

The CEIC has provided comments in the past relating to our concerns about bridge height and we reiterate that our concerns are still valid. We have enclosed a copy of our letter dated November, 19, 2007. The CEIC would encourage a draw, lift or swing bridge to be explored as alternatives to retain valuable river capacity.

3) Loss of jobs and businesses in our district

Job retention and creation are major goals of the CEIC. We want to ensure "best efforts" are made to find alternative locations for all businesses displaced by the creation of this light rail project. This project will displace hundreds of living wage jobs that are difficult to replace. A disciplined and thoughtful process needs to be actively followed to retain these jobs in our region.

In closing the CEIC supports the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail project in principle, but would like the above issues resolved in a satisfactory manner. We appreciate the opportunity to comment and look forward to continuing our involvement in this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Daniel Yates, President
November 19, 2007

Ms. Bridget Wieghart
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

Dear Bridget,

The Central Eastside Industrial Council (CEIC) is concerned that Metro proposes constructing a new light rail, Portland-Milwaukie bridge at mile marker 13 (the "OMSI Bridge") across the Willamette River with a height of 65-72 feet above Columbia River Datum (CRD). The eastern edge of the bridge is in our industrial district and we want to protect existing and potential river user's interests. This bridge height is unacceptable to us.

Multnomah County proposes to replace the Sellwood Bridge. We support replacing it to 72 feet above Ordinary High Water (OHW).

The CEIC wants any new bridge on the Willamette River to be built with the principle of "no loss of existing river capacity". Therefore, we support the construction of new bridges with a river height of 90 feet above OHW at OMSI and 72 feet above OHW at Sellwood.

The use of CRD for bridge height is obscure, confusing and understates river clearances. All mariners use river charts that indicate OHW for bridge clearances. CRD is about 1.8 feet lower than ordinary low water. OHW, which varies from location to location, is 15-20 higher than CRD. For 10 months of a year the Willamette River runs closer to ordinary high water (OHW). The proposed bridge heights measured by CRD will be 15 to 20 feet lower than if measured by OHW. This is completely unacceptable.

The two proposed low bridges will significantly block access to the upper Willamette to many vessels. The Willamette River has a combination of lift bridges and free standing bridges that provide vessel clearance of 90-120 foot OHW for the lower river up to the existing Sellwood Bridge. The Sellwood Bridge, as the lowest point on the river, should be rebuilt at least to its current height of 72 ft above OHW. The County is proposing a bridge between 65-75 feet (at some unknown datum).

The OMSI Bridge has not been clearly explained and is the most controversial. This bridge, to be located between the Marquam and Ross Island Bridges, will be a fixed bridge with a proposed vertical clearance of about 50 to 57 feet OHW. To the North is the Marquam Bridge with vertical clearances of 120-102 feet OHW and to the South the Ross Island has vertical clearances of 120-90 feet OHW. The CEIC believes that the new bridge should be built with a clearance of at least 90 feet OHW to allow river commerce to continue to have full access to this stretch of the river.
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Water Datum Letter

Many vessels need the current clearances. Several cruise ships that operate in the Willamette require clearances of more than 65 feet OHW. In the near future taller vessels will require the higher clearances to access as much of the river as they can today. This issue impacts dredges, tugs, pile drivers, sailboats and any river user that needs access to the upper Willamette now or in the future.

The CEIC, believes that a vibrant port city should support the varied industrial, commercial and recreational river users, by maintaining existing river capacity.

Sincerely,

Chris J Hammond
Central Eastside Industrial Council
Land Use Chairman

cc: File
Metro Steering Committee
David Knowles
Commissioner Sam Adams
Sue Keil, PDOT
OMSI District Property Owners
June 20, 2008

Mark Turpel, AICP
Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project
SDEIS Manager
600 NE Grand Ave
Portland, Oregon 97232

Linda Gehrke
Deputy Regional Manager
Region 10
Jackson Federal Building, Suite 3142
915 Second Avenue
Seattle, WA 98174

SUBJECT: SOUTH CORRIDOR, PORTLAND-MILWAUKIE LIGHT RAIL PROJECT, SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Mr. Turpel and Ms. Gehrke:

The Portland Spirit has been an active participant in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project for many years. Portland Spirit representatives have participated in the process since its inception and have been actively involved with the South Corridor Steering Committee, the Citizen Advisory Committee, and the Willamette River Crossing Partnership. We appreciate this opportunity to provide comment on the South Corridor, Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS).

Our comments focus on four aspects of the SDEIS:

1. Support for selection of the refined Porter-Sherman alignment as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for a new Willamette River crossing.

2. Deficiencies of other alignments for a new Willamette River crossing considered in the planning process.

3. Issues related to bridge design and function that we believe should be addressed in selection of an LPA and in preparation of a Final EIS.

For Excellence in River Cruise Dining
4. Other issues that we recommend be addressed if the EIS is to be legally defensible under NEPA and other applicable regulations.

1. Support for selection of the refined Porter-Sherman alignment as the LPA for a new Willamette River crossing.

*Portland Spirit* strongly supports the refined Porter-Sherman alignment, recommended by the Willamette River Crossing Partnership, as the most feasible alignment for a new Willamette River crossing. We endorse its selection as the LPA for this portion of the light rail project. Among the alternatives considered in the SDEIS, the refined Porter-Sherman alignment best:

- Meets the purpose and need for this project, as defined in the SDEIS. The refined alignment meets the project goals and objectives, specifically to “support land use goals,” “optimize the transit system,” and “reflect community values” (SDEIS p.1-4).

- Supports the Central City Plan and the South Waterfront Plan (particularly the anticipated street network), and supports OMSI and OHSU master plans. The refined alignment supports development of the vision for a Portland Science and Technology Quarter that connects OMSI, OHSU, and PSU.

- Integrates with adjacent current and proposed land uses and facilitates complementary educational, tourist, entertainment, and water based activities at Portland Community College, Portland Boathouse, OMSI, the Portland Opera, and the *Portland Spirit*.

- Preserves more living wage, jobs in the area than the other alignments considered, thus supporting the intent of the Central Eastside Industrial District and the City of Portland’s industrial sanctuary policies.

- Displaces fewer businesses on the east side than other alignments considered, thus keeping more land at the eastern terminus on the public tax roles.

- Improves total transit ridership and better accommodates access and future improvement to the Greenway trail on both sides of the river.

- Provides a better connection to the bridge for the proposed eastside streetcar loop.

- Does not negatively impact cost effectiveness of the project.

- Enjoys wide-reaching support among community leadership, river users, and land owners and thus best reflects the community’s values.

2. The deficiencies of other alignments for a new Willamette River crossing considered in the planning process.

The *Portland Spirit* believes that other Willamette River crossings being analyzed in the SDEIS are deficient in terms of meeting the project’s purpose and need, functionality, and economic
impacts. Our testimony focuses on the 2003 LPA, the Porter-Caruthers, and Meade-Caruthers alignments.

The 2003 LPA emerged as an unsatisfactory option during the 2006 and 2007 Refinement Studies, when four new alignments were developed to address changes in the community since the 2003 option was adopted. The SDEIS states that the South Waterfront has undergone dramatic changes since 2003, triggering significant public and private investment in the area. In addition, OMSI has acquired six acres south of the current museum site to create new opportunities on the east bank of the river. Due to significant changes in the community since its adoption, the 2003 LPA clearly does not meet the purpose and intent of the project and does not adequately serve the South Waterfront District, OMSI or provide the critical connections between the two. It is also not clear the 2003 LPA could be built as intended due to changes in the built environment since adoption. For these reasons, we believe the 2003 LPA is deficient and should be eliminated as an alternative.

The Porter-Caruthers and Meade-Caruthers alignments do not best fulfill the purpose and need or the goals and objectives for the project. The Porter-Caruthers and Meade-Caruthers alignments have greater negative impacts to jobs, access, parking, and connections between educational, tourist, water based and civic uses.

The Caruthers alignments would displace at least 897 jobs, which is 222 more than the Meade-Sherman or Porter-Sherman options (SDEIS p.3-25). The Caruthers options would impede access to existing businesses that are accessible from SE Caruthers Street, such as the Portland Opera and Portland Spirit. The Caruthers alignment would require acquisition and displacement of several businesses, including the Portland Spirit operations. As a water dependent use, we would have difficulty relocating in the immediate vicinity. In fact, it is our assertion that a Caruthers landing would fully displace our central city operations and cause the termination of our business.

The 2003 LPA and the Meade-Caruthers, and Porter-Caruthers alignments do not support the OMSI and OHSU master plans or the vision for a Portland Science and Technology Quarter with connections to PSU. These alignments do not have the same level of support from community leadership, river users, and land owners. In summary, none of these alignments meets the project’s purpose, intent, goals and objectives as well as the refined Porter-Sherman alignment.

3. Issues related to bridge design and function and construction impacts.

Portland Spirit believes that there are a variety of Willamette River crossing design and function issues that must be addressed in selection of an LPA and in a Final EIS. From our perspective, the most important of these are vessel clearance and design that ensure the continuing operation of commercial traffic on the river and maneuverability at our dock/service facility.

The SDEIS states that a bridge clearance of 75 feet is proposed to match the existing clearance of the Sellwood Bridge. The SDEIS found that some ships arriving for the Rose Festival have higher clearances than 75 feet. In addition, the SDEIS notes that several industrial users may be affected because their operations use crane barges that require higher clearance (SDEIS p.4-9). We do not support a bridge height lower than 75 feet above CRD and recommend that a higher
clearance be considered because the height is less than that required by one of our current vessels and other commercial vessels using this reach of the river.

We think the findings of the River Users Survey Report, which outlines the steps for establishing navigational clearance are inadequate. The River Users Survey undercounts impacted vessels by grouping the same class of vessel as one impacted vessel. It does not allow room for error as it assumes a 75 foot tall vessel can pass safely under a 75 foot bridge. The Survey made no attempt to determine potential future river users. In the passenger vessel industry the high fuel costs have forced an accelerated adoption of alternative fuel technologies. Some of the proposed technologies include huge solar panels and wind turbine combinations. These technologies would significantly increase the overall height of new vessels.

The SDEIS states that more details on the design will be developed through a bridge type, size, and location study conducted following the adoption of the LPA (SDEIS p.2-10). The Portland Spirit believes these issues are paramount and should be carefully addressed in conjunction with navigation and maneuverability to ensure the bridge design adequately supports river operations for existing and future river users. Considering the prospects of a carbon constrained future, it is entirely likely commercial river use will increase due to the high carbon efficiency of river transport. The new bridge should encourage, not restrict this transport mode.

The SDEIS identifies potential short-term impacts due to construction, such as temporary lane closures, detours, and disruption of traffic. The Portland Spirit believes it is imperative to conduct a thorough analysis of all possible construction impacts to businesses and residents, including closures, detours, traffic disruptions, change of access, loss of parking, noise, and equipment staging.

4. Other issues that need to be addressed to ensure that the EIS is legally defensible under NEPA and other applicable regulations.

We recommend that the following issues be addressed if the EIS is to be legally defensible under NEPA and other applicable regulations:

- The SDEIS fails to fully analyze the impacts to the SW River Parkway/SW Moody Avenue intersection, which will experience large delays associated with the gate controlled crossing for the LRT and traffic signal phase accommodations for the streetcar and bus movements. Impacts to this intersection would fail to meet jurisdictional standards (SDEIS p.4-32).

- The SDEIS fails to fully analyze the traffic impacts to the SE Powell/SE 8th Avenue intersection.

- The SDEIS fails to fully analyze potential route of the Yellow LRT Line (Expo to Milwaukee) through Southeast Portland rather than downtown (As proposed by the Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates).

- THE SDEIS needs to assess the specific economic impacts of the various alternatives, including the Willamette River crossings, to the Central Eastside Industrial District.
• The SDEIS needs to specifically assess issues of sustainability and global climate change.

We appreciate this opportunity to comment and look forward to continuing our involvement in this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Daniel Yates, President
June 4, 2008 at 5:07 p.m.
Yes, I’d like to leave a comment regarding my opinion on the light rail as far it coming out through Milwaukie and to, at least for now, to Park Avenue. I think it’s a great idea. I think we should just hurry up and get it going. I think it’s inevitable. There’s no going backwards here; we’re going to have to do something. And eventually I’d like to see it go through Oregon City and out to Canby and, who knows, past there. They’ve been doing this in Europe for years and it works really well and we just need to catch up with the times and realize that we need to get it going. I’ve lived in Milwaukie for fifty years and I use my car and sometimes MAX and TriMet. But for me, in Milwaukie, it’s quite a trek to get to St.Vincent Hospital, where I work sometimes, and Providence Portland where I work other times.
I wish I had that option and I hope I’m still in the workforce when it is available, but I’m afraid I probably won’t be. At least not at that current position.
Anyway, my opinion is that we just need to get it going and as quickly as possible.
Thank you.

June 16, 2008 at 12:52 p.m.
Looking on the Metropolitan Area Regional Map of commuter rail lines planned and in place, it becomes very apparent that having light rail down I-205 and McLoughlin Boulevard and Highway 43 is extremely redundant. None of the three lines will be used effectively because there’s simply are too many lines too close to each other to choose from.
Either eliminate the McLoughlin Boulevard line, or, to serve McLoughlin Boulevard industries, eliminate the Highway 43 line. In either case, a line connecting Tigard, the WES rail line, Lake Oswego, or Oregon City, Clackamas, and eventually Damascus, would make more sense.
The resulting overall light rail system will serve far more people much more effectively into the 22nd century. Again, that, to plan and build a line connecting Tigard, WES, Lake Oswego, or Oregon City, Clackamas, and eventually Damascus. That would result in an overall light rail system with, that with, [sic] transfers will serve far more people much more effectively into the 22nd century. Thank you.

June 16, 2008 at 1:18 p.m.
On this light rail line will not have enough riders to make it cost effective. Using the projects own figures, at best, six million rides per year are gained on this system. The amortized system build cost is $4 a ride if the system lasts 50 years, and it’s $2 a ride if its life is a hundred years. Each ride will also cost one dollar operationally. Thus, the cost of each ride varies between $3 and $5.
A bus ride costs less than this and is far more flexible, I think. Please publish the cost of a bus ride instead of this line. Also, increased bus service will be far more cost-effective. Thanks.
EVENTS AND OUTREACH MATERIALS

Public events, meetings and presentations
Newsletters, ads, postcards and other publicity
# Project Meetings
## March 2007 – June 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>MEETING DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 2007</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Open House - Milwaukie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Open House - Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukie South Segment Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tribal Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Milwaukie North Segment Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Milwaukie Downtown Segment Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Milwaukie Main Street Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Citizen Advisory Committee Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Milwaukie Main Street Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Safety and Security Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Citizen Advisory Committee Alignment Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Safety and Security Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Citizen Advisory Committee Orientation Make-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Safety and Security Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Citizen Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Station Area Planning Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Safety and Security Task Force Interstate MAX Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Station Area Planning Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>River Users Open House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Citizen Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Open House – Oak Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>November</strong></td>
<td>Safety and Security Task Force Alignment Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Citizen Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Station Area Planning Open House – SE Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Station Area Planning Open House – SE Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December</strong></td>
<td>Milwaukie City Council Interstate MAX tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Citizen Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Safety and Security Task Force Workshop – SE Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Safety and Security Task Force Workshop - Milwaukie/Clackamas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January 2008</strong></td>
<td>Citizen Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Citizen Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Citizen Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Safety and Security Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February</strong></td>
<td>North Industrial Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Citizen Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Project Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Citizen Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March</strong></td>
<td>Station Area Planning Workshop – Oak Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Citizen Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Station Area Planning Workshop - Milwaukie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April</strong></td>
<td>North Industrial Property Owners Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>North Industrial Property Owners Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Citizens Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Citizen Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Milwaukie Station Area Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May</strong></td>
<td>Citizens Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>SDEIS Open House - Oak Lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>SDEIS Open House - Milwaukie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizens Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**June**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Citizens Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Steering Committee Hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Citizens Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Community Presentations
## February 2007 – June 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>COMMUNITY GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 2007</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ken Love, South Portland Neighborhood Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Joe Hagedorn, Hosford-Abernathy Neighborhood Development (HAND) Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dan Platter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greg Chaimov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dave Blum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>City of Milwaukie Transportation System Plan Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hosford-Abernathy Neighborhood Development (HAND) Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon Museum of Science and Industry Site Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukie City Council briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League (SMILE) Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Benjamin Hazleton, Creston-Kenilworth Neighborhood Association Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Central Eastside Industrial Council Land Use Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbors Meeting: Dolly Mackenhandbright, Ed Zumwalt, Scott Churchill, Greg Chaimov, Keith Neubauer, Dion Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>City of Milwaukie Transportation System Plan Transit Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Eastside Urban Renewal Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Portland Mall Citizen Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clackamas County Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland Business Alliance Transportation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Brooklyn Action Corps Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>South Macadam Urban Renewal Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Southeast Uplift Land Use and Transportation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Village at Lovejoy Fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mall Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Plaza Condos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Portland Streetcar Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SE Portland Rotary Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Creston-Kenilworth Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>TriMet Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10 | North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District Advisory Board  
The South Waterfront Condos  
Discovery Center |
| 11 | Brooklyn Action Corps Board |
| 14 | Downtown Neighborhood Association |
| 17 | Eastmoreland Neighborhood Association  
Reed Neighborhood Association  
Milwaukie High School Superintendent |
| 21 | Portland Oregon Visitors Association Community Action Committee |
| 23 | Portland Development Commission  
St. John the Baptist Catholic School and Church |
| 24 | Milwaukie Public Safety Advisory Committee |
| 25 | Milwaukie High School |
| 30 | Reed College |
| **June** | |
| 4 | City of Milwaukie Riverfront Board |
| 5 | Milwaukie Rotary  
Milwaukie Business Briefing: North Industrial  
Milwaukie Business Briefing: Downtown Businesses  
Milwaukie City Council briefing  
Milwaukie City Council work session |
| 6 | Portland Business Alliance Central City Committee  
Portland City Council briefing  
Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement |
| 8 | Waldorf School |
| 12 | City of Milwaukie Planning Commission  
Milwaukie Elks |
| 14 | City of Milwaukie Planning Commission  
Dick Jones, Thelma Haggenmiller |
| 15 | Marilyn Denham |
| 27 | Oak Lodge Community Council |
| **July** | |
| 9 | Waldorf School |
| **August** | |
| 7 | Central Eastside Industrial Council Land Use Committee  
Milwaukie City Council briefing |
<p>| 10 | Milwaukie Station Tour |
| <strong>September</strong> | |
| 5 | South Portland Neighborhood Association |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 October</td>
<td>Hosford-Abernathy Neighborhood Development (HAND)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 November</td>
<td>Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League (SMILE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 November</td>
<td>Island Station Neighborhood District Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 November</td>
<td>Hosford-Abernethy Neighborhood Development (HAND)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 November</td>
<td>Milwaukie City Council briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 November</td>
<td>Rose Villa Retirement Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>February 2008</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 February</td>
<td>South Portland Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 February</td>
<td>Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League (SMILE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 February</td>
<td>Metro Council work session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 February</td>
<td>Clackamas Business Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 February</td>
<td>Reed Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 February</td>
<td>Reed College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 February</td>
<td>Island Station Neighborhood District Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 February</td>
<td>Eastmoreland Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 March</td>
<td>Central Eastside Industrial Council Land Use/Transportation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 March</td>
<td>Old Town-Chinatown Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 March</td>
<td>Portland Streetcar Inc. Citizen Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 March</td>
<td>Lewelling Neighborhood District Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 March</td>
<td>Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood District Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 March</td>
<td>Alliance of Portland Business Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 March</td>
<td>Hector Campbell Neighborhood District Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 March</td>
<td>Portland Downtown Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 March</td>
<td>Portland Business Alliance Transportation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 March</td>
<td>Creston-Kenilworth Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 March</td>
<td>Ardenwald Neighborhood District Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 March</td>
<td>Lake Road Neighborhood District Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 March</td>
<td>Clackamas County Economic Development Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 March</td>
<td>South Macadam Urban Renewal Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 March</td>
<td>Oregon City Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 March</td>
<td>North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District Board/Trolley Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 March</td>
<td>Linwood Neighborhood District Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 March</td>
<td>Hosford-Abernathy Neighborhood Development (HAND)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 March</td>
<td>American Plaza Condos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 March</td>
<td>Brooklyn Action Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 March</td>
<td>South Waterfront Condos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Milwaukie City Council briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lewelling Neighborhood District Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Waldorf School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>North Macadam Urban Renewal Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Central Eastside Urban Renewal Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Oaks Bottom Lions Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Oak Lodge Community Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Milwaukie City Council briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Portland Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OHSU Schnitzer Campus Planning Open House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Citizens Informed and Aware (CIA) – Oak Lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>TriMet Transit Improvement Plan Open House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Advisory Committee briefing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Milwaukie City Council briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>St. John the Baptist Catholic School and Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>City of Gresham briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oregon City briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>TriMet briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>City of Milwaukie briefing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learn about the upcoming study of a proposed Portland-Milwaukie light rail project

Find out about and discuss potential design options for where the line may terminate and where stations and Park & Ride lots may be located in the Milwaukie area.

Attend an open house
6:30 to 8:30 p.m., March 5
Clackamas Educational Service District building
4011 SE Lake Rd., Milwaukie

For more information, visit www.metro-region.org/transportation.

To ask a question or share a comment, send e-mail to trans@metro-region.org, or call (503) 797-1756.
Purpose: The purpose of the Open House was to inform the public about the initiation of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the design options being considered as a result of the 2004-05 Working Group recommendations, and how to get involved.

Hosts: Metro, TriMet, Clackamas County, and the City of Milwaukie hosted the Open House, which was held at the Clackamas Education Service District Building from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Attendance: Over 150 people attended. One hundred and forty-four signed-in and sixty-seven submitted feedback with the form provided.

Information Presented: 1) PowerPoint presentation of project history, scope and schedule, decision-making process, alignment overview, and citizen advisory committee; 2) display stations of the Locally Preferred Alternative, design options, project calendar and decision-making; and 3) handouts including project fact sheet and maps, applications for citizen advisory committee, feedback forms, and mailing list sign-up.

SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK FORM RESPONSES

MULTIPLE CHOICE SECTION

Question 1. Do you live, work, or own property near the proposed light rail alignment?

Seventy-eight percent of respondents lived within two miles of the alignment and design options with 26 percent living within one-quarter mile. Twelve percent lived between two and three miles while 9 percent lived more than three miles away.

![Pie Chart showing distances of respondents to the proposed alignment]

n=67
Question 2. Which of these best describes you (choose all that apply)?
Sixty-eight percent of respondents identified themselves as a commuter and a resident. Four percent run businesses while 10 percent work near the proposed alignment and design option areas.

![Pie chart showing the percentage of respondents for each category: Resident 29%, Work 10%, Own Property 13%, Run Business 4%, Commuter 39%, None 5%.]

n=105

Question 3. What is your zip code?
Sixty-five percent of respondents lived in ZIP code 97222 (Milwaukie), followed by 15 percent that indicated 97202 (Sellwood-Moreland). The ZIP codes indicated by respondents are 97222 (Ardenwald), 97201 (SW Hills), 97202 (Brooklyn-Reed), 97267 (Oak Grove), 97214 (Hosford-Abernethy), 97219 (Markham), 97223 (Tigard), 97239 (John’s Landing), 97269 (Milwaukie), 97027 (Gladstone), 97068 (West Linn), and 97070 (Wilsonville).

Question 4. In an average week, how many times do you travel one-way between Milwaukie and downtown Portland?
Fifty-seven percent of respondents travel to downtown Portland three or less times a week. Forty-three percent travel to downtown Portland four or more times a week. The largest group was those traveling one to three times a week.

![Pie chart showing the frequency of travel: Less than 1 23%, 1 to 3 34%, 4 to 7 20%, 7 to 10 14%, 10+ 9%.]

n=65
Question 5. How do you travel within this corridor now?
About 87 percent of respondents travel the corridor using automobiles while 7 percent of respondents use bus. About 6 percent carpool, bike, or use some other mode.

Question 6. How did you hear about tonight’s open house (choose all that apply)?
Twenty-three percent of respondents said they learned about the open house by word of mouth. Thirty-nine percent learned either from electronic or local print newsletters.

Question 7. Overall, I believe this meeting was:
Seventy-six of respondents indicated they believed the open house was worth their while only 5 percent had no opinion believed and 2 percent thought it was not worthwhile.
Question 8. The meeting encouraged my input and I felt listened to:
Seventy-nine percent of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that they were listened by staff at the open house. Three percent disagreed and 18 percent were neutral.

![Pie chart showing percentage responses to the question: Strongly Agree 33%, Agree 46%, Neutral 18%, Disagree 3%, and Strongly Disagree 0%.

n=59]

**WRITTEN SECTION**

**Question 1 and Additional Comments. Are there other design options you would like the project team to consider? Additional comments?**

The most frequent response was an expression interest in light rail going further south to destinations such as Gladstone, Oregon City, and Lake Oswego.

Many respondents expressed support for light rail and for it be constructed sooner. A few respondents expressed a preference for not building light rail.

There was no clear consensus on the design options.

A number of respondents specifically expressed support for a terminus at Park Avenue while smaller number expressed concerns about terminating at Park Avenue or about potential impacts to the trolley trail.

Several respondents expressed either concern or opposition to light rail and/or park and ride in downtown Milwaukie.

There were several suggestions about the park and ride at the Southgate. Some respondents expressed support while others expressed concern over this option.

A couple of respondents stated public safety concerns.

**Question 2. The most important things I got out tonight’s meeting included:**

Most respondents reported that learning about the proposed alignment design options was most important. Several indicated that learning that others supported light rail was most important. A couple of respondents stated concerns about light rail going downtown.
Question 3. For future sessions, I would suggest:
Several respondents commented on the need for higher quality maps and graphics, including topographic information, existing bus routes and stops, and legible street names. Other suggestions included speakers or a forum format.

Question 4. Are there other people or groups you would suggest we contact about this project?
Neighborhood associations and residents were the most stated group to be contacted. Others included the Portland Waldorf School, Friends of the Trolley Trail, Milwaukie Rotary Club, and the Portland Business Alliance.
Question 1. Are there other design options you would like the project team to consider?
“Develop park and ride at Tacoma. Integrate Springwater Corridor with rail line and stations. Second park
and ride near Providence hospital to capture future users and traffic from expressway to Clackamas.”

“I. Integration with the Springwater bike trail at Tacoma station. 2. With Milwaukie alignment, consider
station or park and ride at the latitude of the Milwaukie Hospital as an alternative to the Milwaukie Southgate
station.”

“A Harold Street Station. It's half way between the proposed Bybee and Holgate stations, and would service
the Westmoreland neighborhood more adequately.”

“I am hoping team is looking far enough into future -- regards development, especially area between Tacoma
& downtown Milwaukie. I would like to see mixed-use development along there.”

“Need at least two stations in downtown Milwaukie -- one near Harrison or North of Harrison and one near
Lake Road. I like the idea of having a major park & ride facility south of Milwaukie.”

“I feel strongly that the Light Rail should follow McLoughlin Blvd. and begin/terminate at the Park Avenue
site to better accommodate Oregon City residents and to cut costs by not having to traverse the lake.”

“Use the "Mil. Work Group Recommended Alignment", but keep park and ride at Southgate, via a "Wye"
junction: 1. Run South into Southgate; 2. Then reverse direction to go out and continue South to Milwaukie.
North bound would do same in reverse.”

“I think a trolley car line could work. I'm not sure why it would need to extend beyond Milwaukie
downtown. I don't think the additional distance outweighs taking part of the trolley trail.”

“As someone who lives outside the alignment, I can only say that I hope there would be some sensitivity to
those who do. My primary interest is getting light rail as close to Oregon City as possible -- as soon as
possible.”

“Choose design and alignment to minimize cut through traffic. Build major park and rides -- Tacoma, South
Gate, Park -- big enough. Can't decide between A & B, like going South to Park.”

"Milwaukie South End" -- Close Main Street South of Washington. Turn whole area (Cash Spot to P.O. to
Bernard's Garage) into a combined light rail station, park and ride (and parking for Riverfront Park) and either
PSU or Dark Horse "campus" -- pedestrian zone that transitions to Dogwood/Kronberg Parks.”

“The alignment of light rail -- all options look viable to us. The station at Harrison is probably not a good
idea. Monroe seems a good choice to us. Park and ride at Park and McLoughlin would be our choice. We'd
like to see as many trees as possible preserved.”

“Need this sooner.”

“Middle of McLoughlin South of Milwaukie. Station at 18th in Westmoreland. Park and ride at Cash Spot.”

“I would like to see the rail cross McLoughlin on an overpass and not at ground level. Whatever design
option is chosen, we need light rail in Clackamas County.”
“Don't stop at Park Avenue; continue across the river to Lake Oswego. Then loop North along the river on 43/Macadam (yes, for real!) back to Portland. Let's get it to 99E to really open it up for commuters.”

“I am pleased about the proposed extension South of Milwaukie. This would be an asset to the area and reduce congestion in Milwaukie.”

“I. Do not build. 2. Improve bus service throughout the region. 3. Change buses to cleaner fuel. 4. Reconsider hi-speed busways and HOV lanes.”

“No station at Harrison or Monroe Streets.”

“Not sold on this project now. Dollars local match.”

“Run Along McLoughlin. Go all the way to Lake Oswego. New bridge below Sellwood to replace Sellwood Bridge.”

“I believe it does not make sense to end in downtown. There is no room for a park & ride. You will lose all Oregon City ridership.”

“Inner SE needs transit connection. Could you re-design the 17th Ave. underpass to include an above rail ped walkway/overpass. The one existing is horrible -- and well lighted option should be in someone's plans.”

“LRT need to connect directly to the Aerial Tram to connect OHSU (Portland's largest employer) & the projected 15,000 works/residents of South Waterfront District to regional mass transit.”

“If you bring light rail to Milwaukie, it should go south to the Park & Ride in Gladstone. No one will drive to Milwaukie and turn off 99E to go to Park & Ride in downtown Milwaukie. They will keep on driving down 99E to Portland.”

“I prefer design B with more park and rides. I'm concerned if the Sellwood Bridge ever closes, as I work downtown. I would definitely take the light rail to work in downtown Portland.”

“I have been looking forward to having light rail in our community for years. I would certainly like to see this completed with a park and ride in my lifetime.”

“I like the 2003 LPA on park and rides. I do not like a Park Ave. park and ride.”

“We like the Park Avenue design option. Thank you for adding it!”

“The southernmost terminus at SE Park would serve more riders.”

“I support the furthest south terminus at SE Park. This location would allow the largest park and ride facility and increase usage of residents to the south.”

“No. Option A looks best to me.”

“Streetcar through 224 to Clackamas Town Center.”

“Come to Gladstone, please.”
“Lighting and shelter at stations for passengers.”

“Looks good. What happened to 18th Avenue stop?”

“1. Locate a transit station closer to downtown Milwaukie. A great location could be the Milwaukie Lumber site. 2. A station near the Kellogg Treatment Facility to attract future redevelopment.”

“If Option B is used, a solution for the neighborhoods east of the railroad to have a reasonable park & ride option. Much as solution "LPA" and "A" seem "messier" to build. They seem more practical/useable by a larger portion of residents and offers a greater long-term economic benefit to the businesses in downtown Milwaukie.”

“I think one station in Milwaukie would be good. Park & ride at the Elks would be wonderful.”

“Extension to Clackamas Town Center.”

“ Crossing over Powell. Just another bridge will make the ped/bike underpass even worse! Not safe right now.”

“Make Lake Road park & ride smaller or move it out of downtown.”

“Love Option A.”

“Get started quicker; finish by 2012.”

“We need Light Rail ASAP. I am concerned about alignment that would cause family, North industrial, wage, jobs to leave Milwaukie.”

“I am strongly in favor of the Light Rail Project.”

“Consider major improvements to the Powell overpass. Don't make it a bigger/better haven for the homeless.”

“Park Avenue park and ride is a great spot I have never before thought of. Brief legal history: NE corner of this intersection has been barren land forever and SE corner car lots have never done well. Changed hands multiple times over the years. Businesses on East side of road are inconsequential at most. The Park Avenue area is really between worlds -- not Milwaukie, and not Oak Grove, either. A park and ride here would have minimal negative impact on surrounding neighborhoods.”

“I like the Park Avenue Station, but concerned about Island Station Neighborhood. Much better proposal than last one -- less neighborhood impact.”

“Please bring light rail to Milwaukie. Or, a streetcar. We need a good inter-city transportation system. Or, commuter rail to Lake Oswego.”

“1. It might be good to move the river crossing southwards. 2. I think the extension to Park Avenue is an improvement. It intercepts traffic south of Milwaukie. 3. The transit center is Milwaukie needs to consider future commuter rail on the railroad.”
“The 2nd train station/park and ride is best placed as far South as possible -- Park, or even beyond. Those are the people who will use it. Bring them all the way to my tiny neighborhood (just to park) is unkind and not practical. Beyond that -- another light here would further back things up as they already do to this point in the a.m. This location is not policed well as a pure residence and not a good option for that reason. We can walk to Park or to downtown just as easy so it would be of no benefit to us. Few people live here, so why not go further south to commercial zone (policed well), as this is where the riders are going to come from. Again-- few people live here with the narrow strip of and between Kellogg Lake and the River. This is a bad site for a station or park and ride.”

“Do not bring light rail into Downtown Milwaukie. I object to any alignment that brings light rail into Lake Road near the historic Milwaukie area and Lake Road area an its neighborhoods. The light rail station/park and ride should be at the Southgate Theatre site.”

“PDX-Milwaukie L-Rail line should not terminate @ Lake Road. L-Rail provides too easy access to drug dealers to Milwaukie High School campus. Police would need to be policing campus full time from 6 am to 10 pm. Campus facing Lake Road has no windows. Campus Art/Auditorium building facing potential Lake Road L-Rail station has no windows. School staff could not monitor the L-Rail station from the campus -- it's a total blind spot. Too much rush-hour congestion between school buses, students in cars, and commuters.”

“Not sure. I like the map I saw. Wish it could be soon!”

“Leave lots of room for the Trolley Trail. Continue down McLoughlin alignment through Milwaukie park and ride.”

**Additional Comments**

“Consider addition of bike path along entire alignment. Consider south terminus and station at the “Bomber” (13515 SE McLoughlin.”

“I am concerned the alternate route along warehouse area will hinder that kind of development.”

“Multi-modal transportation will make for a healthy downtown!”

“Please reconsider staying on McLoughlin and avoiding downtown Milwaukie, which is already congested. Thank you.”

“I’m concerned about light rail’s impact on the new waterfront park in Milwaukie. It would be considerably less pleasant with the train running by.”

“As a user of park and ride, I am most interested in adequate and safe P & R locations.”

“I’m ambivalent about extension to Park Avenue -- if it can be done without displacing Trolley Trail, worth exploring.”

“Can’t wait for the line to begin service!”

“Would like to see the trolley trail preserved, if line goes to Park or beyond.”

“Make a serious study of river transit.”
“We went through this before.”

“Reconsider staying on McLoughlin to the Park Avenue Park & Ride Terminal.”

“Extend river-crossing study to include South Waterfront down to Gibbs Street.”

“I prefer multiple park and rides to just a couple.”

“LPA is fine, but could be extended to Park Ave., if not too expensive. Keep park and ride out of downtown.”

“We want to ride the light rail soon.”

“I thought I was well informed on transit issues, but this came up very fast -- lucky I saw notice at Open House.”

“Also, getting the train for SE up 99E the better to ease heavy traffic between I-205 and downtown Portland.”

“Thank you for continuing this discussion so soon. Thought it would be many more years.”

“Please build it faster!”

“We like design option "A".

“OK GO!”

“Lake Road park and ride scares me! Bad location as it is tiny and takes up precious downtown parking space. I'm all for a MAX stop there, but let people park their commuter cars elsewhere.”

“We're strongly in favor of light rail -- we'd use it a lot!”

“Great idea! I hope it goes through.”

“Time to give this area contemporary transportation. We need to clean up our environment. The time is now!”

“We need a good, environmentally clean mass transit system. All us baby-boomers will not drive cars in a few short years.”

“Bringing light rail into downtown Milwaukie will bisect the city, like Highway 224 did. Light rail also brings crime with it. It is an easy escape route for "druggies" and should not come anywhere near Milwaukie High School campus. I do not want light rail in downtown Milwaukie! The only acceptable site to terminate it is Southgate Theatre site.”

Milwaukie L-Rail should terminate at Southgate Cinema site or Pietro's Pizza location, not come into downtown Main Street.
**Question 2. The most important things I got out of tonight’s meeting included:**

“Good understanding of potential station locations and alignments in Milwaukie.”

“A lot of thought & work is going into this -- hopeful sign -- we need light rail!”

“A look at the alignment.”

“Became aware of new alignment.”

“Where the proposed line, park and ride and stations will be.”

“Overview of design proposals.”

“Better understanding of time line and proposed route choices.”

“Future plans to proceed.”

“Current planning/proposals.”

“Ideas on how to organize cocktail parties.”

“How difficult it is to locate park & rides.”

“See all the people out, concerned and in favor of Light Rail -- what more do you need!”

“Decisions about river crossing don’t include stakeholders in South Portland.”

“They are interested in our input.”

“Seeing old friends!”

“A good overview of the proposed project.”

“Understanding alignment options and project timeline.”

“The alignment of potential light rail.”

“There is a lot of emphasis on public involvement in this process.”

“Informative.”

“Alignment alternatives. Insight to specific concerns re extension to Oatfield area.”

“Seeing the maps of the proposed routes made for more clear the issues involved.”

“Information about park & ride.”

“Extension of rail to at least Park -- Yeah.”
“Obvious enthusiasm for getting this project moving.”

“Seeing "old" people that have worked on this project for years.”

“Just like other issues in Milwaukie. They have already been decided--by who?”

“How long the process takes.”

“There is hope.”

“Seeing optional alignments.”

“I'm going to have to wait a long time for Light Rail, if still might not happen.”

“Seeing the local interest.”

“Application for Citizen Advisory Committee.”

“Proposed routes.”

“A good overview of the light rail needs.”

“I don't like the route of the train coming into downtown Milwaukie.”

“There is a small, loud-mouthed minority pushing for L-Rail to come to Lake Road. Most residents don't want L-Rail in downtown Milwaukie.”

“Where proposed alignments are.”

**Question 3. For future sessions, I would suggest:**

“I sure wish there was hope for an OC station -- more valuable to me than a Clackamas Town Center route.”

“A talk or two discussing pros and cons of the different designs.”

“Well attended; extremely well "staffed"/supported -- though, in looking at the maps, it's not clear that there is a cliff and that streets cannot be easily connected near the industrial park, where the "recommended alignment" is proposed. In future meetings, this should be addressed.”

“Put existing and proposed bus routes on maps.”

“Better signing on Lake Ave.”

“To meet more people.”
“The map used to show the routes proposed needs -- in particular Route B -- to better call out the geographic challenges of that part of town. In particular, people who don't live or commute near 30th/28th and Olson won't have a clue about the challenges of the train trades -- cliff, industrial business there. The people facilitating seem to understand, but the map should call it out for all those who don't know to ask.”

“Recognition necessary of Sellwood-Moreland involvement.”

“Less talk, more construction!”

“Have an overview of project in more detail.”

“A PowerPoint presentation with a speaker or speakers. Also, maps that are graphically more readable as far as street names, etc. I could barely see street names or the maps (they were so light) in order to get oriented to where the route was traveling through. Very poor graphics.”

“Much higher quality graphics, maps, diagrams, etc. An open forum, featuring proper and business owners, residents who list near L-Rail in Gresham and Beaverton; equal numbers of people who've had positive and negative impacts from L-Rail in their area. Also include police officers that regularly police the stations and trains in DT Gresham and DT Beaverton. We want honest, experiential testimony -- not sugarcoated Metro-speak.”

**Question 4. Are there other people or groups you would suggest we contact about this project?**

“Possibly Providence Hospital and low-income dev. To west of line – likely users.”

“The Portland Waldorf School will be greatly impacted by this project; that community should have a voice in this project.”

“Friends of the Trolley Trail”

“SMILE”

“ORTEM”

“Neighborhood people--not groups.”

“Portland Waldorf School”

“Macadam URAC, South Portland N.A., OHSU and VAHC, and Homestead, N.A.”

“Milwaukie Rotary Club”

“Portland Business Alliance”

“AGC?”
“SMILE (Sellwood Improvement League)--General meeting 1st Wednesday monthly, 7:30 pm; Board 3rd Wednesday monthly 7:30 p.m.”

“Definitely the Brooklyn Neighborhood.”

“SMILE (Sellwood Neighborhood Association); Gardens on 15th Homeowners Assn.”

“Neighborhood Associations, Chamber”

“The residents of Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood Association and Lake Road Neighborhood Association”

“All Milwaukie Neighborhood Associations, especially Lake Road NDA, Historic Milwaukie”

**OTHER COMMENTS SUBMITTED – TROLLEY TRAIL COMMENT COMMENT COMMENT CARD**

“1. Light rail – yes. Option B (Third). 2. Continue to park and McLoughlin – must. 3. Try to have one station between Tacoma and downtown Milwaukie – north of or at Southgate. 4. Strong feeder lines throughout Milwaukie. 5. Continue some bus routes to downtown Portland. Light rail cannot be the only way in. 6. Fewer but strategic stations along route. Too many make it too slow. 7. Stay off Frontage.”

“1. We voted this down- why do we need it (light rail) at all? 2. Why can’t we have better roads that everyone uses? 3. Why can’t we have buses and trolleys that can go anywhere, are less expensive and more user friendly? 4. Why does TriMet/Metro care so little about Milwaukie citizens and Milwaukie livability- is it because the powers that be live in the untouchable Lake Oswego? 5. Why does TriMet not listen?”

“What is the point of ‘commenting’ the people have spoken time and again against light rail through Milwaukie, but the so called decision-makers (those with a vested interest in densification) are determined to ignore the public and the vote and do as they want.”
Learn about the Portland-Milwaukie light rail project and the upcoming study

Get the latest details on the alignment, stations and bridge crossing. Find out how to stay up-to-date and participate in the study.

Attend an open house
4:30 to 7:30 p.m., April 9
OMSI Auditorium
1945 SE Water Ave.

For more information, visit www.metro-region.org/transportation.

To ask a question or share a comment, send e-mail to trans@metro-region.org, or call (503) 797-1756.
Purpose: The purpose of the Open House was to inform the public about the initiation of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the design options being considered for the river crossings, and how to get involved.

Hosts: Metro, TriMet, and the City of Portland hosted the Open House, which was held at the OMSI auditorium from 4:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.

Attendance: An estimated 70 people attended. Thirty-eight comment forms were turned in to staff, approximately 54 percent of all Open House attendees.

Information Presented: 1) PowerPoint presentation of project history, scope and schedule, decision-making process, alignment overview, and public involvement; 2) display stations of project history, the Locally Preferred Alternative, design options, project calendar and decision-making; and 3) handouts including project fact sheet and maps, applications for citizen advisory committee, feedback forms, and mailing list sign-up.

SUMMARY OF COMMENT FORM RESPONSES*

MULTIPLE CHOICE SECTION
Question 1. Do you live, work, or own property near the proposed light rail alignment? Eighty-two percent of all respondents live, work, or own property within one-mile of the proposed light rail alignment. The most received response was one-half mile to one mile, 36 percent. Nine percent of respondents were outside of 3 miles.

Live, work, own property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 and 1 mile</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2 miles</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 and 3 miles</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3 miles</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3 miles</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=38
Question 2. Which of these best describes you (choose all that apply)?
The most frequent description was resident at 31 percent followed by commuter at 23 percent.
The third most selected description is property owner 12 responses.

**Respondent self-description**

- Commuter: 23%
- Resident: 31%
- None: 9%
- Work: 11%
- Own Property: 18%
- Run Business: 8%

N = 31

Question 3. What is your zip code?
The ZIP codes indicated by respondents are 97201, (SW Hills); 97209, (NW Portland); 97210, (NW Industrial); 97212, (NE Portland); 97214, (Hosford-Abernethy); 97239, (John’s Landing); 97215, (Mid-SE Portland); 97206, (Outer-SE Portland); and 97202, (Brooklyn-Reed-Eastmoreland-Sellwood).

**Zip code**

- 97202: 48%
- 97201: 9%
- 97215: 6%
- 97239: 6%
- 97214: 3%
- 97212: 6%
- 97210: 6%
- 97209: 3%
- 97206: 3%

N = 32
Question 4. In an average week, how many times do you travel one-way between Milwaukie and downtown Portland?
Approximately 73 percent of respondents travel less than one to three times a week between downtown Portland and Milwaukie.

Travel between Milwaukie and Portland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than once</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 7</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 10</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 plus</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 10</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 plus</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=33

Question 5. How do you travel within this corridor now?
Seventy-one percent of respondents travel in corridor by car at while 20 percent travel by bus. No respondent indicated traveling by bicycle.

Travel Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Mode</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=35
Question 6. How did you hear about tonight’s open house (choose all that apply)?
Forty-two percent of respondents learned of the open house through electronic announcements such as Metro’s Planning E-news and Councilors electronic newsletters. Others methods were phone calls to neighborhood and business groups.

![Source of Event Info](image)

Question 7. Overall, I believe this meeting was:
Seventy-five percent of respondents indicated the open house as worth their while only 6 percent had no opinion or thought it was not worthwhile.

![Value of Event](image)
Question 8. The meeting encouraged my input and I felt listened to:
Sixty-three percent of respondents either agree or strongly agree that they were listened by staff at the open house. Thirty-four percent of respondents were neutral and 3 percent strongly disagreed.
WRITTEN SECTION

Question 1. What do you think of the optional crossings shown tonight? What are your comments, concerns, or preferences?

Crossing options that received the most comments in order of magnitude:

- Support for Meade-Caruthers
- Support for the Locally Preferred Alternative
- Support for Division-Porter
- Equal number of support and opposition to Ross Island

There was one comment from a representative of the South Portland neighborhood association opposed to the Naito Parkway crossing options. There were 4 comments indicating interest in keeping the alignment on the eastside. Other comments include concerns construction cost and support for a public vote on the project.

Question 2. Are the current station locations still ideal? Are there other station locations we should consider?

Thirty-one participants responded to this question. The most received comment was 4 participants indicating support for a Harold St. station. The next most received comment was 3 participants indicating that the LPA’s adopted stations were sufficient. There were equal number of respondents that expressed support or concern for Holgate and Bybee St. stations.

Other comments included having stations better serve the south waterfront and needing more information on design and development.

Additional Comments:

There were 17 responses on varying topics. The most received comment was on the quantity and type of the information presented at the Open House. One response stated the displays were great. Another stated more specifics needed on crossings eliminated in previous studies. Yet another response stated the amount of information and staff were great and helpful. Other comments include improvements to the Powell Blvd. rail bridge, concern with property impacts, South Portland neighborhood representation on the citizen advisory committee member, streetcar preference over light rail as well as support for light rail.

Question 3. The most important things I got out of tonight’s meeting included:

The most frequent response was information on the river crossing options and basic project information such as the study schedule and station locations. Each received 9 comments out of 24. Other issues identified were public input, and other studies or alignment options not mentioned at the Open House.

Question 4. For future sessions, I would suggest:

Comments ranging from suggestions about maps to “actually building it” were received.

Question 5. Are there other people or groups you would suggest we contact about this project?
Six comments were received. Suggestions were the voters, Oregon Trucking Associations, PSU planning students, SE 17th Ave., Amcot International Engineers, businesses, teens, children, and seniors.
Question 1. What do you think of the optional crossing show tonight? What your comments, concerns, or preferences?

I work at Intel in Hillsboro. I'm very excited about this connection. I think keeping the Eastside landing closest to OMSI and streetcar east (Meade/Caruthers) is very important.

The Meade-Caruthers or the Porter-Division will serve the Brooklyn neighborhood well.

Stay away from Ross Island and the Ross Island Bridge. Direct link to South Waterfront is very important.

My 1st choice would be the OMSI crossing. I might consider the "blue" crossing, but would depend on ridership NOW and time it takes to get downtown.

Without seeing detailed impact studies, my cross preference is for Meade. Though either Meade or Parker look great to me.

It's good to consider improving South Waterfront service. However, it should not be at the sacrifice of more distant commuters. Therefore, the Ross Island crossing should not be considered--it introduces too much delay to the primary commute--not to mention the visual impact.

Unsure about cost of another bridge crossing.

I would like a vote of the people.

It needs to consider GVW's that support freight. Large trucks are stranded, loading up freeway for local only deliveries.

South waterfront to OMSI over Caruthers Bridge seems best to meet the need.

Alignment furthest South best serves OHSU (city's largest employer) on Marquam Hill and new Schnitzer campus, as well as more of S. Waterfront district.

Stay on the Eastside. Join the North line. No bridge. Save money.

A number of difficult choices -- can't please OMSI and SOWA.

I like the idea of a rail bridge between the Marquam and Ross Island Bridges, which could serve also the streetcar, bakes and pedestrians.

They could make more sense. Need more details on design constraints and the politics involved (vertical and horizontal clearances, landowner involvement in route design, etc.). Maps could include more information about specific design issues and constraints and rationales for route choices made.

Any on Naito Parkway are of great concern to the South Portland Neighborhood Association. Naito is destined to be a local 2 lane street--South Portland Circulation Study approved by the City Council--and this goes by our National Historic District. Your alternatives that go more directly to Southwest Front are more favorable.

I prefer the locally preferred crossing, which has a station at OMSI.

Transfer opportunities are critical. The longer (farther) between modes (e.g. light rail to tram) the less people will use it.

I like the bridge "banded" design between Meade & Caruthers and Porter-Division. I live at the Meriwether Condos. Seems like it would provide reasonable walking distance access.

Meade-Caruthers best choice as it serves OMSI best, while also serving South Waterfront.

Closest to tram is preferred option.

I agree with the two options placed highest on your cost/benefit chart.
Too expensive and counter productive!!! The NS Light Rail needs to stay on the East Side for speed, efficiency, ridership to save money!!!

Need technical analysis to fully inform. Further refinement/options.

The alignment should be constructed to maximize connections to other transit and the South Waterfront, even if it involves an elevated station.

South Waterfront should be served by LRT to maximize transit opportunities for employment and residents.

Looks great--I think OMSI to River Place is best. The streetcar will cover South Waterfront & SE would benefit from the MAX near Division/Hawthorne.

Serving OMSI with light rail and streetcar seems redundant. The Ross Island Bridge alignment separates these tracks and increases the utility of both operations. But where then does the streetcar cross?

I run the Residence Inn on SW River Parkway and I am concerned about access to my property if the LPA is approved.

None of the options that cross the river. Keep line on Eastside for faster N-S trips. Modern transfer stations at bridgeheads and Rose Quarter.

The Caruthers crossing makes the most sense and would serve the needs of a wide range of people.

I don’t really prefer any over any others, except definitely no to Ross Island Bridge.

Question about route going along SE 17th. Why not McLoughlin? Please put a step back at SE Harold and McLaughlin. Also, I hear safety being a big issue with my neighbors.

It's crucial to connect light rail to the eastside streetcar as well as westside streetcar and connect either light rail or streetcar to OMSI. Locate somewhat nearer South Waterfront (OHSU).

No bridge!!! Connect to NLR!!!

Seems okay.

Good

---

**Question 2. Are the current station locations still ideal? Are there other station locations we should consider?**

A station at Harold might do well to serve Westmoreland/North Moreland neighborhoods. Not sure what time penalty that gives to the trip times .

17th & Holgate is perfect and will serve the Brooklyn neighborhood as well.

Most locations are good. I worry about the Holgate station. Truck traffic is heavy, poor walking links to Sellwood-Moreland.

They look good.

I think that the station locations look good generally. Of course, I would like to see specific station plans to get a better idea for parking, traffic, etc., impacts.

**ONE** more in South Waterfront, so as not to significantly slow the commute. Otherwise, the alignment along 17th and the associated stations are excellent--great choices.

Unclear how buses/peds interact with trains at stations, if at all.

17th & Holgate will likely put us out of business in SE Portland.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You need to restore the north end Westmoreland Station which was part of the original plan (and which Westmoreland voluntarily rezoned itself for).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station at tram terminal is imperative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers at the bridges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comment. I'm not familiar with those neighborhoods/corridors enough to comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. The analysis should include transfers between Milwaukie LR and possible future LR (Powell/Foster) and streetcar (Division) lines. (Even if these are not officially approved yet.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I very much support the Bybee Blvd. Station as it will be close to my house, but oppose any parking there, other than what currently exists. I support Park and Ride at Milwaukie Southgate to accommodate drivers from Highway 99 East, also Highway 224.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question feasibility of Bybee. Too hard to get to. Route between Powell &amp; Reedway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a station at the new OHSU campus site seems reasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhine should be well connected to Brooklyn on East and West side of tracks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think Bybee is a very crucial station. I would also be sure to make MAX access from the South Waterfront condo towers very easy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Rose Quarter, stations at the bridge heads to/from Downtown West.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too early in Central City to focus on stations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be consideration to increasing density of development near the proposed stations and/or creating feeder shuttle bus service to the stations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong recommendation for an alternative to LPA to serve South Waterfront.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the stations look good, but what about Sellwood? The MAX bypasses 17th. Is a streetcar (down 17th) in the near future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, current stations look sensible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the proposed station locations are ideal. Good spacing. Close to other modes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please put stop back at SE Harold &amp; McLoughlin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete Bybee and substitute another, not too far from Reed College. Include OMSI, Clinton and the others. Problem with Milwaukie alternate. I understand is no access to neighborhood to the East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One block south on 17th would be better. We have several well-established businesses here. We don't want to jeopardize too badly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, next corner-lot-parking. (sic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments**

Work hard to secure Tacoma park and ride soon. Owner of property (Howard Dietrich) doesn't seem keen on waiting on the project much longer

A great project that those of us in Brooklyn enthusiastically support!

Please consider the crossing over Powell helping to fix the problem--not make it worse. Thank you.

The amount of information and helpful people are great. Thanks!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike is my second travel option. Light rail will enhance this option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Streetcar over Light Rail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like cost effective transit that pays for itself at the fare box.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i would like to stay in business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoring Westmoreland Station would most economically meet the need at Harold Street on McLoughlin!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You need representatives from South Portland Neighborhood Association on the CAC, so input can be given about light rail impact on the existing neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please continue the open houses. There seems to be some confusion about the project's status and these events are very helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through service N/S and S/N is essential. Also the Central Eastside needs to be efficiently served by light rail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The analysis of the 4 crossing options was informational; more specifics on the no longer considered alignments would be more helpful and support the reasoning and/or convey no bias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great display. Lots of info to think about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can it access ground at OMSI when the river crossing must be 60+ feet in the air.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We own 4505, 4525 and 4535 SE 17th. We don’t object to a station at 17th and Holgate, but will argue that you buy equal property from both sides of the street and not all on our side!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will be more practical and beneficial &amp; convenient to use Milwaukie Ave. more. Resend…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 3. The most important things I got out of tonight’s meeting included:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>River crossing alternatives.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being able to talk about my concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic information on proposed routes, stations, timeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More info on crossing options to allow me to form an opinion--<strong>NOT</strong> Ross Is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timelines/schedules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will not be allowed to vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparently it could really happen, at long last, <strong>THIS</strong> time!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning the proposed alignment and bridge options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route options for crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You need more information about South Portland circulation study and how light rail does or does not fit!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of alignments in the Milwaukie area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current status of project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better understanding of bridge wide band option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The possibility to offer rational, more efficient, less expensive alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good project context/aerial maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of alignment options for river crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on alternatives considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing new opinions and seeing clear maps and timelines. I overheard many who are anti-this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I should come to a later meeting when more real options are defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking at other potential cross options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastside alignment is still not on the table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timelines/Current Status/Station Locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Station info, and alternatives. 2. Bridge crossing alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rail is coming soon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 4. For future sessions, I would suggest:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streetscape renderings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town meeting, with Q &amp; A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing how other modes of transportation can be effected. Space effected directly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actually building it!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A more formal presentation outlining the history, current issues and future design options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting on west side while discussing bridge-crossing alternatives. Impacts in established neighborhoods very great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The streetcar should use the Hawthorne Bridge. The South Waterfront should be served by the Lake Oswego line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More detailed plans. Evaluate options using consistent outreach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representatives from agencies should refrain from being condescending.
Larger handouts (11x17). More cost and decision point details to the alternatives on the timeline.
I would like to know if the zoning regulations will change?

**Question 5. Are there other people or groups you would suggest we contact about this project?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The voters.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Trucking Association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses on 17th--do they want a streetcar?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU Planning students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teens and children; seniors. What alternatives are most useful to them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep us informed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Non-scientific self-selected respondents
REPORT:
Milwaukie Segment Meetings
April 16, 18, & 26, 2007

In April of 2007 Metro and its partner agencies hosted three public meetings in the Milwaukie area to share more detailed and specific information about the Portland – Milwaukie light rail project after a widely attended open house on March 5th at the North Clackamas Education District building. Open house participants responded positively to the project and requested further detail and opportunities for input.

The Portland – Milwaukie light rail project team is preparing for the formal commencement of a Supplemental Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS), a federally structured study of the proposed light rail alignment for the south corridor, which will begin in summer of 2007. The three community meetings were held to raise public awareness about the contents of upcoming study including design options, and to help inform and finalize the scope of the study.

OVERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Focus</th>
<th>Date/Location/Format</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Segment: Island Station neighborhood, Oak Grove and areas further south and east of McLoughlin Blvd.</td>
<td>April 16th, evening Portland Classical Guitar Shop Introduction of project, presentation, break-out sessions on specific areas including station and park &amp; ride locations.</td>
<td>Full room, but manageable. Parking was scarce. Approx. 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Segment: North Industrial and Ardenwald neighborhoods</td>
<td>April 18th, evening Ardenwald Elementary School Introduction of project, presentation, break-out sessions on specific areas including station and park &amp; ride locations.</td>
<td>Medium/light attendance. Approx. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Segment: Downtown stakeholders, the Historic Milwaukie neighborhood and riverfront users</td>
<td>April 26th, evening Portland Waldorf School A school representative requested to change the program format. General dialogue between project team and meeting attendees took place instead.</td>
<td>Packed w/ Waldorf parents, students teachers, some neighborhood representatives Approx. 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY

South Segment
Some participants were eager for light rail though there were many concerns about specific impacts to access, businesses, and the neighborhoods. There were general questions and concerns about how alignments would affect noise levels, property values, trees, and the Trolley Trail. There were also questions about the possibility of adding more stations and extending alignments to Oregon City. There were several questions about the potential for eminent domain takings.

There were many specific questions and comments regarding where and how alignments could be located. Respondents proposed a variety of specific routes and infrastructure changes to accommodate transit alignments as well as specific routes that should or should not be considered.

There was interest in seeing transit serve the needs of local schools, but there was also concern regarding the hazards associated with transit crossings and the perceived security issues associated with park and ride sites and transit stations. Participants generally seemed to like the downtown and Park Avenue park and ride locations. Some respondents felt that a station at Lake Road would support the Milwaukie High School and encourage redevelopment, while others felt that a stop would bring increased crime and drug problems. Participants asked to see attractive and safe structures.

Participants demonstrated an understanding that incoming transit would bring changes in development, though there were mixed reactions to each potential route. As one example, some participants felt that a station at Bluebird would be unnecessary because of the lack of proximate development, while others felt that a stop might serve to create development in the sewage treatment area.

Attendees wanted more detail about the site design and amenities that will be included to create a better place (e.g. landscaping, bike parking, lighting, etc.) Some attendees expressed opposition to extending the line past Lake Rd., siting concerns about the traffic that a park & ride will generate, and the impact to area businesses if the line were to keep going to Oregon City.

North Segment
Some participants indicated that they would like to see light rail come as soon as possible. The comments from attendees to this meeting were generally constructive. Concern seemed to focus mainly on how a light rail alignment and associated park & rides could serve the Ardenwald neighborhood better. Several suggestions proposed for additional parking (or keeping a park & ride near Southgate, and opening up eastern access to the alignment to serve Ardenwald residents south of Tacoma.

Other participants were concerned about impacting businesses and limiting access to retail and industrial areas. Recognizing impacts to the industrial areas, participants were interested in seeing the costs and trade-offs laid out for each alternate alignment, such as plans for how truck, bus, and LRT would be managed under each. There were also concerns that some of the options would adversely affect the Ardenwald neighborhood in terms of noise, views, and access.
Participants noted the heavy bike traffic coming from the Springwater corridor and the need for bike parking at park and rides. Participants seemed to feel that a park and ride at Tacoma would be valuable for relieving traffic and many felt that the estimated number of parking spaces it would provide is too low. There were general concerns about the impact to area streets and park and ride stations if no park and ride is provided in Milwaukie. Concerns were directed at 32nd, Tacoma, and Johnson Creek Blvd. Participants saw value in a Southgate park and ride with access from Hwy 224, along with using shuttles to transport passengers from park and rides to light rail stations.

 Several questions and concerns were raised about how existing truck and North Industrial business traffic will fare in the presence of a light rail alignment and associated features. Maintaining access to or through specific sites within the north industrial area, such as the Pendleton site, and the main & Milport intersection were mentioned. There were concerns about security and providing retail space at the park and ride stations. Participants encouraged consideration of station placement relative to schools, while at the same time recognizing youth as an important transit group. Participants had questions about the factors that drive the locating of park and rides, where the demand data comes from, as well as the City of Milwaukie’s role in determining the penultimate alignment. There were also questions about eminent domain and potential effects on property values.

**Downtown Segment**

There was a last minute request to change the meeting format to general questions and answers. Staff made a brief presentation then turned to questions and answers. There were many concerns expressed particularly by Waldorf parents about the alignment being near the school. Questions were asked about the history of the alignment and why it was chosen. Many participants requested that 99E be reconsidered.

A straw poll was taken on audience preferences for station locations. A large number of participants indicated that they preferred a station at Monroe/Washington St. instead of at Harrison St. Others asked that Harrison St. not even be studied as a potential stop. Given reasons ranged from concerns about commuters parking in the school lot to the potential for train crossings at Harrison St. creating traffic problems. There was a great deal of concern for Portland Waldorf School parents and students in attendance. Some participants liked the idea of serving the school with a transit stop, though there were concerns about safety, noise, security, and land takings associated. There were also concerns about trains facilitating truancy and crime.

Some participants indicated a preference for keeping stations and park and rides outside of residential areas and away from schools. There were several concerns that a park and ride at Lake Road would exacerbate traffic problems and impact the neighborhood. Other participants indicated that a park and ride would be appropriate at Park Avenue. Some respondents indicated that a park and ride at Southgate would be vital, and others suggested running a shuttle from Southgate to downtown.
There were several concerns about downtown Milwaukie serving as a park and ride stop for commuters coming from the south who would not be supporting the downtown area. There were corresponding suggestions about reserving parking in Milwaukie for those with business there. A variety of respondents expressed concern about light rail negatively influencing downtown. Some suggested a streetcar as an alternative.

Several participants noted out that light rail had been twice rejected by voters. Others felt that light rail would cause Milwaukie’s livability to suffer disproportionately in order to fulfill a regional transportation need.

Several participants were unclear on the criteria for bringing light rail through Milwaukie, who should be contacted with questions, and where funding will come from.

APPENDIX- MEETING NOTES & COMMENT CARD TEXT

SOUTH SEGMENT

General Comment Cards:

1. McLoughlin Boulevard is a great place for urban development – don’t discount the consideration of this. There are many of us who would use Oregon City as a destination if MAX went there. Don’t listen just to Punkie!
2. Consider making Sparrow one–way for cars (i.e., heading east) – would allow rail gate, then but not require one for cars wanting to go west on Sparrow.
3. Need to happen ASAP.
4. Park Avenue sounds like a good park and ride place, think out taking rail out to Gladstone.
5. I have big concerns about the possibility of the light rail continuing past Park Avenue and going onto the O.C. via McLoughlin. Access for businesses as main (The Bomber Restaurant and Wings of Freedom Museum) would be greatly impacted. The route to O.C. should be at town center and out 205 (where the population center's growth is huge).
6. I vote against ending at Park Avenue. Too much cost and traffic and trolly trail congestion.
7. Need to expand, immediately, south in Oregon City. We like the "light rail west side of roadway" plan. Bridge over the roadway, raised stations at Blue Bird, park and ride at Park.
8. I'm all for it! Wish it was(sic) done already. The park and ride at Park Avenue is a good location – the businesses there now are eyesores anyway.
9. Think it should go all the way to Oregon City.
10. I vote to stop light rail at Lake Road. Close to Milwaukie High School.
11. If you build a park and ride at Park now, could you add one at Sparrow when and if need develops rather than both now?
12. Great Meeting!
13. LPA Locally Preferred Alternative 2003
15. I think the issue of left turn lanes mitigating against a center –of –99E alignment is a red herring. In the stretch from the RR trestle to Park, the only important left is in the southbound lanes from entry onto the Miramonte Complex. Left turns for northbound
traffic at Park and Bluebird are quite adequate. Very, Very few residents are turning left at Sparrow. I think a center or road alignment needs more consideration.

**Station Locations table:**
- Need Harrison & Monroe Street both and don't need Bluebird. Nothing there.
- Like's Bluebird, lives close by. How does it cross McLoughlin? Serves neighborhood that would use it.
- Park Avenue has better pedestrian access now, but could still be improved.
- Harrison not a good stop for school.
- Monroe works better for town.
- Don't go farther south. More park and ride at Lake Road.
- McLoughlin is a parking lot already (a.m.)
- Like Bluebird and park & ride at end of the line (Park Avenue).
- Station at Lake Road for high school students.
- Station and redevelopment at Lake Road - shared use.
- More potential riders at Sparrow than Bluebird – only have access/development on one side of McLoughlin, just a station, not park and ride.
- Concerns regarding Lake Road and safety (drugs/crime/etc. close to the high school).
- Sparrow better spacing.
- More housing close to Harrison
- Monroe better access to downtown
- Does Lake Road have to be a park and ride?
- Sparrow makes more sense then Bluebird.
- Sewer treatment area might redevelop with Bluebird.
- Can you build more station later - no so get them right.
- Like Monroe location closer to downtown
- All three –Lake, Sparrow, and Bluebird are important
- Alignment doesn’t go through downtown –should go, how about a streetcar?

**Alignments table:**
- How would traffic access the Park Ave. Park & Ride facility?
- Could the project exercise eminent domain to take the property & park?
- How difficult would it be to extend the line to Oregon City?
- Does the project realize there’s a big pipe under the Park Ave. Park & Ride?
- How would the trail, rail, 99E be sequenced?
- What is the current roadway width? Have recent measurements been taken?
- What kind of separation would be provided near the Trolley Trail?
- Closing Sparrow would create a safer environment for Trolley Trail users.
- What about raising the rail on the Westside?
- Concern about the number of trees lost.
- Question about station right outside Classic Guitar. Would there be parking on this side?
- Could the track be elevated all along McLoughlin? Avoid tree impacts on the east side.
- Where will the alignment cross the freight lines?
- Would Sparrow be closed at 99E?
- Will ODOT project still have pedestrian crossing at Sparrow for bus station if there will be a transit station up at
• Would station at Sparrow complicate access to the apartment complex?
• Alignment would provide safer transit for high school kids.
• The tracks go through the restaurant.
• What would be the gap between the rail and the trail? Would there be a fence?
• Would Trolley Trail construction be delayed?
• Security concerns at Park Ave. station
• Any discussion of tunneling the line where it’s currently above ground?
• Will another bridge have to be constructed?
• Question about whether or not the Park Ave. land could be developed because it’s a wetland area.
• Safety concerns for crossings – There are two children who catch the bus where the rail currently is. Also concerned about security for children so close to a transit center
• Traffic increase will also create greater pedestrian hazards.
• Add another signal
• Access from the south rather than the north.
• What times would the trains be coming and going?
• What will happen to our property value?
• Concerns about increased noise.
• Housing for sexual predators right there on 99E, south of Park Ave.
• Frustrations dealing with bureaucracies re: Trolley Trail, ODOT
• What will happen if more width is needed? Will there be a take in property?

Park & Ride Table
• Be nice to have something “exciting”, Attractiveness?
• Families, kids, school buses on Park
• Concerned about Sparrow – downtown and Park better
• Prefer LPA. Don’t want to go south. Stop at Lake Road.
• Amenities at station? Art?
• Concerns about level of security service to this area (aka unincorporated Clackamas County)
• Design so it isn’t a nuisance garage.
• Culvert on diagonal property – Difficulty of developing lot at Park
• Noise rising from hill?
• Traffic from River Rd.
• Homeowner next to alignment noise? Buffer? Esp. next to Trolley Trail
• Security at Park and Ride? Vehicle break-in + theft? Trespassing?
• Bike Parking?
• Acquiring property?
• How many exits from garage?
• Extent of circulation impacts at Milport?
• One or the other or both? How many spaces?
• How do you estimate 2600? Is there much growth south?
• Value of homes with light rail?
• Park & Ride will increase crime?
• Safety of kids – traffic safety – supervision
• School bus traffic
• Impacts to existing bus line service
• Time to downtown? 22 minutes
• How recent is data?
• How long for construction? 2014-2015
• Wetland at Sparrow?
• Walking access to Sparrow?
• Contact with Elks Club?
• There is a new sidewalk N. side of Park
• I prefer parking at Park instead of cars downtown.
• I like parking at Cash Spot – access to river and downtown.
• I think there is opportunity for development at triangle cafes, condos?
• Oak Lodge Sanitary District.

NORTH SEGMENT

General Comment Cards:

1. I definitely want to light rail come to this area. I would mostly use the Tacoma or Bybee stops – I would probably come from the Springwater. Bike traffic is constant. The Tacoma, park and ride should have bike parking. I am worried about impact on Tacoma, JCB and 32nd if there isn’t a Milwaukie station.
2. I would love to see either alignment but both with a Southgate park and ride – with access to 224!
3. Some retail at the Tacoma park and ride could state a nice change between Ardenwald/Sellwood.
4. The Acropolis and Fantasy Video and Industry seems a poor joint between Portland/Milwaukie.
5. I live in Ardenwald and would like to see light rail coming to and through Milwaukie as soon as possible. There is a park and ride location in our neighborhood right at the Tacoma street entrance to our neighborhood and it needs to be at least 1000 spaces. We have a large volume of traffic through our neighborhood daily and traffic studies for those roads may show we need something larger. We have a bottleneck problem, so I don't see how any park and ride would make it worse. The Tacoma park and ride will be filled very quickly.
6. I think that the proposed south corridor phase II LPA serves the most people and is a good plan, but will impact many businesses.
7. I think that the Milwaukie working group recommended alignment will not serve as many people and might upset some Ardenwald neighbors who live by Roswell Pond if a small bridge construction is placed near their houses. (would block their view of the other side of the river.)
8. Love option A. As an Ardenwald resident, I'm worried about stress to Johnson Creek Road if there's only a park and ride at Tacoma. Need the Milwaukie park and ride. PLEASE make sure Springwater bike trail has effective link to Tacoma park and ride. Tacoma park and ride needs more spaces – 600 not nearly enough!
10. Could option B still utilize Milwaukie park and ride?
11. The Tacoma station needs more spaces. I'm not sure where the demand estimates come from, but I think they need to revisited.
12. The Tacoma street park and ride and McLoughin street alignment would remove all access to the Pendleton site. We prefer the design option B alignment. The Milwaukie park and ride would disrupt the industrial neighborhood and not serve the Ardenwald neighborhood.
Park and Ride Table:
- Pendleton: Access to retail ______; Internal vehicle circulation from retail _____ to north side of building
- Don't think 600 spaces is enough at Tacoma – too much traffic/demand.
- Access into Pendleton site?
- Bike parking? Connection to Springwater Trail
- Parking in Industrial area? Odd fit, hurts business?
- How does Milwaukie park and ride serve Ardenwald? Hard to get to.
- Impacted businesses? Do they know?
- Noise? And neighbors?
- The "dip" at Tacoma – how tall is park and ride?

Station Locations Table:
- Alignment to CTC via 224 would make sense. Station should be north of Harrison for safety reasons (Waldorf School to south)
- What drives decisions to site park and ride
- Estimated demand vs. supply –where data from?
- City of Milwaukie planning's role in determining alignment, stations, and park and ride locations?
- Youth is the greatest user group from transit
- Monroe more beneficial –given higher number of youth (High school).
- Concerns about poor access to working group alignment –(dead end neighborhood streets)
- Tacoma park and ride favorable to WalMart and beneficial to relieving Sellwood Bridge traffic
- Any removals/takings for station at Harrison?
- How does traffic access Tacoma and Milwaukie park and ride (provide diagrams)
- 32nd/Tacoma/Johnson Creek traffic impacts caused by Tacoma park and ride
- Traffic diversion into neighborhood (JCBldv.)
- Effects on property values within ¼ mile of LRT line/park and ride facility/station
- Security at park and ride lots
- Cost effectiveness comparison of few large –capacity park and ride verses several small capacity park and rides and traffic impacts –specifically 1,000 spot at Tacoma
- Access from Springwater Trail to Tacoma park and ride –will people park at Tacoma to use Springwater?
- Effects on bus service on 32nd Avenue
- If working group alignment chosen, possibility of shuttling park and riders from Milwaukie park and ride lot to LRT and using buses on layover to do it
- Feasibility of raising LPA alignment to reduce conflicts with trucks on McLoughlin.
Alignment Table:

- Relative costs and trade-offs of 2 alternatives through north industrial area?
- How will increased congestion between (Milport (n. industrial) Main and Ochoco be mitigated for local truck traffic?
- How much of the alignment(s) is on public ROW?
- How to control interactions between trucks, buses, and LRT? At Milport?
- Talk to Goodwill about rerouting their truck traffic
- Impacts or/on future population increases?
- When would Milwaukie LRT open?
- Traffic, Johnson Creek, Tacoma, and 32nd -LRT impacts?
- Access to Southgate park and ride?
- Access to park and ride from 224?
- Future of old ODOT facility?
- Why not maintain park and ride at Southgate with working group alignment?
- What does the local roadway grid look like in 2030?
- Will the Johnson Creek bridges accommodate LRT?
- What are buildings next to parking garage?
- Will light rail create more train noise?
- How far apart would park and rides be?
- Comparison between alignments of where they capture park and riders in this segment?
- Why not a larger Tacoma park and ride?
- LPA access off Pendleton site
- Why not put park and ride on Tillamook Railroad alignment? Not that far apart.
- Would you keep both the Johnson Creek and the north industrial park and rides?
- How tall a structure over the tracks?
- Can a station serve Ardenwald neighborhood near the southern end of the north industrial area?
- Why on eastside of Tillamook branch?
- Does pedestrian access on north side of McLoughin go away with LRT?
- Working group alignments' structure over the railroad creates visual impediment for Ardenwald residents.

DOWNTOWN SEGMENT

General Comment Cards:

1. The rapidly changing demographics of Milwaukie demand that new alignments be considered. My strong, strong preference as a Milwaukie homeowner and Milwaukie business owner is that the McLoughlin Blvd. Alignment be reconsidered. Thank you and good luck!
2. What is the traffic impact on Lake Road between 224 and downtown? This needs to be minimized or mitigated, particularly for homeowners on Lake Road. Please no park and ride at Lake Road stop.
3. Impact on Waldorf School needs to be minimized/mitigated.
4. Impact on city center also needs to be minimized/mitigated.
5. Going down Main Street with light rail is not a good idea.
6. If the train crosses Harrison and closes it (the street) every three minutes during peak it will cause a huge snarl of traffic on Harrison. Please be sure you do your traffic evaluation when school is in session.

7. Monroe station preferable to Harrison station.

8. Need lighted, paved footpath between Harrison and Monroe, to avoid foot traffic coming across PWS campus or heavy rail tracks.

9. Yes, on extension to Park Avenue.

10. Coordinate with Trolley Trail!

11. Keep light rail away from residential.

12. It can be run through I-205, south of 224.

13. Use the lowest impact to residential and lowest cost, which is buses, not light rail. The project can easily be done by running a bus through <lowest cost>

14. I would prefer options that capture traffic before it reaches Milwaukie. Park and rides that are big enough, located on major roads. I would insist that we respect our schools and keep a safe distance away. I oppose drop off location near neighborhoods and schools. I would like to hear more specifics about what impacts light rail will have on our livability.

15. Please consider a Monroe/Washington stop rather than a Harrison station.

16. Southgate park and ride is essential as Milwaukie expressway. Traffic will just as soon drive all the way to Portland as they will drive to south, park and ride in/past our town.

17. BIG CONCERNS with Lake Road park and ride. A stop is fine, but if park and ride is placed there, it must be minimally –sized and concealed (retail, etc.). Milwaukie already complains of parking issues. Make Southgate HUGE, if you need to. Build at proposed Wal-Mart site. Even build a park and ride at Park Avenue for Oak Grove residents. Any parking structure in Downtown Milwaukie should be reserved for city business patrons, not commuters. Lake Road traffic impacts at peak hours for those who park there??

18. Park Avenue is a decent spot for park and ride. ODOT–owned post north of there is okay too, as that land is likely not to be used for anything else and residents nearby sit up and away from the road at both sites.

19. Too much residential impact in and around Lake Road potential park and ride (and I don’t live near there, so I am not biased). You don’t want that firestorm. It’s not worth the public backlash you’ll get.

20. Would like to see the 99E Option re–looked at (instead of cutting through Milwaukie).


22. Security: additional people loitering –safety or children

23. Noise: wheels, bells, PA, people, cars –school is open, no A/C


25. Future of Harrison parking lot

26. Not really adjacent to pedestrian–friendly residences or businesses, which are blocks away to the west.

27. No bus connection adjacent

28. I like that idea of light rail serving PWS from Portland -as long as rail is on east side of current RR track and no land is taken from current school site and parking lot. I am fine with station at lumberyard site (Monroe/Washington) –but not at Harrison.

29. I’d like to see current bus mall changed/moved to tie in with light rail station. Thank you.

30. I love the idea of light rail. I would love to see the light rail go down on 99E instead of going on Harrison and behind the Waldorf School. Thank you for your kind consideration.
31. What type of compensation could be made to the Portland Waldorf School with the line being right behind it, i.e. New parking lot, school improvements, etc.?
32. There are both benefits and costs involved; can they all be listed somewhere?
33. As a walker and TriMet rider it is important for me to be able to transfer to the 75 or 28 buses. If I must walk home (I don’t own a car) the area around a station is best if well lit and open. Currently late night walks from the TriMet bus end of line behind City Hall is safer up Monroe Street and “uncomfortable” up Harrison.
34. We don’t want light rail through the ________ 99E.
35. Parking lot on Lake Rd. will seriously increased traffic on Lake – a neighborhood.
36. With respect to the history of previous studies, will this project be put to a vote in the community like previous years? If not, is that because we’re not paying for it?
37. I am in favor of light rail in Milwaukie. We need rail to move into the future. When light rail comes to Milwaukie, I will use it.
38. I would like to see the alignment down McLoughlin –like North Interstate –an already busy street. I am so excited that light rail is coming!!! I will be a rider for sure! Therefore with the alignment down 99E the stop could be at Harrison –not behind the schools –any of them.
39. Please have meeting without people from Waldorf School. I have lived here 30 years and people here in the past three years are trying to take over with out regards to long time residents. Amen! (Someone else’s writing)
40. Of the proposed alternatives (and the unimaginable hellish scenario of NO light rail station here) I prefer studying Harrison and Monroe. I do not like the ideas of staying on Milwaukie, as it would be less convenient and accessible in my opinion.
41. With north Main and Town Center coming with high density it make more sense to have the alignment and stations on 99E.
42. Traffic impact on McLoughlin?
43. How many cars would come off McLoughlin?
44. I spent 40 years in Paris = Paris Metro brings crime.
45. Nightmare traffic to have to wait every 7 minutes (?)
46. How can you waste so much money with such a bad idea?

Poster Comments
- Why alignment not on McLoughlin (vs. Tillamook Branch)
- Is truck access nighttime influence over alignment
- Does staff ride light rail?
- Don’t want on Harrison and behind school
- Good idea, but not behind school; concerned about people parking at school
- These kids today deserve more respect than the process from the past
- How much opportunity does school community has to shift the alignment away from the school?
- Why doesn’t it work on 99?
- I was on the committee in 2003 that chose the LPA and I don’t remember Harrison Station. I question the process.
- I live in SE Portland all my life and I never heard about this.
- Also on park of LPA development - I do remember seeing Harrison. We didn’t go with 99 alignment because of river and what city was going to do. Would like to hear more about mitigation –parking, noise, safety.
• We moved to Portland to be car–free with children—it was wonderful. Good for our children; know to be careful around trains. Great to have children who aren’t dependent on cars.
• Why could industrial area shift from alignment, but Historic Milwaukie can’t? We don’t have the tax base they have.
• Is it going to look like your pictures?
• My first year at Waldorf. At the time, Waldorf was just a year old and we couldn’t give input because we weren’t here.
• Safety for the kids –drugs, kidnapping, skipping school to ride the train
• I have crime statistics –they look pretty scary. What is this?
• Are there any other stations this close to an elementary school?
• This community values green space. Seems like we’d love more green spaces, gardens, and springs.
• I came here tonight to learn, but this isn’t working very well because I am upset. Some of us here aren’t Waldorf school parents. I want to understand the reasons before I decide I don’t like things. I'm not sure I'm getting a chance to learn what they have to tell us.
• Sunday Oregonian talked about alignment on South Waterfront—they shifted the alignment, but we can’t. We've changed too – new buildings, etc. Why not the other alignment? Seems like fancy (?) condos are dictating things.
• I have heard from a majority of Milwaukie citizens—we have voted down light rail twice.
• I'd like to hear what these people have to say.
• Milwaukie resident with two children at Waldorf. Over 100 families in Milwaukie have children at Waldorf. Waldorf is all about sustainability. We've considered about livability. We want to be part of the conversation. How are we unique as a school located by a line?
• What are setbacks?
• We’re all used to how freight rail works through town. Compare MAX to that. The pictures are scary.
• Can we as a community affect the location of the stations?
• How does this fit in with eventually going south? Long–term, does it make sense to have Milwaukie as a stopping point?
• Not at Harrison; like theater alignment.
• Don’t like Harrison. Move to Monroe Street site.
• In study, will you look at Harrison even if this group doesn’t want it? This school has an early childhood program. Concerned about noise and distraction. Shaken might be more of distraction.
• Prefer Monroe; no to Harrison
• Rail line cutting through businesses and houses, seen it on 205—who pays for the movement of the people? Why not offer to pay for a new Waldorf School?
• Harrison Street good place, but not across from the school.
• Wondering about actual street: Harrison—stopping traffic. Speed up/stop versus cruising back (?) Can go either way on Harrison. What is close by for kids to ride.
• No on H - -46
• Do study on Harrison site - - 14
• Train speeds adjacent to Waldorf with or without station?
• Only 6 not in favor of 99 alignment
- Monroe –yes in SDEIS –almost all
- Opposed to studying Monroe –5
- Terminate light rail at Southgate point and run shuttles downtown? What's wrong with a shuttle?
- Lake Road station should be studied.
- Haven't had an opportunity to discuss this with the Lake Road neighborhood.
- Can you provide a list of people (elected officials) to contact on this topic?
- Representing Lake Road –uninformed about this. My concern is Metro wants this and your job (Kenny) is to get us to accept it. We've been rejecting it for 15 years. If you put light rail through this ____ of town, it will ruin the town.
- Existing freight track will be there –where will light rail be? What happens to the bus transit center?
- Assuming there was criteria to bring light rail through Milwaukie, what are they? Council approval, willingness of people, what?
- Monroe station would be south of Monroe?
- Crime potential: we have an obligation to keep our campuses open to the public. If light rail brings in more crime, will the city let us close the campus?
- Lincoln was in the news yesterday about drugs.
- What's the impact of the construction? How long would it take?
- Would it be possible to do construction by the school in the summer or at times of day when school is not in session?
- Are you telling me you won't run trains (if you do this criminal act) while schools are in session?
- Problem with traffic stopped at Harrison every 3.5 minutes.
- Does an EIS only study soil, animals, etc. or also economic inputs?
- Afraid –Metro and TriMet have to approach this regionally. But Milwaukie is at the center of the hourglass. Danger is we will be asked to accept things detrimental to the city. The core area should have no park and ride to serve outside people –only downtown. People from further south aren’t going to park here and shop in downtown Milwaukie.
- Didn’t hear safety on the list of things studied. I live here, don’t have a car, not safe walking from buses. Can the buses be near the park and ride?
- Neighborhood perspective –we support light rail at Southgate theater site. If this alignment goes through, it's going to destroy our town. If you want it to succeed, it needs to be elsewhere. Even consider a streetcar.
- We voted this down twice, in 1996 and 1998. I was here for both of those battles. Now we're going ahead. Interstate light rail cost $60 million/mile, Could have improved bus service for $60,000/mile. Just stop light rail, quit stampeding us, and give us back our vote. How will this be financed?
- Spent 40 years in Paris. We used to say Metro brings crime. In Paris we have lots of historical buildings we respect. This is total lack of respect for a historical building.
- Okay, this was voted down twice. But can’t be voted down again because Portland is growing so much. Portland and Milwaukie are going to let light rail do what it wants.
- Might tracks shift?
- What was general consensus at other town segment meetings?
- How can people get more questions answered?
Portland – Milwaukie
LIGHT RAIL PROJECT
Main Street/21st Ave.
Alignment Workshops
Wed., July 18, 6 to 9 p.m.
Thurs., July 26, 6 to 9 p.m.
Milwaukie High School
Commons Area, 11300 SE 23rd Ave.

A regional study examining Portland - Milwaukie Light Rail is poised to get underway.
In recent meetings it has been suggested that another Downtown Milwaukie alignment be added to the analysis.
Milwaukie's Mayor and City Council invite interested parties to these workshops to explore an alignment that travels along Main Street and/or Main and 21st Avenue. Participants are encouraged to attend both, as these workshops are sequential.
City Council will discuss the workshop outcomes at its August 7th meeting.
For more information please call 503.786.7508.
The Clackamas County Department of Transportation & Development, in partnership with Metro and TriMet,

Invites you to attend . . .

**WHAT:** OPEN HOUSE on the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project in Unincorporated Clackamas County

**WHEN:** 6-8 p.m., Monday, October 29, 2007
6:30: Presentation of Project Information

**WHERE:** Oak Grove Elementary School Cafeteria, 2150 SE Torbank Rd., Oak Grove

**WHY:** To review and discuss the proposed Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project and its potential impact on unincorporated Clackamas County south of Milwaukie

For more information, visit [www.metro-region.org/southcorridor](http://www.metro-region.org/southcorridor)
To ask a question or share a comment, e-mail trans@metro-region.org or call (503) 797-1756
Come Join Us...

Monday, October 29
Learn more about
Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail in
Unincorporated Clackamas County
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City/state/ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you want to be placed on the Portland-Milwaukie Light-Rail Project mailing list?</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments** (please print) Turn in completed card to project staff.

______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________


---

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Your written comments will be included in the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Citizen Advisory Committee meeting record.
Community Workshops on Future Southeast Portland Light Rail Stations

Tuesday October 2
Cleveland High School Cafeteria  
3400 SE 26th Ave.

This workshop will focus on station areas around SE Clinton St./SE 12th Ave., SE Rhine St. and SE Holgate off SE 17th Ave.

Thursday October 11
Sellwood Middle School Cafeteria  
8300 SE 15th Ave.

This workshop will focus on station areas around SE Harold St., SE Bybee, SE Tacoma St. off SE McLoughlin Blvd.

Both workshops begin at 6 p.m. and end at 8:30 p.m.

The Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Project would bring MAX to Southeast Portland. Currently, Metro and its partners, the cities of Portland and Milwaukie, Multnomah County, Clackamas County, TriMet and the Oregon Department of Transportation, are conducting an environmental analysis of this proposed light rail alignment including the station areas.

The project needs to hear from you!
The station area community workshops are your opportunity to:

• learn about the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Project
• provide input about what makes a good light rail station
• provide input about what changes to make the station areas more attractive places for transit riders and your community

Don’t know where the stations are?
Go to www.metro-region.org/southcorridor and download a map of the alignment. Keep checking website for new information on the workshops.

To ask a question or share a comment, send e-mail to trans@metro-region.org, or call (503) 797-1756.
Open House
Find out what Southeast Portland residents have been saying about future light rail stations!

Drop-in anytime between 6 p.m. and 8 p.m.

Monday November 26
Sellwood Middle School Cafeteria
8300 SE 15th Ave.

Tuesday November 27
OMSI Auditorium
1945 SE Water Ave.

Proposed Southeast Portland Light Rail Station Areas:
SE Clinton/SE 12th Ave. • SE Rhine/SE 17th Ave. • SE Holgate/SE 17th Ave. •
SE Harold/SE McLoughlin Blvd. • SE Bybee/SE McLoughlin Blvd. •
SE Tacoma/SE McLoughlin Blvd.

The project needs to hear from you!
The open houses are your opportunity to:

• Learn about community ideas from the workshops held in October
• Share your ideas to make station areas attractive places for your community
• Learn about the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

Need more information?
Go to www.metro-region.org/southcorridor.

Have an idea or comment to share?
Send e-mail to trans@metro-region.org, or call (503) 797-1756. You can also fill-out the self guided tour comment form from the website and return it by December 1st to the e-mail address or to Portland - Milwaukie Light Rail Project, c/o Metro, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland, OR 97232.
Community workshops on future light rail stations

Wednesday, March 12
Rose Villa fellowship hall
13505 SE River Rd. in Portland

This workshop will focus on the station areas at Park Avenue and Bluebird Street, and is held in coordination with Citizens Involved and Aware.

Wednesday, March 19
Milwaukie High School commons
11300 SE 23rd Ave. in Milwaukie

This workshop will focus on station areas around Harrison Street, Monroe Street, Washington Street, and Lake Road.

Both workshops begin at 6:00 p.m. and end at 9:00 p.m.

The project needs to hear from you!
The station area community workshops are your opportunity to:

• learn about the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail project
• provide input about where stations will be located in downtown Milwaukie
• provide input about how to make station areas the most attractive places possible for transit riders and your community.

The Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail project would bring MAX to Milwaukie and, possibly, Clackamas County. Metro and its partners, the cities of Portland, Milwaukie, and Oregon City, Multnomah and Clackamas counties, TriMet and the Oregon Department of Transportation, are conducting an environmental analysis of this proposed light rail alignment including the station areas.

Don’t know where the stations are?
Go to www.metro-region.org/southcorridor and download a map of the alignment.

To ask a question or share a comment,
Send email to trans@metro-region.org or call 503-797-1756.
Portland - Milwaukie Light Rail Project
Station Planning Workshops

The Portland - Milwaukie Light Rail Project Team hosted two public workshops in March 2008 to obtain public input on potential light rail stations in the Oak Grove and Milwaukie communities. The workshop at Rose Villa Manor community center on March 12 focused on the Bluebird and Park stations. The workshop at Milwaukie High School on March 19 focused on the Milwaukie/Southgate, Harrison, Monroe, Washington, Lake and Bluebird stations. About 230 people attended both meetings.

The purposes of both of the workshops were to:
- Identify the station locations being considered in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the Oak Grove and Milwaukie areas.
- Review best practices for station development.
- Identify opportunities and constraints for the suggested locations.

Each meeting began with a presentation about the conditions, opportunities, and challenges around the proposed stations. Time was then allocated to group table work. In Oak Grove, participants shared their perceptions about opportunities and challenges of the station locations and the project as a whole. Participants then reconvened as one group to share those thoughts through a community dialog. In Milwaukie the table work focused on prioritizing the station locations.

This meeting summary is organized by workshop location, with key points summarized from the meeting notes, maps, and flip chart notes. A complete list of comments from each meeting is attached.

Oak Grove Workshop

The Oak Grove meeting drew approximately 130 people, mostly from the immediate surrounding area. The mix of participants included those who are curious, interested in, or in support of light rail transit (LRT) and those who are against bringing LRT into the community. Consequently, the comments from the meeting reflect this schism. The following themes were reflected in the comments about both stations.

Bluebird Station Opportunities
- Trail connections and bicycle parking opportunities
- Re-development potential for the surrounding community

Bluebird Station Concerns
- Questions about access to the location for vehicles and pedestrians (safety)
- Concerns about crime and safety at an elevated station
Concerns that the physical site is too small for a station
Questions about the need for a station at this location (not enough users)
Concerns about the visual impacts of the above-grade light rail crossing over McLoughlin
Concerns about the traffic impacts of the at-grade light rail crossing at McLoughlin
Concerns about impacts to the Trolley Trail and surrounding neighborhood
Concerns about impacts to Kellogg Lake watershed

Other Concerns/Comments
- Concerns about transit-induced crime in neighborhood areas away from the stations
- Questions about the need for LRT in the community
- Concerns about LRT-induced intrusions into established neighborhoods

Park Station Opportunities
- Mixed-use development opportunities associated with the Park & Ride
- Gets traffic out of downtown Milwaukie
- Connects area residents and retirees to LRT
- Improves or increases re-development potential for the surrounding community

Park Station Concerns
- Concerns about crime and safety associated with the station and Park & Ride
- Concerns about impacts to the Trolley Trail, surrounding neighborhood, and mature trees
- Concerns about how the Park & Ride structure will fit within an established neighborhood
- Concerns about traffic intrusions into the neighborhood
- Concerns about air quality degradation

Other Concerns/Comments
- Questions about the terminus at Park vs. north of Milwaukie or further south into Clackamas County
- Concerns about transit-induced crime in neighborhood areas away from the stations
- Questions about the need for LRT in the community
- Concerns about LRT-induced intrusions into established neighborhoods

Milwaukie Workshop

The Milwaukie meeting drew approximately 100 people. Again, the mix of participants included those who are curious, interested in, or in support of light rail transit (LRT) and those who are against bringing LRT into the community. Consequently, the comments from the meeting reflect this schism. Workshop participants at this meeting added their comments to aerial maps as they discussed the Milwaukie station locations. Afterward, participants prioritized their LRT stations choices using colored dots.

Milwaukie/Southgate
Many people agreed that this is a logical location for a LRT station with a Park & Ride facility. Comments in favor noted that the previous Southgate park and ride was successful and the parking structure would be a better fit in the industrial area than downtown. There were a few concerns about how this would impact the industrial businesses in the area. This station location garnered the highest number of dots in the prioritization exercise.

**Harrison**

The Harrison LRT station location was not very popular with meeting participants. Many viewed this location as being too close to schools (particularly Waldorf) and there were concerns about the crossing arms blocking traffic as well as safety concerns for school children. The Harrison station option received very few dots in the prioritization exercise.

**Monroe**

The Monroe LRT station location received comments similar to Harrison and was also not very popular. It too received very few dots in the prioritization exercise.

**Washington**

The Washington LRT station location was popular with meeting participants. Many saw this as a convenient, central location that would serve the downtown business area, schools, and churches while also offering redevelopment opportunity for the lumber yard. Many people seemed to prefer the idea of a single downtown station and this seemed to offer the best fit. There were a few concerns about impact to street traffic from the crossing arms. This station location garnered the second highest number of dots in the prioritization exercise.

**Lake**

Comments about the Lake LRT station location were mixed. On the plus side, many saw opportunities in convenient access from McLoughlin, a good location for special events, access for Milwaukie High School, and opportunities to access the Kellogg treatment facility when that area redevelops. Concerns included questions about limited visibility and security, proximity to the river, and the availability of parking. Some people also felt that this station would be too close to the Washington station, if there were one.

**Bluebird**

Comments about the Bluebird LRT station location were also mixed. There were concerns about bike and pedestrian safety and access, but also a recognition that this site presented redevelopment potential and an opportunity for the connection to the Trolley Trail. Many people disliked the elevated McLoughlin overcrossing.

**Other Concerns/Comments**

- Crime and safety concerns
- Questions about the need for LRT in the community
- Concerns about LRT-induced intrusions into established neighborhoods
Appendix: List of Comments Received

Oak Grove Station Planning Workshop
March 12, 2008

Worksheet Summary:

Park Ave. Station Area

Ideas/Questions...

- Traffic signal at Park and River Rd.
- Most folks are totally opposed to light rail coming anywhere near Oak Grove—remember 2003, can’t wait until April.
- Elevated crossing from P&R to stop
- Light at Oatfield/Park necessary
- Taper right turn lane into and out of Park and Ride?
- Why is there no plan to travel down 224 to Clackamas Town Center to service the growth areas heading east from Town Center and south toward Oregon City onto Molalla? If light rail goes from Clackamas Town Center on 205 to Oregon City, a commuter would have to ride all the way to Gateway and transfer to go to downtown Portland. They won’t do it, they will continue to drive.
- Why can’t the terminus be at the Milwaukie north industrial area and then out 224?
- Extend light rail further into Oregon City via McLoughlin
- This was (light rail) voted down twice by the citizens and four times in congress. What are you doing here? This is another waste of taxpayer’s hard earned money!
- Expand hole through 224 (21st or 22nd underpass).
- Use trolley system (LRT doesn’t need to be 50 ft wide)
- Ideally, Park Ave. station would have some mixed use capability (coffee shop attached, etc.) to help “jumpstart” businesses in that area. As is, this is an uncomfortable block to sit and wait for a train. Add to that the suburban dweller’s mindset: drive to train to work and don’t linger as one might downtown.
- Bus & Light rail needed?
- End of the line is?
- No parking at BB, close together, why both? Rationale?
- So the tallest structure on 99 is a 4-6 story parking garage? Height restrictions?
- Please no elevated rail, this is a residential area.
- Parking garage at Park? 3 stories?
- What happened to the sewer project? Under the TT??
- This will dump tons of people into the area which is already seriously degraded.
- With the overhead wires, the visual blight will be considerable, along with the increase in carbon emissions from Park and Ride.
- Concern with Elk RV parking access due to the stop from the alt route in from SE Park Rd

Station Area Opportunities...

- Trail parking at Park station restrooms and other trail amenities.
- Redevelopment opportunities in under used areas
- Tillamook branch, least into neighborhoods.
- Park Ave and surrounding area is a longtime failure. Light rail would vitalize a current dead zone. Extra plus=very little displacement of current landowners.
Utilize Elk’s parking for day time.
Get traffic away from downtown Milwaukie.
Connect area retirement communities to light rail.
Park Ave. only
Make the station and parking lot well lit, but limit light pollution.
Develop trail south of Park and Ride, dark Trolley Trail? Problem
Park like feel, not parking lot look.
Security concerns
Art work, maybe voted on by those who will see it day to day?
Park and Ride would help ridership from area, vs. Bluebird with no parking.
Residents at Rose Villa and Willamette View Manor would have access to public transportation when they no longer drive
Traffic on Milwaukie downtown (and into Portland) would be less if people south of Milwaukie could access Max before getting through Milwaukie.

Issues/Concerns/Comments...
Don’t like Park station location; impact to area seems greater than potential benefit.
Removal of present business, old growth trees, attracting car thieves, crime and traffic!
Have cyclists pay for the Trolley Trail
Traffic increase on Oatfield and River, intersection back up
Keeping Park and Ride safe from predators
Traffic at Park and Oatfield—where does ridership come from (south)? I.e. Oregon City.
Concord is a better terminus
Intent to collect money from riders?
Safety and crime in surrounding area.
If your long term plan is to continue down McLoughlin to Oregon City, I will fight it vehemently.
Safety concerns in having Park and Ride across the street from station. Prefer close like Gateway.
Go for it!
Single sidewalks on Park.
Park has limited neighborhood access
Linear barrier with track.
Would violate our community’s standard of living.
Don’t take another ten years to get it done
Why not use bio-diesel electric? LRT is subject to blackouts
Gated parking structure.
A Park and Ride at Park Ave. will have a large negative impact on our neighborhood. Specifically, my property and those of my neighbors will most likely drop in value as we are very close to the proposed site. Please do not place a station at Park Ave.
Do not come to Park Ave, this will ruin the Trolley Trail
Safety/security
Something to divide the station from the residential area
Visual concerns from 26th neighborhood looking down on parking structure.
Have parking structure access on Evergreen rather than Park Ave. gets traffic off a residential street and on an industrial.
Design LRT & Trolley Trail so both work!
Work with Metro Parks, NCPRD and Friends of Trolley Trail
Have light rail on the west side of ROW and trail between LRT and Hwy 99E
Trolley Trail and mature trees existing needs to be protected
Security for Oak Grove
Bluebird Station Area

Ideas/Questions...
- Keep light rail in Milwaukie—our area does not want or need the development, crime, added traffic, displacement of trees, homes and existing businesses.
- Have a police/Sheriff’s office at Park Ave station (small with facilities for officers to use such as computer, etc.) Please provide appropriate mitigation for the trails—art, landscaping, lighting, restrooms, bike parking, and water fountains.
- Pedestrian access to eastside
- Extend light rail further along McLoughlin.
- Improved pedestrian access
- Traffic/topography tough
- Sidewalks on main street form 10 min walk.
- Don’t stop traffic on 99E, use trolley overpass.
- Oak Grove is going to need help with first steps in revitalizing this area.
- How do you go about purchasing properties in island station for commercial development? How do you determine appropriate development and getting neighborhood feedback?
- Will Metro use eminent domain to take park land? If so, how much land? What will the impact of daily trains have on habitat and wildlife for that corridor?
- Could we “give” you that park land in exchange for you to remove the dam and restore the watershed from the river up to the eastern end of the lake?
- A trolley car line through Milwaukie is a smaller footprint and would probably be accepted also by Oak Grove residents.
- Have light rail go down Hwy 224 or I-205 to Oregon City and a trolley down McLoughlin.
- Portland-Milwaukie light rail needs to contribute money to replace road crossings (cost, about, $10 million).
- Need more refined design and physical improvement ideas on both sides of Kellogg Creek @ 200 set back from high water mark and set back to top of slope outside 500’ floodplain.
- I would suggest you use the Tillamook rail road and locate the station in Lake Oswego, they would love it and you wouldn’t have to build a bridge.
- We in Oak Grove voted this down years ago, what part of no don’t you understand?

Station Area Opportunities...
- Bicycle parking to access Trolley Trail.
- Trail accommodation at station locations
- Intersections to access stations, particularly at Bluebird where River, 22nd and Bluebird intersect, confusing/dangerous currently.
- Improvements to surrounding area in terms of landscaping lighting intersection improvement.
- Redevelopment of commercial area.
- Seems like downtown Milwaukie station would be a better alternative to Bluebird. Park, with a Park and Ride would be even better.
- This might be better for Milwaukie itself, in terms of proximity
- Combine 99E and sewer plan driveway crossing Kellogg floodplain with rail road and light rail crossing.

Issues/Concerns/Comments...
- I am against light rail coming through Milwaukie. It would be very bad for the schools in town and any business that do not want it.
- Light rail does not improve the community; crime is also much worry for safety.
- This will screw up traffic-it isn't broken, why fix it?
- Pedestrian/bike safety crossing
- Kellogg Creek Estuary: We need to evaluate what “sense of arrival” we want to create (a sense of space). Beginning at River Rd./Hwy 99E on the south and about Washington St on the north, this including Frontage Rd to sewer plant, Hwy 99E, HR crossing (and its trestles and creosote) and CRT and Trolley Trail. The estuary needs CPR (dam removal and lake removal) recovery of habitat, id 500 year floodplain and then 200 feet beyond the historic estuarine setting. This is the “setting” and should contain only one transportation crossing (auto/bus/pedestrian/bike/rail road and light rail). Hwy 99E from River Road to Washington should be only 2 lanes wide to slow traffic (like going through “gate”). Not sure about Bluebird station-too close to estuary, need the habitat.
- Slow line down, not enough ridership served, too expensive.
- 1400 weekday riders, Trolley Trail challenge, traffic movement to incorporate pedestrian traffic, will continue to grow especially from the east.
- Funding
- Will the station be used?
- Lack of parking
- Use gated station for security.
- As a resident of Island Station (19th and Bluebird) I am opposed to the idea of a station in our neighborhood for safety reasons, especially if this is going to be above grade. We are primarily single family residential and we are in walking distance of downtown Milwaukie (where stations should be).
- Issues 2 separate lines in our tiny neighborhood.
- Above grade simulation looks like a highway dropped into our neighborhood.
- If they would stop at the old south gate theater area, I think that would be ok.
- Need elevated rail-not surface.
- Safety: pedestrians and bikes on Trolley Trail
- Keep auto/bus traffic from stopping one more time after leaving Milwaukie.
- Bluebird area does not support a Park and Ride.
- Design LRT and Trolley Trail so they support each other.
- Safety in neighborhood and impact throughout Oak Grove
- How many people will be killed by the train?
- Small area of benefit from proximity to station area.
- Entry to McLoughlin from River Road is already a hazardous intersection. A station would not help but probably would cause more problems.
- Foot traffic is a bit dicey in this area
- Kellogg Estuary Habitat not identified.
- Trolley Trail design needs planning
- Lack of 500 year flood delineation

Flip Chart Summary
Participants’ comments written on sticky notes were grouped by theme throughout the exercise.

**Bluebird**

- Why is Bluebird necessary?
- How would Bluebird affect work being done on McLoughlin now?
- Station would slow line for riders at Park.
- Restaurants
- Crossing McLoughlin
• Downtown station better alternative
• How to get to the station

Intersection and Traffic concerns
• Good site distance – the whole intersection needs to be improved. How does the trail get through?
• Confusing, dangerous intersection
• An elevated station will keep traffic moving south after the “slow down” through Milwaukie.

Design Ideas
• Lighting
• Tight right of way south of Bluebird
• Sidewalk connectivity, creation
• Lighting
• Bathrooms

Parking?
• Is there enough potential for riders at Bluebird if no parking is allowed?
• Bluebird area does not support a Park & Ride.
• Parking in neighborhood

Ridership
• Bluebird does not support much ridership; no Park and Ride, no commercial
• Ridership too low to justify cost

Safety and Security
• Elevated grade will enhance safety of pedestrian or bike traffic along Trolley Trail
• Station safety if it is elevated
• Unsafe traffic speeds at River Road
• Fix Oatfield “S” curves that have repeated accidents
• Improve crossing access for safety.
• Sheriff’s office or annex at Park.

Bike/Pedestrian
• Issue crossing McLoughlin
• Bike and Ped access
• BBQ – How do peds access from the eastside?

Trolley
• Affect on Trolley Trail
• Both mitigate changes for Trolley Trail with positive trail amenities. Bike parking, restrooms, water fountains and then amenities that can be shared, art work, history of trail.

Park Avenue
• Ideal conditions present.
• “Pay before you enter facility.”
• Needed for plan to work
• One track from Milwaukie to Park
• Of the two Park is the most important station

No Station on Park Avenue:
• Park Avenue is a rotten site. Move to Courtney.
• Light Rail does not improve local communities. Takes 50’ right of way for Trolley Trail and light rail; I do not want light rail to Park.
• No station at Park

Trolley Trail
• Close to Trolley Trail
• Clarify alignment of Trolley Trail with respect to the orientation of the transit oriented development - access and viability.

Park and Ride
• Sidewalks on main streets; 10-minute walk from Park and Ride
• Look at how other cities deal with crime for options. (Park and Ride)
• Parking structure access on Park Ave will be a challenge
• Increase of cars that are forced to come into this neighborhood to take advantage of Park and Ride structure.

Could reduce traffic to the north
• Park and Ride can reduce bottleneck at Milwaukie Center
• Keep traffic out of Milwaukie by building Park and Ride
• South traffic will avoid downtown Milwaukie

Close to dense housing
• Close to two large retirement centers
• Can serve many apartments on River Road

Access to station
• Close to McLoughlin (easy to find)
• Shuttle to Rose Villa and Willamette View
• Park and Ride for easy transit
• Better pedestrian access; safety on McLoughlin

Redevelopment opportunities
• Redevelopment/upgrade Opportunities
• Good economic development opportunity
• Redevelopment opportunities in currently underused areas

Impact on Existing Roads/neighborhoods
• Impact on River Road traffic, especially southbound from Park
• Will stations bring clutter to neighborhood? Overhead wires, noise, more people?
• What is the impact of LRT on River Road? Especially southbound from Park

Decision already made
• To get government and Metro to listen to people before making the plans
• Opposes project and thinks decision has been made
Property acquisition and business displacement

- Concern about lost business
- How much land on the sides of the 99E corridor will be destroyed by this?

Ped Environment

- Put sidewalk on Oatfield and Park
- Buildings need to be ped friendly
- Simple sidewalk on Park
- Topography at Park limits utility, consider Courtney
- Crossing from parking lot to station, existing crosswalk or new pedestrian walkway
- Put actual sidewalks on Oatfield and Park to allow nearby residents to safely walk to Max
- There is no crosswalk on Oatfield between Oak Grove Blvd. and Lake Road. Residents need a way to safely cross to the west side to get to the Park and Ride.
- Bad – Bike and ped mobility up Park is too steep
- Single sidewalk on Park limits sidewalks in whole area
- 300 foot block length maximum for walk ability and achieve pedestrian scale

Safety and Security

- Concern about crime
- Will police cost more with these stations?
- County security force – Is it adequate? What is the cost?
- Crime at the Park and Ride; look at a two mile radius
- Safety – keeping the Park and Ride lot safe from registered sex predators
- No sidewalk and limited if no lighting on Oatfield and Park east of McLoughlin
- Safety of Trolley Trail south of the parking structure – no lights, uneven path and secluded
- Why only TriMet Police? Why not all police departments, Multnomah County, Portland police, Washington County?
- Concern about safety crossing of light rail over streets and trolley and other traffic; possibly overpasses, especially for walkers.

Congestion

- Traffic issue with Park and Ride – right in, right out
- Heavier traffic on River Road and Oatfield
- The station will make Oatfield even more congested than now
- South on Oatfield if you quadruple traffic due to...
- Nightmare traffic situation at 5 pm on McLoughlin
- Oatfield back to Aldercrest; cars will back up on Aldercrest and it is an undeveloped road
- Traffic increases on Oatfield and River Road, intersection back ups on McLoughlin and Park
- Traffic light needed on River Road and Park?
- Stop light at Park
- More traffic problems
- Signalization every 1/8 mile or 1000 feet; new intersection? (Dove to south of Silver Springs)
- Oatfield Road with the terrible “S” curves already is heavy with traffic. Will this increase traffic?
- Tapered right lanes and out of the Park and Ride lot.
- Put a stop light on Oatfield and Park to increase safety with heavier traffic.
- A traffic light is necessary at Park and Oatfield.
• Will this relieve congestion?
• Light rail will create barrier along McLoughlin
• Needs auto access

**Bus Service**
• Existing bus routes should continue
• Existing bus facility should be better utilized now - also these should be coordinated with any light rail stations
• Add bus stop at Park for Express 99 bus.
• Existing bus routes to continue and add stop for Express 99

**Station Amenities**
• Sidewalks on Park and 32nd; on Evergreen between River Road and Oatfield; on Silver Springs between River Road and Oatfield; on Concord between River Road and Oatfield
• More amenities for people who have hearing concerns, ADA, sight, elderly
• High quality sidewalk on Trolley Trail to Oak Grove Blvd
• Parking access on Evergreen

**Park and Ride**
• How many stories will the Park and Ride be?
• Park and Ride; Goal should be 5 acres for parking spaces for 1000 parking spaces (= five stories, some of which could be subterranean).
• Place mixed use on all sides of parking structure to shield structure from view.

**Economic Benefits and Concerns**
• If this goes through, will this make money for the community within the next five or ten years?
• TriMet should connect employment areas with labor force areas.
• Do you have money to build the rail?
• Needs to connect to job sites
• Portland is no longer population center or a job center.

**Design Questions and Ideas**
• Terminal line at Southgate with a large Park and Ride.
• Have LRT on the west side and mall between LRT and Hwy 99E
• Keep option above McLoughlin (not at grade)
• Design LRT and Trolley Trail to work together.
• Expand hole through 224 (21st or 22nd Ave overpass). Use trolley system. (LRT system doesn’t need to be 50 feet wide.)
• Move station south about 1000 feet to accomplish: better sun, more level terrain, public Accessibility (HC) and for a better opportunity to enhance existing commercial areas.

**Fuel Choices**
• Why not biodiesel or electric? LRT is subject to blackouts, which could lead to crime.
• Consider fuel cells or advanced lithium ions on light rail to reduce visual impact.
• Bio-diesel electric

**Crime and Safety**
• Pedestrian bridge between Park and Ride and station.
• What police force would be allocated for the Park and Ride?
• What crime data is Metro using? Same as Sheriff’s
• Crime!
• Why weren’t there more public patrols or oversight prior to some of the recent….

**Redevelopment**
• I want redevelopment of area surrounding Park and Ride to assure this helps property values instead of diminishing those that live in surrounding neighborhood.

**Milwaukie Light Rail-General**
• At your next presentation, please bring a laser pointer so to better identify the areas that you are pointing out for further discussion.
• Do not take another ten years to get it done.
• Tillamook Branch: least impact on neighborhoods.
• 40 dwelling units per acre density.
• Extensive mixed use to maximize public investment
• Prefer LRT to bus service
• [www.ortern.org](http://www.ortern.org)
Comments from the Maps

Milwaukie
- Park and Ride is better here than Lake
- No station
- Functions well
- Station would support industrial workers connection with buses.
- Southgate Park and Ride was successful, low crime
- Prefer Park and Ride here
- Good place for P&R
- Logical place
- Stop LRT at Southgate
- Prefer Southgate stop
- Good station
- Truck access concern
- Parking loss in businesses
- Prefer Tillamook Branch alignment
- Interest in 25 foot offset from rail line with cyclone fence
- Concerns about tucking LRT behind the activity

Harrison
- Good for density east of station
- Bad idea - too much going on at that location school
- No station
- No good
- Not acceptable! Safety, traffic, too far downtown, property impacts, environmental concern
- Traffic issues
- Too close to school
- Pedestrian area isn’t safe - traffic, busses “blind spots”
- No, too close to schools
- Traffic concerns with gates
- No stop here
- Too close to Waldorf
- Want to take Max to Waldorf; like having Waldorf in Milwaukie; I 25 years, what if Waldorf redevelops? McMenamins? Also other St. John’s school?

Monroe
- Makes more sense; gives even balance
- No station
- Brings too much traffic
- Too close to Waldorf
- Re: Monroe v. Washington: Only one of the stations should be chosen
- Concern about density and lack of local control re: downtown stations: Harrison, Monroe and Washington
- Close to High School
• No, too close to school
• Playground at Monroe Station is too close
• Traffic concern
• Don’t like station – too close to school
• Train could attract kids and be dangerous
• No stop here
• Impacted properties need info about moving part of building
• Lumber yard wants to sell – could be a T.O.D. under current zoning
• Central to downtown

Washington
• Makes more sense; closer to proposed Park and Ride versus Monroe
• Parking lot between Monroe and Washington limits impacts
• Makes most sense if not Lake
• No station
• Bike, ped path from Washington to Harrison
• High School; good school access
• Should be the only downtown station
• Less impact from 224
• Move bus functions to Washington Station
• Most central location, serves most people
• Best development potential
• Take train to church, St. John’s Episcopal
• Traffic, Park and Ride issues
• Washington closer to businesses
• Would feel safer, especially at varying times of day
• Opportunity at lumber yard for residential and retail
• Don’t like “huge” structure, traffic flow to Park and Ride
• Yes
• Preferred station
• Eco friendly/ green
• Closest to Main Street businesses
• Farthest from schools
• No stop here
• Traffic concern

Lake
• Good if terminal site
• Feeds special events and Washington and McLoughlin
• No station
• Limited visibility and security
• Like access off highway, vacant lots, least impact, Lake Road is a major arterial
• Like Lake if it’s not a terminus
• Good place for a station
• Older students at nearby school
• Additional property could be served if Kellogg is redeveloped
• Great location for accessing park or activities in the park
• Park and Ride too close to river
• Maybe not enough parking even with structure
• Consider parking in neighborhood
• Too close to Washington
• No Park and Ride here
- Prefer Lake Rd. station, farther from elementary schools
- Good place for plaza
- Opportunity for station related development
- I like Park for capturing Clackamas County commuters, so don’t go through Milwaukie
- Lake Road would capture this neighborhood before getting on McLoughlin

**Bluebird**
- Makes sense with north, middle and Bluebird
- No station
- Need station and Bluebird and Park
- Access to station important to Island Station Community
- Crossing McLoughlin can be dangerous
- Properties are ready for redevelopment
- Want a ped bridge along elevated alignment
- Would provide a connection to end of Trolley Trail (Katie M. was a part of this conversation)
- Kellogg Creek restoration project should coordinate to provide greenway crossing
- Yes
- Park and Ride
- No stop here, too close to Trolley Trail

**Other**
- No light rail in downtown Milwaukie – Keep it away from our schools, we already voted it down! Put the station at Southgate
- If you don’t extend to Park, stop at Southgate
- Horns an issue with crossings – end point of quiet zone.
- Hideous sight of over-crossing
- Watching harder in southern area
- How long for train to travel downtown?
- Where do Park and Ride drivers come from?
- Time between stations and speed?
- Safety very important; Stations closer to businesses near Washington
- Maximize activity and eyes around station
- Park and Ride north and south of town at Kellogg Sewage Treatment Plant and at Washington
- Would still prefer another alignment
- No Park and Ride at Park Ave
- Need more funding for local police with LRT
- If we have to have LRT in Milwaukie, have stations and Southgate and Lake Road
- Light rail will reduce demand on roads
- Maintain park space at river
- Like idea of small boat launch and large grassy park
- Design of Cash Spot/ Lake park and ride = floodplain restricts development to facing Washington
- Rather not have it go through Milwaukie at all
### SUMMARY TOTAL (10 TABLES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th># of Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukie/Southgate</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluebird</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th># of Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukie/Southgate</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluebird</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th># of Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukie/Southgate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluebird</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th># of Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukie/Southgate</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluebird</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station</td>
<td># of Dots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukie/Southgate</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluebird</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th># of Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukie/Southgate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluebird</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th># of Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukie/Southgate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluebird</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th># of Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukie/Southgate</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluebird</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th># of Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukie/Southgate</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluebird</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th># of Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukie/Southgate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluebird</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th># of Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukie/Southgate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluebird</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We need to hear from you!

Comment now on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Our region is changing and growing. The health, sustainability and livability of our communities are indeed dependent upon the choices we make today. The Portland – Milwaukie Light Rail Project will provide a dependable way for people in our communities — from northern Clackamas County to downtown Portland — to travel in the region conveniently, safely and economically. It will connect communities and build the most important transit bridge our area has seen in a generation.

The project will construct an extension of the MAX system from downtown Portland to a terminus at Lake Road in Milwaukie or Park Avenue in the Oak Grove neighborhood of Clackamas County, a distance just over 6 miles. Metro is leading the project in partnership with TriMet, the Oregon Department of Transportation, the cities of Milwaukie, Oregon City and Portland and Clackamas and Multnomah counties. The project team just published the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS describes the potential effects in sixteen topic areas and includes a transportation and financial analysis of the project. It also includes a Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation with Preliminary Findings of De Minimis Impacts to Public Parks, a federally-required environmental analysis that documents the costs, impacts and benefits of the project.

Now is the time to tell us what you think!
Visit www.oregonmetro.gov/southcorridor to review and comment on the SDEIS. Attend an upcoming open house or public hearing. Dates and times are listed on the back.
The Portland – Milwaukie Light Rail Project is the latest step in connecting our region through high capacity transit. It is a part of the regional transportation system planning that Metro undertook in the 1980s that has produced an active and vibrant light rail system.

The project was originally part of the Vancouver to Oregon City corridor in the 1990s. The northern portion became the Interstate or Yellow line, which opened for business in May 2004.

How we got here

A Milwaukie Light Rail connection is Phase II of the South Corridor Project

The southern portion was studied in the South Corridor Project and adopted in 2003 by all local jurisdictions and the Metro Council. Phase I of the South Corridor Project is I-205 or the Green line, which is expected to open in Fall 2009. Connecting downtown Portland to Milwaukie is Phase II. If the project moves forward, construction will begin in 2011 and you could board the new MAX line in 2015.

Citizen involvement

Citizen Advisory Committee helps guide project

The project’s Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) formed in the summer 2007 and meets regularly. CAC members are local residents, business leaders and representatives from public institutions and community groups. Over the course of the year they learned about and toured the proposed alignment, participated in public meetings and reviewed the technical findings on such things as cost, acquisitions and displacements, safety and security, traffic impacts, ridership, project finance, the river crossing and station areas. They have asked questions, actively engaged in dialog and continually provided feedback and local knowledge that project staff have found invaluable. In June, the CAC is expected to make a recommendation to the Steering Committee on the river crossing, alignment and terminus and stations.

Rick Williams, Portland resident and CAC Chair reflected, “I am impressed with the level of commitment, participation and interest by our citizen stakeholders.”

Valerie Chapman, resident of Oak Grove, said she valued “the opportunity to listen to the various viewpoints of CAC members to view the project from a much wider lens.”

David Aschenbrenner of Milwaukie is proud that “future generations will benefit from our work.”

Lance Lindahl, of Portland said, “My colleagues on the CAC have been strong advocates not only for the livability of their own neighborhoods, but for the economic health and general well-being of the region as a whole.”
How we evaluate the alternatives

With a broad-reaching project like a new light rail line, the objectives and criteria for evaluating the alternatives must be comprehensive. The SDEIS studied how the alternatives perform using the following measures. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Provide high quality transit service | • Access  
  • Ridership and ease of transfers  
  • Travel times and schedule reliability |
| • Ensure effective transit system operations | • Operating effectiveness |
| • Maximize the ability of the transit network to accommodate future growth in travel demand | • Future expansion capability |
| • Minimize traffic congestion and traffic through neighborhoods | • Highway system use  
  • Traffic activity through neighborhoods |
| • Promote desired land use patterns and development | • Support of activity centers like Oregon Museum of Science and Industry  
  • Support of land use policies  
  • Transit access to labor force and employment |
| • Provide for a fiscally stable and financially efficient transit system | • Cost-effectiveness  
  • Financial feasibility |
| • Maximize the efficiency and environmental sensitivity of the design of the project | • Ecosystems, air quality, wetlands, parks, noise and vibration  
  • Historic and cultural resources, visual impacts and displacements |

*Results are summarized in Chapter 5 of the SDEIS.

Summarizing the advantages and disadvantages of the project

In addition to the river crossing, alignment and station options evaluated, the SDEIS compares the benefits and impacts of building a new light rail line to not building one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO-BUILD ALTERNATIVE</th>
<th>LIGHT RAIL ALTERNATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Advantages**        | • More than 22,000 households and almost 89,000 employees within walking distance of a light rail station.  
  • Between 1,475 and 2,600 additional park and ride spaces.  
  • Up to 24,400 additional light rail rides each weekday.  
  • Up to 59 percent reduction in transit travel time.  
  • Short-term addition of 10,000 to 12,000 construction jobs in the region resulting in $490 million of economic activity.  
  • Reduction in peak hour congestion on the highway system.  
  • Number of people using transit for work trips to downtown Portland grows by as much as 24 percent. |
| **Disadvantages**     | • Up to 62 potential full acquisitions.  
  • Impacts to up to 4 historic resources and up to 6 existing and 2 planned parks.  
  • Impacts to one fish-bearing river and 6 streams.  
  • Noise and vibration impacts. |
| **Other things to know** | • Saves 15 minutes in transit travel time to Portland State University and 32 minutes to South Waterfront.  
  • Would cost between $1.25 and 1.4 billion to build (in year of construction dollars, 2013).  
  • Would add between $5.5 million and $6.6 million in operating costs. |

*Mitigation planning in process.
**Choosing the location for a new bridge**

A new bridge across the Willamette River will carry pedestrians, bicycles, buses, streetcar and the new MAX line. It will be an important and unique addition to the region’s family of bridges. The recent growth in the South Waterfront area creates an increasing need for transit further south than the original river crossing location, last studied in 1998 and adopted in 2003. The SDEIS studies four alternative bridge locations with an east landing at SE Sherman or SE Caruthers streets and a west landing at SW Meade or SW Porter streets in South Waterfront.

The four options have similar benefits and impacts. They contribute equally to the percentage of people using transit, have very similar travel times and traffic impacts to nearby roadways. They also access the same activity centers on either side of the bridge, places like the Oregon Museum of Science and Industry and Oregon Health Science University. The difference in cost to build and operate the four options is relatively minimal.

**River crossings studied in the project**

**Willamette River Crossing Partnership**

Portland Mayor Tom Potter and City Commissioner Sam Adams assembled a group of property owners and neighborhood representatives from both sides of the river to study possible locations for the new bridge. Called the Willamette River Crossing Partnership and chaired by Portland’s former mayor Vera Katz, this group reviewed the benefits and impacts of each river crossing location and shared their unique perspectives.

In May, the group recommended a refinement of the Porter-Sherman crossing. The adjustment would serve Oregon Museum of Science and Industry while complementing Oregon Health and Science University, the Greenway and South Waterfront area master planning and providing a short walk distance to the tram. Their recommendation includes suggestions to inform future work on bridge structure and design, street network, open space and land uses. The project’s Steering Committee could recommend this option for further study.

**River crossing recommended by the Willamette River Partnership Committee**

**Differences between the new Willamette River crossing options and the 2003 Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)**

While the four new river crossing options share many similarities, there are a few key differences between them and the 2003 LPA river crossing that has a western landing at River Place:

- **Residents and employees served by light rail**: The new crossing options would serve almost 3,000 more residents and 4,000+ more employees than the 2003 LPA.
- **Light rail ridership**: The four newer crossing options would add between 1,200 and 1,400 light rail trips a day between downtown Portland and Milwaukie over the 2003 LPA.
- **Travel time**: The 2003 LPA would be one to two minutes faster, but the four crossing options would reduce travel time to South Waterfront for people on transit by five minutes.
- **Nearby uses**: The 2003 alternative would have fewer impacts to businesses on the east side, but the new crossing options would have fewer noise impacts and would impact one less park.
How far should we extend the line?
The line could terminate at Lake Road in Milwaukie or extend to Park Avenue in Oak Grove, an unincorporated community in Clackamas County. The two terminus choices have different benefits.

**Benefits of the Lake Road terminus:** See map A
- Requires 6 to 7 fewer full acquisitions.
- Impacts 2 fewer planned parks.
- Results in fewer noise and vibration impacts.
- Costs $99 to $124 million less to construct.
- Costs $1 million less annually to operate.

**Benefits of the Park Avenue terminus:** See maps B and C
- Increases the number of people using alternate forms of transportation to get to downtown Portland.
- Adds 1 or 2 more light rail stations.
- Puts a light rail station within a 1/2 mile walk for 1,100 to 1,600 more households.
- Reaches more commuters in North Clackamas County and maximizes park and ride opportunities by providing 800 to 1,100 more spaces.
- Increases light rail ridership by 2,300 to 3,100 rides each day.

The environmental analysis identified a need for additional park and ride spaces along the alignment. A traffic sensitivity analysis indicates it is likely feasible to include 1,230 spaces at SE Tacoma Street and 1,200 spaces at Park Avenue.

Which route should MAX take through the North Milwaukie industrial area?
South of the Tacoma station, the route could either follow the 2003 Locally Preferred Alternative on Main Street or the Tillamook Branch railroad through the North Milwaukie industrial area. Each route presents unique challenges and opportunities. The following compares these routes extending to Park Avenue.

**Benefits of the 2003 Locally Preferred Alternative on Main Street:** See map B
- Provides 600 parking spaces with a park and ride at Milwaukie/Southgate.
- Facilitates access to light rail for employees of the industrial area.
- Offers walking access to a light rail station to 500 more households and 1,600 more employees.
- Increases transit ridership by 800 trips each day.
- Results in fewer impacts to the freight railroad.
- Reduces the need for an extension to Park Avenue, which would reduce cost.

**Benefits of the Tillamook Branch option:** See map C
- Requires fewer acquisitions or displacements of businesses in the industrial area.
- Results in fewer impacts to traffic and freight access for businesses in the industrial area.
- Reduces light rail travel time by one minute.
- Costs $25.6 million less to construct.
- Avoids impacting the historic ODOT property on McLoughlin Boulevard.
What makes a great station community?

By design, our region is made up of individual neighborhoods and communities, each with its own distinct character. Some neighborhoods are a piece of the big city where people live in high-rise towers and greet each other as they pick up their mail or take the elevator; other neighborhoods feel like small towns where people congregate on sunny weekends for the farmers market or the kids’ soccer game.

The Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project is an opportunity to connect these different neighborhoods while respecting what makes each place special. Through a variety of workshops, meetings and open houses in Southeast Portland, Milwaukie and Oak Grove, we asked community members about the areas near and around stations.

We learned that people from all kinds of neighborhoods want some of the same things for stations in their neighborhoods—stations that people can access conveniently and safely on foot, bike, bus or by car. They want stations that are visible and connected to the surrounding community.

There are differences, though. In some communities, people envision their stations as catalysts for new development and opportunities to help create a place where people will want to go—whether to catch MAX or to grab lunch with a friend. In other communities, people want the station to blend into the existing neighborhood. Our region’s planning process allows for both these types of stations and everything in between—it allows stations to match the vision of community members.

Portland station choices

At two station workshops in Fall 2007 approximately 80 participants wrote on maps to illustrate their ideas for station areas including development and redevelopment, bike and pedestrian connections and areas where crossings may be challenging. At the two open houses that followed, about 60 participants reviewed and confirmed ideas provided in the workshops and provided comments on how the ideas might come to fruition.

Ideas for station areas included things like:
- Improving existing pedestrian and bicycle connections within and to the neighborhood and adding new ones
- Providing adequate parking near stations and or signage or other tools to limit parking in neighborhoods
- Preserving the character of neighborhoods and making stations reflect the unique quality of nearby neighborhoods
- Completing mitigation to limit noise impacts
- Exploring, along with local jurisdictions, concerns about impacts of truck traffic

Public input during the comment period will inform the decision to include—or not include these stations—in the selected alignment. Beyond that, some of the ideas—like station design details and mitigating traffic, noise and parking impacts—will be addressed during the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) which is expected to begin Fall or Winter 2008.

Other ideas, such as rezoning land for transit-oriented development, will not be included in the project because they fall under the jurisdiction of the City of Portland. The project teamed with and shared results of this community dialog with the city and with all project partners.

Harold Station

The project could include a station at SE Harold Street. This station was not part of the 2003 Locally Preferred Alternative, but had been discussed in past processes and was suggested for analysis by community members from the surrounding area.

The community has expressed strong support for a SE Harold Street station. The station would support local land use plans, which call for higher density development in the station area. However, the SE Harold Street station would increase capital costs by $6.4 million and add about one minute in travel time for anyone traveling past the station. And, even with a $6-8 million pedestrian bridge to connect Reed College and neighborhoods to the east, it would add few riders to the system.

Note: Stations on alignment will be selected after public input and review of technical analysis.
Milwaukie and Oak Grove station choices

There are four station choices in downtown Milwaukie and one at Bluebird Street south of downtown. One or two downtown stations at Harrison, Monroe, Washington and/or Lake could be combined in different ways with a potential Bluebird station just south of downtown. Each combination comes with its own opportunities and challenges.

Meetings were held in Milwaukie to share information about, and discuss, station choices.

• Approximately 100 people attended a station workshop in March. Participants asked questions about ridership, redevelopment, safety and security, and traffic impacts and shared their preferences for station locations.

• The City of Milwaukie hosted a follow-up meeting for people to rank station locations in relation to the terminus. In June, the Milwaukie City Council will recommend Milwaukie stations to the Steering Committee.

Meetings were also held in Oak Grove.

• Approximately 130 people attended a station workshop in March. The community dialog highlighted interests in safety, redevelopment and light rail compatibility with trails and the existing neighborhood character.

• Oak Lodge Community Planning Organization hosted a follow-up meeting. Some questioned the need for the project. Others emphasized opportunities for senior communities to access transit and suggested integrating Metro’s Nature in Neighborhood program into station design.

Other considerations

Safety and Security Task Force

Planning for safety and security on and around light rail is essential. The Safety and Security Task Force was created to ensure that public concerns about safety were reflected in this process. They identified concerns and brainstormed possible design ideas and policies to address them, things that give us insight for this light rail project and for current MAX operations. A number of these suggestions are already used by TriMet.

• Review and use best practices, especially Crime Prevention through Environmental Design.

• Improve use of closed circuit TV at station platforms.

• Increase TriMet or other authoritative presence on trains and at stations.

• Design park and rides to be safe and secure for people and property.

• Improve coordination with local first responders.

• Design light rail system to promote safe interaction between light rail trains, cars, bicycles and pedestrians, especially near schools.

• Create inviting, safe platforms and station areas.
Farmers markets

Wednesday, May 14
4:30 to 7:30 p.m.
Moreland farmers market
SE Bybee/14th, Eastmoreland

Saturday, May 17
9 a.m. to 2 p.m.
Oregon City farmers market
2051 Kaen Rd, Oregon City

Sunday, May 18
9 a.m. to 2 p.m.
Milwaukie farmers market
Main St. across from City Hall, Milwaukie

Upcoming events

Open houses

Milwaukie
Main St. across from City Hall,
Milwaukie farmers market
Saturday, May 17
4:30 to 7:30 p.m.

Portland
2115 SW River Parkway
Broadway Room
2 p.m. to 4 p.m.

Tuesday, May 27
6 to 8 p.m.
Putnam High School cafeteria
4950 SE Roethe Rd., Oak Grove

Wednesday, May 28
6 to 8 p.m.
Milwaukie High School commons
11300 SE 23rd St., Milwaukie

Public comment period
May 9 to noon on June 23

Public hearing
Monday, June 9
5:30 - 8:30 p.m.
Metro Regional Center
Council Chambers
600 NE Grand Ave., Portland

Contact information

City of Milwaukie
Grady Wheeler, 503-786-7503

City of Oregon City
Nancy Kraushaar, 503-496-1545

City of Portland
Mauricio LeClerc, 503-823-7808

Clackamas County
Ellen Rogalin, 503-353-4274

Columbia County
Jeff Koenig, 503-594-9363

Hood River County
Linda Kershaw, 503-966-9245

City of Oregon City
Claude Stinson, 503-966-2154

Metro
Dana Lucero, 503-797-1755

Oregon Department of Transportation
Ralph Drewfs, 503-731-3359

Oregon Department of Transportation
Claudia Steinberg, 503-998-3043 x 2937

TriMet
Ken Bonn, 503-998-3043 x 2937

Multnomah County
Metro
Dana Lucero, 503-797-1755

Multnomah County
Claudia Steinberg, 503-998-3043 x 2937

Oregon Department of Transportation
Ralph Drewfs, 503-731-3359

Metro
Dana Lucero, 503-797-1755

Project website:
www.oregonmetro.gov/southcorridor
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Having choices about how we get around – on bike, foot, buses, streetcar, light rail and in cars – is an important part of keeping the Portland metropolitan region, and your neighborhood, a great place to call home. The Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Project, selected by the region in 2003 as the second part of a two-phased plan to bring light rail to the southeast portion of the region, would offer a new, efficient and economical way to travel between neighborhoods in North Clackamas County, Milwaukie, Southeast Portland, the South Waterfront area, RiverPlace and downtown Portland.

Metro is leading the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail project in partnership with TriMet, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), the cities of Milwaukie, Oregon City and Portland, and Clackamas and Multnomah counties. The SDEIS project team currently is completing a federally-required environmental analysis that will document the costs, impacts and benefits of the project.

This environmental analysis, called a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS), will update a prior SDEIS for the South Corridor that was completed in 2003. The results of the analysis will be available for public review and comment in spring 2008.
A project Steering Committee comprised of elected and appointed officials from Metro, TriMet, the Oregon Department of Transportation, the cities of Milwaukie, Oregon City and Portland, and Clackamas and Multnomah counties provides ongoing policy-level guidance to the project team. The Metro Council, after reviewing recommendations from the Steering Committee, local jurisdictions and the public, is responsible for making final project decisions.

The project’s Citizen Advisory Committee, made up of community and business leaders and advocacy group representatives, makes recommendations, along with the Project Management Group, to the Steering Committee. All interested community members are invited to attend Steering Committee and Citizen Advisory Committee meetings to learn about the project and provide input. A calendar of project meetings is available at www.metro-region.org.

Citizen Advisory Committee members:
- Rick Williams, Chair, Portland
- David Aschenbrenner, Milwaukie
- Mike Bolliger, Portland
- Valerie Chapman, Clackamas County
- Barbara Dimick, Clackamas County
- David Edwards, Clackamas County
- Lisa Ferguson, Milwaukie
- Michael Gebhardt, Portland
- Susan Hartnett, Portland
- Christopher Heaps, Portland
- Greg Hemer, Milwaukie
- Gary Hunt, Milwaukie
- Joanna Jenkins, Portland
- Michole Jensen, Clackamas County
- Theresa Langdon, Portland
- Susan Pearce, Portland
- Nicole Peterson, Portland
- Valeria Ramirez, Portland
- Dan Zalkow, Portland

The Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Project would result in:
- A new 6.5-mile light rail route between Portland and Milwaukie with a terminus at Lake Road in Milwaukie or Park Avenue in the Oak Grove community of Clackamas County. In Portland, the route would connect to the existing light rail system at the south end of the new Portland Mall at Portland State University.
- Eleven to 13 new light rail stations.
- Three to four new park and ride facilities with approximately 2000 new parking spaces.
- A new bridge across the Willamette River between the Marquam and Ross Island bridges.

To view project maps, visit www.metro-region.org/southcorridor.

For the purposes of the SDEIS, the proposed light rail project will be compared to a no-build alternative. The no-build alternative serves as a reference point to gauge the benefits costs and impacts of the light rail project. The no-build alternative
includes existing transit service and improvements to the transit and road system that are anticipated for construction by the year 2030 without new sources of transportation funds.

Message from

**Lynn Peterson**
Clackamas County Commissioner

Clackamas County is excited to be part of planning the Portland-Milwaukie light rail line, the second light rail line that will more closely tie our County to important destinations such as Gresham, Hillsboro, downtown Portland, the Expo Center and the airport.

We are all seeking more environmentally friendly, sustainable ways to live our lives and conduct our business. Light rail is a significant part of a sustainable transportation system, and we are confident that this option will benefit our citizens and businesses. Light rail will allow the increasing amount of traffic anticipated in the future to flow more safely and smoothly in the McLoughlin Boulevard corridor.

The I-205 light rail line between Portland and Clackamas Town Center is under construction and scheduled to open in 2009. The planned line to Milwaukie will provide even more opportunities for people to work, play and shop in our vibrant, growing County. We are pleased to be working with all of our regional partners on this important expansion of light rail.

There have been, and will continue to be, many opportunities for citizens to help design this investment to create a more livable, safe and vibrant community. I encourage all citizens to stay informed and be a part of this step forward for transportation options in Clackamas County.

---

**New Willamette River bridge**

In 2003 the Metro Council directed staff to include a new Willamette River bridge as part of the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail project. The project team is still working to determine the bridge alignment that will be studied in the SDEIS.

In addition to the previously studied location located between OMSI and RiverPlace, the team is considering four possible locations for the new Willamette River bridge, between the Marquam and Ross Island bridges, that will connect to the growing South Waterfront neighborhood. With the new options, the east bridgeheads would be near either SE Sherman Street or SE Caruthers Street. The west bridgeheads would be near SW Porter Street or SW Meade Street. The new bridge would accommodate bikes, pedestrians, streetcar, light rail and, possibly, buses.

Message from

**Sam Adams**
City of Portland Commissioner

The City of Portland is excited to be part of the planning for a new light rail line that will connect downtown Portland to southeast Portland neighborhoods and the City of Milwaukie. Making this connection will require a new bridge across the Willamette River. The new bridge will be located between the Marquam and Ross Island bridges in the South Waterfront district.

The new bridge will help create a unique linkage between the Oregon Museum of Science and Industry (OMSI) and Oregon Health Science University (OHSU). Both institutions are of statewide and regional significance and are currently preparing master plans to guide their future development. The proposed light rail bridge could create unique opportunities for public-private partnerships. Connecting these two institutions will involve planning for light rail, streetcar, buses and bicycles on the bridge as well as integrating these modes with greenway connections and roadway systems on both sides of the river.

To help address these issues in a coherent fashion, I asked our regional partners — TriMet and Metro — to join with the City and area property owners to evaluate land use and transportation impacts. This group — the Willamette River Crossing Partnership — is charged with advising the Mayor and me on the transportation infrastructure needed to support the bridge and new development on both sides of the river.

The Partnership will also advise me, as the City’s representative on the light rail project Steering Committee, on the river crossing alignment options. The committee’s work is expected to conclude by February 2008.

There have been and will be many opportunities for citizen input, including efforts to analyze station locations and improvements in southeast neighborhoods along the corridor. I encourage all citizens to stay informed, ask questions, attend meetings and be a part of this move toward to sustainability.

---

We stand, along with our partners, ready to move toward the goal of providing safe and efficient transportation alternatives to those living along and in the south corridor —

**Jim Bernard,** Milwaukie Mayor
Message from
Jim Bernard
Milwaukie Mayor

Milwaukie has been engaged in a community conversation about light rail for more than a decade. We have taken care to make sure our citizens are informed and engaged in this discussion. As a partner in the Portland to Milwaukie light rail project, we look forward to participating in the SDEIS process that has just begun.

Over the years our community has changed. We’re not the same Milwaukie we were ten years ago, and we’re excited by the prospect that, in another ten years, we will have changed even more. I’ve seen the kinds of opportunities and investment light rail has brought to other parts of the region and I believe the same will follow right here in Milwaukie.

In the next six to nine months, TriMet, Metro and our jurisdictional partners will work together to complete the SDEIS. Milwaukie City Council, and our citizens, are eager to participate in discussions regarding station locations, safety and security and all of the other aspects of the various alignments. We stand, along with our partners, ready to move toward the goal of providing safe and efficient transportation alternatives to those living along and in the south corridor.

Safety and Security Task Force

Because safety and security has emerged as a significant issue related to the study of light rail alternatives, the project team has determined that these issues should be addressed during the SDEIS rather than during preliminary engineering and final design as in past practices. This approach offers community members and safety and security professionals an opportunity to be proactive in identifying principles for safety and security.

Participation is open to the general public. Those interested in, and able to make a commitment to participate for the duration of the project, may choose to be members of the Task Force. The project team is seeking a manageable-sized group comprised of members that represent a balance of perspectives and a cross-section of the project area. Anyone interested in safety and security is welcome to attend task force meetings on a drop-in basis. Meetings are expected to occur between September 2007 and February 2008.

Imagining station communities

Imagine what a light rail station in your community might look like. Is the station a distinctive center with housing, restaurants, shops and offices? Does the station blend so seamlessly into your neighborhood that passers-by would think that it had always been there?

Light rail stations can serve different purposes based on their location. In some locations, communities use light rail stations as a catalyst to encourage new development or redevelopment. In other areas, light rail stations serve existing businesses and residents.

This phase of the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail project will include a preliminary evaluation of station areas. This evaluation will start with defining a community vision for each station area – what should stay the same about the station area and what could be improved – and end with identifying action steps to help cities create the station areas envisioned by community members.

The first set of community meetings for this station-by-station process will focus on Southeast Portland stations: Clinton Street, Rhine Street, Holgate Street, Bybee Boulevard and the proposed station at Harold Street.

If you are interested in the future of these station areas, there are several ways to participate.

You can go to www.metro-region.org/south corridor to download materials to complete a self-guided station area tour. You’ll find aerial photos of station areas, information about guiding principles for station area development and an online comment form. You can complete the station assessment on your own or with your neighborhood association, business group, book club, neighbors or school group. It will be available through November 2007.
Or, plan to attend one of the Southeast Portland station community kick-off workshops:

**Clinton, Rhine and Holgate Station Workshop**
6 - 8:30 p.m. Tuesday, Oct. 2
Cleveland High School
3400 SE 26th Ave., Portland

**Harold, Bybee and Tacoma Station Workshop**
6 - 8:30 p.m. Thursday, Oct. 11
Sellwood Middle School
8300 SE 15th Ave., Portland

These workshops are your opportunity to shape a vision for future station areas and identify opportunities for positive community change in the station areas.

Open houses to share and obtain input on the draft plans resulting from the workshops will be held in November 2007.

Station area planning workshops will be held at the southern end of the alignment over the winter.

Message from
Brian Newman,
Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Steering Committee chair and Metro Councilor, District 2

Metro is thrilled to see the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail project continue to advance. From a regional perspective, this light rail line completes a long-envisioned high capacity transit connection between the central city and an important town center. And, the new Willamette river crossing will make new east-west links possible, not just for light rail but also for streetcar, pedestrians, bicycles and maybe even buses.

As a former Milwaukie City Councilor, I am excited at the prospect of what this new line can do for the City of Milwaukie and southeast Portland neighborhoods. A new connection to the existing transit system - light rail, streetcar and buses - will give people new travel choices and even make walking and biking more feasible for some.

Metro will work with project partners to complete the environmental analysis and ensure that residents and business owners along the line, as well as commuters across the region, will have ample opportunity to review results and share their advice and opinions about the project.

During my tenure at Metro, I have been proud to be involved with this light rail project.

Despite the fact that I am leaving the Metro Council in early October, I will continue to be a strong advocate for the project and I encourage all citizens to stay informed and participate as well.

Get involved

**Web site**
Visit www.metro-region.org/south-corridor for the latest project information and meeting schedule. You may also place your name on the mailing list and provide comments.

**Small group briefings**
If you belong to an organization that is interested in learning more about the project please call Phillip Kennedy-Wong at 503-797-1755 to schedule a briefing.

**Newsletters**
Newsletters, like this one, will be distributed periodically throughout the project. Place your name on the mailing list to continue receiving newsletters. Steering Committee and Citizen Advisory Committee meetings will be advertised on the web site and are open to the public.

Community open houses
Open houses will be held after the draft environmental analysis is complete to give you the opportunity to review and discuss the costs, benefits and impacts with project staff and offer comments.

**Public hearing and comment period**
Community members will be invited to provide input on which alternative and design options should move forward during a public hearing held after the SDEIS is published. The Steering Committee will host a public hearing during the comment period and review public comments as they deliberate about which alternative should be advanced as the Locally Preferred Alternative.

During my tenure at Metro, I have been proud to be involved with this light rail project. Despite the fact that I am leaving the Metro Council in early October, I will continue to be a strong advocate for the project and I encourage all citizens to stay informed and participate as well.--

Brian Newman,
Metro Councilor District 2
Contact information

City of Milwaukie
Grady Wheeler, 503-797-7503

City of Oregon City
Nancy Kraushaar, 503-496-1545

City of Portland
Mauricio LeClerc, 503-823-7808

Clackamas County
Ellen Rogalin, 503-353-4274

Multnomah County
Ed Abrahamson, 503-998-5050 x 29620

TriMet
Claudia Steinberg, 503-962-2154

Oregon Department of Transportation
Ralph Drewfs, 503-731-3359

Metro
Phillip Kennedy Wong, 503-797-1755

Project Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Define alternatives for environmental analysis (SDEIS)</td>
<td>Complete environmental analysis</td>
<td>SDEIS available for public review</td>
<td>Complete Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), Complete preliminary engineering on the LPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence station area assessment</td>
<td>Complete station area assessment</td>
<td>Hold public open house and hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Headquarters Hotel

On September 27, the Metro Council considered a resolution giving staff a month to determine whether there are partners willing to share the risk of investing in a headquarters hotel across the street from the Oregon Convention Center. The hotel would be publicly owned but privately operated.

At the meeting, I proposed an amendment to require at least one of the financing plans to be structured to protect Metro’s general taxpayers from any and all risk associated with building the hotel. The amendment passed unanimously, and that in turn allowed me to vote for the resolution, which also passed unanimously.

Studies supported by the headquarters hotel’s advocates have insisted that with the benefit of lower interest rates provided through Metro’s bonding authority, such a hotel could come close to paying for its own costs (both daily operations and construction costs) because of a strong hotel market in Portland today.

More importantly, research—challenged by knowledgeable analysts—projects that the hotel would result in an additional eight new national conventions coming to Portland with the attendant economic benefits. Without the hotel, proponents argue, our region will gradually lose convention business. It is those additional eight conventions that are the justification for the hotel.

But there are risks involved.

A new 600-room hotel will be very expensive to build; more than $160 million in construction and related costs, plus another $60 million cushion for various contingencies, including unanticipated construction costs and to cover possible operating losses during the start-up period.

If the hotel doesn’t cover its construction costs, then someone must ultimately be responsible. I don’t want the risk-takers to be Metro’s taxpayers, because I don’t want to risk sacrificing other important programs that we offer the public—from recycling and open spaces to planning—in order to pay for a money-losing hotel.

I believe the bond holders, or the visitors who pay local hotel and car rental taxes, or other investors must be ultimately responsible for paying the debt, not the taxpayers. If the hotel’s proponents are so confident of its success, then Metro should have no difficulty finding other persons, businesses and governments willing to make their own investment in the project.

Another risk is that even if the hotel covers its own expenses, it still might not be enough to attract an additional eight national conventions a year. That risk is related to the escalating competition we have with other cities and their convention centers around the country. They are also expanding convention centers, building hotels, and offering other inducements to attract conventions, all of this to gain a share in a business activity that grows only about 2% per year. (Trade Show Executive reports that 61 convention center projects are in progress in 2007 and “another 13 convention centers or cities are considering either expansions or new builds, up from 8 last year.”)
Citizens invited to help plan for new light rail stations in Southeast Portland

Metro is in the process of completing an updated study of the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail project that would add an estimated 20,000 daily riders to the existing MAX system, running from Milwaukie through Southeast Portland to the new South Waterfront neighborhood. The new MAX line will have 10 to 12 new light rail stations, including five or six in Southeast Portland.

Two community workshops in southeast Portland are scheduled for residents to learn about the light rail project and offer their ideas and advice about how to make the new stations a community asset for the residents who use them and for other people and businesses as well. Residents are encouraged to bring illustrations including photographs or written suggestions to the following community workshops:

Tuesday Oct. 2 
6 to 8 p.m.
Cleveland High School cafeteria
3400 SE 26th Ave.
Focus: areas near SE Clinton St./SE 12th Ave., SE Rhine St. and SE Holgate off SE 17th

Thursday Oct. 11
6 to 8 p.m.
Sellwood Middle School cafeteria
8300 SE 15th Ave.
Focus: areas near SE Harold St. and SE Bybee

For more information or to submit comments, call (503) 797-1756 or e-mail trans@metro-region.org. Information on the stations and a map of the alignment can be found online at www.metro-region.org/southcorridor.
The Metro Council adopts sustainability resolution

As Oregonians, we take great pride in the beauty of our environment and the health of our region. We have been at the forefront of innovative ideas to preserve and enhance our quality of life both now and for future generations, long before the word “sustainability” entered our everyday vocabulary. That term has gained momentum as an increased awareness of the effects of global warming, greenhouse gases and increased resource consumption have become more apparent.

The Metro Council has always taken a leadership role in fostering a region-wide approach to policies that integrate sustainable practices and goals, from transportation and land-use planning to recycling and waste reduction programs. In order to strengthen Metro’s commitment to a consistent, collaborative approach to sustainability, the Council recently passed a resolution that formally adopted the State of Oregon’s definition of sustainability to direct Metro’s internal operations, planning efforts and role as a regional convener:

“‘Sustainability’ means using, developing and protecting resources in a manner that enables people to meet current needs and provides that future generations can also meet future needs, from the joint perspective of environmental, economic and community objectives.”

The adoption of this sustainability resolution allows Metro to continue to develop a comprehensive practice of evaluating all programs and planning efforts through the sustainability lens. It also strengthens Metro’s role as a convener in sustainability discussions and a leader in the regional coordination of sustainable policies and planning. The Metro Council has made it a priority to engage in sustainable practices and the passage of this resolution ensures that Metro will continue to find sustainable ways to serve the region.

Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project open houses in May

The Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project’s 45-day public comment period is fast approaching and Metro is looking for your input. The public comment period will begin after the publication of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

This month, the project team will host three open houses to share information about the costs, impacts and benefits of the project’s alternatives. The open houses will give participants the opportunity to review information, ask questions, talk with project staff and offer comments. The project’s steering committee will hold a public hearing before the end of the public comment period.

The steering committee will consider public comments, a recommendation from the project’s citizen advisory committee, and technical findings as it develops a Locally Preferred Alternative for the project. Steering committee members include elected officials from Metro, the cities of Milwaukie, Portland and Oregon City, and Clackamas and Multnomah counties, and appointed officials from TriMet and the Oregon Department of Transportation.

continued
The six and one-half mile alignment between Milwaukie and Portland would provide additional transportation options for fast-growing communities in north Clackamas County and Southeast Portland. The line would connect an estimated 20,000 daily riders to the existing MAX system, creating access to central eastside, South Waterfront, downtown Portland, Hillsboro, Gresham and the Portland airport.

For more information on the project and a schedule for the upcoming open houses, visit www.metro-region.org/southcorridor.

Hotline helps homeowners build green

The Portland metro region continues to make headlines around the world for innovation in the field of green building. As enthusiasm for sustainable building practices grows, more homeowners want to go green with their new construction and home improvement projects.

Inspired by the fast growing trend in green building, Metro, the City of Portland Office of Sustainable Development and Clackamas, Washington and Multnomah counties are collaborating to increase access to information on green materials, comprehensive design and professional services.

The new Regional Green Building Hotline is a part of the Green Development Resource Center. The hotline provides information about green building strategies and resources, as well as financial incentives for new and existing commercial and residential projects.

The hotline is equipped to address your questions, large or small. Call with how-to questions or for guidance on the process of green building from start to finish.

Residents, non-profits, businesses, developers, builders, contractors and government agencies are welcome to call and ask staff about material procurement, remodeling and product certification, sustainable site planning, green contractors, design or salvaged and recycled materials.

The Green Development Resource Center also plans to offer a library, a mobile workshop and an expanded website with solutions and strategies to help inform current practitioners and inspire those who have ever contemplated green building.

The hotline is open to calls Monday through Friday during regular business hours. Call 503-823-5431 to speak with the green building specialist or submit a question by sending e-mail anytime via the Green Development Resource Center web site at www.buildgreen411.com.

Celebrating Earth Day billboard artwork

On Saturday, April 5, the four winning and nine honorable-mention designs were revealed during a ceremony and art show at the Metro Regional Center. One winner from each grade-level category, K-2, 3-5, 6-8 and 9-12, was selected to have his or her artwork, name and the names of his or her teacher and school displayed on billboards posted throughout the metro region for Earth Day.

The four winners are:

- Zach Wright, grade 1, Harold Oliver Primary
- Elaine Wan, grade 5, St. Mary of the Valley School
- Kate Kobielsky, grade 7, Colton Middle School
- Matthew Humphrey, grade 11, Tigard High School

To see the winning and honorable mention designs, visit www.metro-region.org/schoolrecycling or watch for the billboards at different locations throughout the region from April to June 2008.
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Portland-Milwaukie light rail project open house on March 5

Learn about the upcoming study of a proposed Portland-Milwaukie light rail project at an open house being held from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m., March 5 at the Clackamas Educational Service District building, 4011 SE Lake Rd. in Milwaukie.

Communities in the corridor selected light rail through an extensive public process during the South Corridor Project between 1999 and 2003. Metro will conduct an environmental analysis of the proposed light rail line beginning this spring and finishing up in the summer of 2008. The analysis will study things such as design, cost, land use and travel time. Along the way, there will be numerous updates and opportunities for public participation and comment. A citizen committee will advise Metro throughout the analysis. Project partners include the Oregon Department of Transportation, Tri-Met, Clackamas and Multnomah counties and the cities Portland, Milwaukie and Oregon City.

The six and one-half mile alignment between Milwaukie and Portland would provide additional transportation options for fast-growing communities with high traffic congestion in north Clackamas county and southeast Portland. It would connect an estimated 20,000 daily riders to the existing MAX system, creating access to central eastside, south waterfront, downtown Portland, Hillsboro, Gresham, and the Portland airport. Nine to ten stations and a new bridge across the Willamette River would be part of the line.

Find out about and discuss potential design options for where the line may terminate and where stations and park and ride lots may be located in the Milwaukie area.

For more information, visit www.metro-region.org/transportation. To ask a question or share a comment, send e-mail to trans@metro-region.org, or call (503) 797-1756.
RTP update winds up research phase with a draft policy framework

The Research and Policy Development phase of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update begins to wind up on February 28, 2007 when a draft Regional Transportation Policy Framework goes to the Metropolitan Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) for approval, then to the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) on March 1, and to the Metro Council on March 15.

The policy framework will eventually become Chapter 1 of the RTP. Approval of this draft would allow staff to proceed with System Development and Analysis, the next phase of the RTP update. The draft policy framework will be revised after key concepts have been tested and before the RTP is finalized in fall 2007.

The draft Regional Policy Framework incorporates results of stakeholder workshops, public opinion research, community feedback, review of policies in the current RTP, and research into the current state of regional transportation funding and systems. Summaries of research findings and a calendar of RTP milestones are available for download on the project website.

To read or download the recommended draft Regional Transportation Policy Framework, go to www.metro-region.org/rtp and click on “2035 RTP update.” Then click on the Phase 2: Research and Policy Development link under "Process Overview."

Metro Launches Brownfield Recycling Program

With funding from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Metro Council announces the launch of a Brownfield Recycling Program to benefit local communities.

The program will inventory and assess underutilized properties with actual or perceived contamination, provide technical assistance to local governments and property owners and help to identify sources of funding for the cleanup and redevelopment. The Brownfield Recycling Program will initially focus on properties with petroleum-based contamination such as old gas stations, fueling facilities, auto-related businesses and some industrial sites.

By reinvesting in urban brown fields, the Metro Council aims to foster economic, social and environmental benefits that will reinvigorate communities. Additionally, reuse of land within the urban growth boundary will reinforce the region’s goal to protect surrounding farmland and natural areas.
Those who know of a potentially contaminated property that is underutilized or who are interested in more information about Metro's Brownfield Recycling Program – including upcoming informational meetings, technical workshops and other resources – should contact Miranda Bateschell at (503) 797-1817 or send e-mail to brownfields@metro-region.org.
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**Portland-Milwaukie light rail project open house on April 9**

Learn about the upcoming study of a proposed Portland-Milwaukie light rail project at an open house being held from 4:30 to 7:30 p.m., April 9 at OMSI, 1945 SE Water Ave., Portland.

Communities in the corridor selected light rail through an extensive public process during the South Corridor Project between 1999 and 2003. Metro will conduct an environmental analysis of the proposed light rail line beginning this spring and finishing up in the summer of 2008. The analysis will study things such as design, cost, land use and travel time. Along the way, there will be numerous updates and opportunities for public participation and comment. A citizen committee will advise Metro throughout the analysis. Project partners include the Oregon Department of Transportation, Tri-Met, Clackamas and Multnomah counties and the cities Portland, Milwaukie and Oregon City.

The six and one-half mile alignment between Milwaukie and Portland would provide additional transportation options for fast-growing communities with high traffic congestion in north Clackamas county and southeast Portland. It would connect an estimated 20,000 daily riders to the existing MAX system, creating access to central eastside, south waterfront, downtown Portland, Hillsboro, Gresham, and the Portland airport. Nine to ten stations and a new bridge across the Willamette River would be part of the line.

Find out about and discuss potential Willamette River bridge crossing design options and potential stations locations.

For more information, visit [www.metro-region.org/transportation](http://www.metro-region.org/transportation). To ask a question or share a comment, send e-mail to trans@metro-region.org, or call (503) 797-1756.

***********************************************************
Ten heads are better than one

Driving alone on crowded highways can be an expensive, frustrating experience that increases congestion and pollution. Commuting in a vanpool saves money on car maintenance, fuel and insurance, eliminates the stress of driving, and reduces traffic congestion and air pollution. A vanpool is a group of 5 to 15 people who share their commute. The vanpool travels from home or a prearranged meeting place to work or school.

Vanpooling can cost a quarter of what you would pay to drive alone! Metro helps make vanpooling even more economical with a new incentive program that pays for 50 percent of the van lease cost, not including fuel. Passengers split the remaining costs. Vanpool riders avoid the stress of driving, and can relax, read the newspaper, work on their laptop, knit a scarf or take a nap.

There may already be a vanpool that meets your travel needs. View current routes and schedules and learn how to start a vanpool at www.metro-region.org/vanpool.

******************************************************************************

Metro Council approves list of transportation and related projects

The Metro Council recently approved the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation’s recommendations on projects to fund through the flexible funding portion of the 2008 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). MTIP is the biennial program for managing federally funded transportation projects in the metropolitan region. Flexible funds supplement other federal, state, and local transportation funds spent in the region that are typically dedicated to specific types of projects. Flexible funds represent approximately 4% of all transportation spending and 11% of federal transportation spending in the region.

MTIP funds are spent on state and federally approved highway, transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the region. The flexible fund portion, administered by Metro, may be used for a variety of transportation projects, such as trail planning, regional transportation options, transit shelters or street improvements.

Projects to receive these flexible funds are evaluated and selected based on:
  ‣ Consistency with state, regional and local transportation plans
  ‣ Support of economic development in the region’s mixed-use centers and industrial areas
  ‣ Lack of other dedicated funding sources
  ‣ Completion of gaps in the transportation system
Meeting state air-quality requirements by making bicycle and pedestrian improvements in the region

Jurisdictions and transportation agencies were awarded nearly $45 million for 32 projects out of the applicant pool of 66 projects totaling $132 million.

A complete list of project funded and the final public comment report can be found on the Metro website, www.metro-region.org. Click on “transportation priorities process 2008-11” in the left navigation menu.
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The 2040 Match of the Century: Corridors versus Centers

7 p.m. Wednesday, Sept. 26
Council chamber
Metro Regional Center
600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland

Get a ringside seat for a lively debate of different strategies for implementing the 2040 growth concept, our region’s plan for the future - featuring heavy-weight professors Patrick (“Corridors”) Condon, University of British Columbia, and Gordon (“Centers”) Price, Simon Fraser University and refereed by Metro Councilor Robert Liberty.

Condon, professor of landscape architecture at UBC, favors low and mid-rise development along transit corridors – three and four story mixtures of housing, stores, restaurants, professional services and offices. Price, director of the City Program at SFU and former Vancouver BC city councilor, is a strong supporter of the strategy emphasizing growth in high-energy, high-density centers.

Both contenders are internationally recognized experts in their fields and extremely familiar with the Portland metropolitan region. Both approaches are consistent with our region’s 2040 plan for growth. Will either strategy be victorious or will it be a draw? Can both sides win? You be the judge.

We’ll provide the popcorn.

This event is free and no reservations are required. For more information, check Metro’s online calendar at http://calendar.metro-region.org/
Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Planning for light rail stations

Light rail stations have the ability to transform their surroundings, as a catalyst for development and by offering more accessibility to existing neighborhoods. Communities that have stations become regional destinations for commerce and gathering places for local residents. How a station transforms a community is up to those who work, live, or play in the area. The goal of station area planning during the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement process is to create a venue for communities to maximize the opportunities that light rail stations present.

The process will culminate in the identification of action steps that cities can consider to achieve the station areas envisioned by their community members.

Two community workshops are scheduled for early October that will focus on the proposed Southeast Portland stations. The workshops are forums for Southeast Portland residents to share opportunities they see in areas near proposed light rail stations. The workshops will help to identify important considerations such as station access for riders, street improvements, transit connections, and redevelopment opportunities.

Interested individuals can go to www.metro-region.org/southcorridor to download maps of specific station areas and comment forms. The maps and forms will be available online the week of September 24th.

Completed comment forms, suggestions and ideas will be accepted throughout the project. Interested persons are encouraged to bring illustrations including photographs, or written suggestions, to the community workshops. For more information, call (503) 797-1756 or e-mail trans@metro-region.org.

6 – 8:30 p.m.
**Tuesday, Oct 2**
Cleveland High School cafeteria
3400 SE 26th Ave., Portland

(This workshop will focus on station areas around SE Clinton St./SE 12th Ave., SE Rhine St. and SE Holgate off SE 17th)

6 – 8:30 p.m.
**Thursday, Oct 11**
Sellwood Middle School cafeteria
8300 SE 15th Ave., Portland

(This workshop will focus on station areas around SE Harold St., SE Bybee St., SE Tacoma St. off SE McLoughlin Blvd.)
Safety and Security Task Force a priority for the Portland Milwaukie Light Rail project

As the planning and evaluation process for the proposed Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail project is underway, there are many opportunities for interested citizens to get involved and offer input on the various impacts and benefits of a new light rail line. Among the factors along the line that would be affected by the project, safety and security has emerged as a significant issue.

As a result, the project team has decided to create a safety and security task force to address community interests and issues during the current study rather than during final design, as is typically done. The task force will give interested community members and professionals in the industry an opportunity to identify and convey safety and security issues and opportunities to the project team.

The project is looking for a balance of perspective from people along the proposed alignment. With members committed to attending each task force meeting, discussion will be lively and productive. Task force meetings are expected to occur between September 2007 and February 2008 and will be open to the public.

For more information, visit www.metro-region.org/southcorridor, send an email to trans@metro.dst.or.us or call (503) 797-1756
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Metro seeks public comment on draft 2035 Regional Transportation Plan

Metro released a review draft of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) on October 15, 2007, for a 30-day public comment period. The draft RTP and an online comment form is posted on the Metro website at www.metro-region.org/rtp. Hard copies of the RTP are available at the Metro Planning Department.

Four informational open houses and public hearings on the draft RTP are scheduled in conjunction with regular Metro Council meetings at the following times and places.

Thursday, October 25
Clackamas County Chamber
Public Service Building
2051 Kaen Road, Oregon City
Open house at 4 p.m.; hearing at 5 p.m.

Thursday, November 1
Metro Regional Center
600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland
Open house at 1 p.m.; hearing at 2 p.m.

Thursday, November 8
Hillsboro Civic Center Auditorium
150 E. Main Street, Hillsboro
Open house at 4 p.m.; hearing at 5 p.m.

Thursday, November 15
Metro Regional Center
600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland
Open house 1 p.m.; hearing at 2 p.m.

To ensure that the public record accurately reflects your comments, please be prepared to submit written comments along with any oral testimony. Comment forms will be available onsite or you may bring prepared statements. Please be sure to include your name and address on all prepared statements.

Comments may also emailed to rtp@metro.dst.or.us or mailed to RTP Public Comment, Metro Planning, 600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland, OR 97232. All comments are due at Metro by 5 pm on Thursday, Nov. 15, 2007.

For more information, contact Pat Emmerson at 503-797-1551 or emmersonp@metro.dst.or.us.

**********************************************************************

Clackamas County open house for the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

Clackamas County, in partnership with Metro and TriMet, invite you to attend an open house on the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail project.

Monday, October 29
6 – 8 p.m.
Oak Grove Elementary School Cafeteria
2150 SE Torbank Rd., Milwaukie

A brief presentation at 6:30 p.m. will provide up-to-date project information, generate a list of ideas and questions about the project and offer an opportunity to address issues specific to unincorporated Clackamas County.

For more information, visit www.metro-region.org/southcorridor, e-mail trans@metro-region.org or call (503) 797-1756.

**********************************************************************

Regional Travel Options Subcommittee seeking members

The Regional Travel Options (RTO) subcommittee is seeking four community representatives to serve two-year terms to begin in January 2008. The subcommittee makes recommendations to the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC), Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), and the Metro Council related to a program to the Regional Travel Options Program.
Applicants for these positions should live in Multnomah, Clackamas, Washington, or Clark County, and have an interest in promoting transportation choices that help reduce the number of drive-alone trips. The applicant from Clark County should commute to the Portland metro area for work or business. Applicants should be able to attend regular meetings that take place on weekdays during normal working hours. Metro seeks diverse representation on all its advisory committees; women and minorities are strongly encouraged to apply.

Applications are due at Metro by 5 pm on Friday, Nov. 16, 2007. Use the form at www.metro-region.org/article.cfm?ArticleID=26036 to submit an application online, or download the form and mail it completed to RTO Recruitment, Metro Planning Department, 600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland, OR 97232. For more information, contact Pam Peck, Metro Regional Travel Options Program, peckp@metro.dst.or.us or 503-797-1866.

***********************************************************

Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project light rail station open houses

In early October, Metro held two community workshops focused on proposed light rail stations in SE Portland. Participants had lively discussion about opportunities and challenges for each station area. They talked about things like station access for riders, street improvements, transit connections, and redevelopment opportunities.

The project team is compiling results from the community discussions and will share them, along with additional technical analysis, at two identical open houses in November. Participants can drop in at any time.

The process will culminate in the identification of action steps that cities can consider to achieve the station areas envisioned by their community members.

Monday, November 26
6 - 8 p.m.
Sellwood Middle School cafeteria
8300 SE 15th Ave., Portland

Tuesday, November 27
6 - 8 p.m.
OMSI Auditorium
1945 SE Water Ave., Portland

Interested individuals can go to www.metro-region.org/southcorridor to download maps of specific station areas and comment forms. For more information, call (503) 797-1756 or e-mail trans@metro-region.org.

***********************************************************
City of Portland Streetcar System Plan open houses

The City of Portland has a national reputation for an innovative transportation system - excellent bus service, a popular and expanding light rail system, an envied network of bike routes and the beginnings of a world-class streetcar system.

In October, the City of Portland Office of Transportation will kick off a ten-month planning process to create a Streetcar System Plan, which will identify corridors for future streetcar development.

You’re invited to attend an open house to kick off the planning process and see a new Primary Transit Network map that shows current transit corridors (bus, light rail, streetcar) as well as corridors that may require future transit and land use infrastructure investments.

Monday, October 29
4:30 – 7 p.m.
Parkrose High School Community room
12003 NE Shaver St., Portland

Tuesday, November 13
4:30 – 7 p.m.
Lincoln High School Cafeteria
1600 SW Salmon St., Portland

Thursday, November 15
4:30 – 7 p.m
Grant High School Library
2245 NE 36th Ave., Portland

For more information, contact Patrick Sweeney at 503-823-5611 or email patrick.sweeney@pdxtrans.org.

*******************************************************************************
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********************************************

Metro seeks comments on Portland Streetcar Loop Environmental Assessment through March 10

With the release of the Environmental Assessment, a 30-day public comment period begins. An open house to take public comment will take place on March 6 at the Multnomah County Building 501 SE Hawthorne Blvd., Portland, OR 97214, from 5 to 7:30 p.m.

In addition to the open house, comments on the Environmental Assessment can be submitted through fax, mail or email. All comments must be received by 5 p.m. on March 10, 2008. To submit a comment on the Environmental Assessment, email trans@metro.dst.or.us, mail it to “Portland Streetcar Loop” 600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland, OR 97232 or fax it to 503-797-1930.

The project would extend the current streetcar by adding 3.3 miles of new track and 18 stations from Northwest Lovejoy Street and 10th Avenue in the Pearl District, across the Broadway Bridge, and south along the Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and Grand Avenue couplet to the Oregon Museum of Science and Industry. The ultimate goal is to create a complete loop, with the streetcar eventually crossing back downtown over a new bridge proposed as part of the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail project.

To obtain a copy of the Portland Streetcar Loop Environmental Assessment, visit Metro’s website at http://www.metro-region.org/streetcarloop, send an email request to trans@metro.dst.or.us or call 503-797-1756 and request a copy of the document.

********************************************
Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail project station area planning meetings happening in March

We want to hear from you! Learn about the light rail project and the station choices studied in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You’ll hear about best practices and guiding principles for station planning, and then give us your opinion. What are the tradeoffs between the downtown Milwaukie station options? What are the opportunities and challenges at Park Avenue given the surrounding land uses? What works best for your community?

The planning team will present information about station planning and will delve into the considerations of the specific locations. We’ll then work in groups to get your feedback. Tell us what you think makes a good station now and what you want it to look like in 20 years. How would you prioritize and focus station development in your community? Join us and have a voice in shaping the decision.

Oak Grove meeting
March 12
6:00-8:30 p.m.
Rose Villa fellowship hall
13505 SE River Rd., Portland

Milwaukie meeting
March 19
6:00-8:30 p.m.
Milwaukie High School commons
11300 SE 23rd Ave., Milwaukie

Interested individuals can go to www.metro-region.org/southcorridor to download maps of specific station areas and comment forms. For more information, call 503-797-1756 or email trans@metro-region.org.

***********************************************************

Lake Oswego to Portland Transit Alternative Study moves forward

The Lake Oswego to Portland corridor went under review on Dec. 13 by the Metro Council, when it approved advancing further study of an environmental impact statement for various transportation options. Enhanced bus services and streetcar implementation, as well as a bicycle and pedestrian trail, work tasks related to refining streetcar alignments, and steps in securing funding for the environmental impact statement are all included.

The environmental analysis will be led by Metro beginning in late 2008, to conclude in 2010 with the selection of a single preferred alternative to be advanced into Preliminary Engineering and a Final Environmental Impact Statement.
As part of starting the environmental impact statement, Metro is holding a scoping meeting at 6 p.m. on April 21 with a location to be announced on Metro’s web site as soon as it is confirmed.

The scoping meeting will provide an opportunity for interested parties to learn about the plan to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement and comment on the proposed transit options.

For more information, visit Metro’s web site at www.metro-region.org/lakeoswego.

***********************************************************

Metro begins state component of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan

Metro staff has begun updating the state component of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which focuses on integrating state and regional land-use goals with mobility needs and economic goals. Programs and projects included in this component of the plan must be accompanied by realistic funding strategies. Metro staff will work closely with local jurisdictions and transportation agencies throughout this part of the update process.

The Metro Council adopted the federal component of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) on December 13, 2007. The federal component focused on meeting federal timelines and requirements. The state component, when completed, will be integrated with the regional component to create a final RTP for public review and final adoption.

A comprehensive plan for stakeholder and public involvement is under development and expected to be completed by March 13, 2008. Key elements will include regular status reports provided to all interested parties, interactive web-based feedback mechanisms, technical workshops, structured conversations with business and community representatives and public comments periods with formal hearings.

To keep abreast of project developments and opportunities to provide input, please see the project web site at www.metro-region.org/rtp or write to Metro staff at rtp@metro.dst.or.us.

***********************************************************

Updated policies to guide allocation of regional flexible funding

Metro recently updated the policies that guide evaluation and selection of projects and programs to receive regional flexible funding. Regional flexible funds—comprising the federal Congestion Management/Air Quality (CMAQ) program and Surface Transportation Program (STP)—are administered by
Metro. Although the flexible funds comprise only a small percentage of transportation funding available to the region—about 4% of all spending and 14% of federal spending—they attract considerable public attention because they support a wide variety of programs and projects, some of which have no other source of funding.

This allocation cycle, conducted as part of developing the 2010-13 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), concurs with the current update to 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The 2035 RTP includes new goals and objectives for our regional transportation system. The policy update for the regional flexible fund allocation was conducted to bring this process more in line with the policies in the RTP.

The policy update sought jurisdictional, agency and community feedback to help select key objectives (as articulated in the 2035 RTP that is currently under development) to form the foundation of an updated policy document. Both the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council must adopt the policies. Once the policies are in place, Metro will distribute application packets to the eligible jurisdictions and transportation agencies.

For more information about the MTIP and the allocation of regional flexible funds, please visit the Metro website at www.metro-region.org.
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***********************************************************

Metro gets a new web address

Metro’s new site will make it easier to find the information important to you. Visit www.oregonmetro.gov.

***********************************************************

Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) released for comment

The SDEIS will be officially published May 9 and will trigger a 45-day public comment period. A number of public events have been scheduled to share information from the SDEIS and provide opportunities for public comment. Open houses will feature a project overview, SDEIS results by topic, next steps and project staff to answer questions. People can drop in as their schedule permits.

6 to 8 p.m.
Wednesday, May 21
Cleveland High School
3400 SE 26th Ave., Portland

6 to 8 p.m.
Thursday, May 22
Marriott Residence Inn Broadway room
2115 SW River Parkway, Portland

6 to 8 p.m.
Tuesday, May 27
Putnam High School cafeteria
4950 SE Roethe Rd., Oak Grove
6 to 8 p.m.
Wednesday, May 28
Milwaukie High School commons
11300 SE 23rd St., Milwaukie

Project staff will also have basic project information at upcoming farmers markets.

4:30 to 7:30 p.m.
May 14
Moreland farmers market
SE Bybee/14th, Eastmoreland

9 a.m. to 2 p.m.
May 17
Oregon City farmers market
2051 Kaen Rd, Oregon City

9:30 to 2 p.m.
May 18
Milwaukie farmers market
Main St. across from City Hall, Milwaukie

There will be an opportunity to provide testimony at a public hearing before the project Steering Committee.

5:30 - 8:30 p.m.
Monday, June 9
Metro Regional Center council chambers
600 NE Grand Ave., Portland

The project website has been updated to include an Executive summary and downloadable version of the SDEIS, event information and information about the decision-making process. Visit www.oregonmetro.gov/southcorridor for more information.

***********************************************************
Families needed for Drive Less Challenge

Are you always in your car? Fed up with spending big bucks at the gas pump? Tired of traffic headaches? Here's your chance to learn how to drive less and save more, while winning great prizes, including a computer and entertainment package. Enter the Drive Less/Save More Family Challenge in May. The Drive Less/Save More Campaign is looking for three families in the Portland metro area who are willing to put their skills to the test for one week to reduce the
number of miles they drive. Experts will be on hand to coach families on how to drive smarter and take advantage of travel options. All participating families will receive an incentive package to help them compete in the challenge. Items will include gift certificates for home delivery services, list pads and organizers, driving tools and bus tickets, as well as walking and biking gear.

If you're interested, e-mail your name and phone number to stoner@pacwestcom.com. Please put "Challenge" in the subject line. Learn more about the challenge and the Drive Less campaign at www.drivelesssavemore.com.

***********************************************************

Travel options individualized marketing grants available

Metro's Regional Travel Options Program is soliciting proposals for individualized marketing projects. $1 million in grant funds are available. Individualized marketing projects identify people within a specific geographic area who want to change the way they travel. The projects use personal, individualized contact to motivate travel behavior change. Projects in the city of Portland and more than 300 cities around the world have achieved significant reductions in the number of people driving alone and increased the number of people cycling, walking and using transit. Proposal letters of interest and pre-applications are due to Metro at 4 p.m. Fri., June 6, 2008. Applicants whose projects pass the pre-application screening phase will be invited to submit proposal applications. Applicants will be notified of screening results by June 27, 2008.

An application packet and application materials are available to download at www.oregonmetro.gov/grants, click on Regional Travel Options grants. For more information, contact Pam Peck at pam.peck@oregonmetro.gov, or 503-797-1866.

***********************************************************

CarpoolMatchNW fills commuter demand

Facing rising gas prices area commuters are driving less and saving more by carpooling. The increasing cost of gas has created a corresponding increase in registrations on Metro’s CarpoolMatchNW ride-matching web site. Since the beginning of the year up to 200 new commuters have registered on CarpoolMatchNW monthly, compared to an average of 50 registrations per month in 2006. The Oregonian noted this trend with a front page Sunday-edition story on April 27. The coverage spurred more than 255 commuters to register with the site in just four days. With well over 9,000 people now active with CarpoolMatchNW, there’s never been a better time to register. Go to www.CarpoolMatchNW.org (http://www.carpoolmatchnw.org/) and select register. The entire process takes less than five minutes. Just follow the step-by-step directions to find your carpool match.
2010-13 Regional Flexible Fund allocation features new two-step process

Regional Flexible Funds to be programmed in the 2010-13 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) will be allocated through a new two-step process. The new process was developed as a result of an outreach effort that solicited feedback from local jurisdictions, transportation agencies, business groups and community organizations to update the policies that guide project evaluation, and to simplify the allocation process for local jurisdictions.

The process separates projects and programs into two pools: regional projects and programs, and local transportation priorities. The specific projects and programs for the regional pool are currently being identified by the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) with technical input from the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC). This regional pool will remain the same each cycle, but the amounts recommended for allocation could be different each time and are subject to public review and comment.

Local transportation priorities in the second pool will compete for funding by application, as they have in the past, with allocation levels recommended by TPAC and subject to public review and comment along with those in the regional pool. Application packets for local transportation priorities will be distributed to eligible jurisdictions, transportation agencies and service providers by the end of May 2008. As always, final approval for all regional flexible fund allocations rest with the Metro Council based on JPACT’s final recommendation.

Using this two-step process, local jurisdictions and transportation providers will have a better idea in advance of the total amount of money that will be available for local priorities.

For more information about Regional Flexible Funds and the MTIP, please visit the project web sites www.oregonmetro.gov/regionalflexiblefund and www.oregonmetro.gov/mtip.

State component of 2035 Regional Transportation Plan extended to 2009

On May 1, 2008, the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission approved a request from Metro and its regional partners to extend the timeline for completing the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) from Fall 2008 to Fall 2009. This extended timeline is necessary to balance state planning requirements with pressing transportation needs in the face of severe funding challenges. The expanded timeline allows the RTP update to continue to be closely integrated with Metro’s comprehensive planning effort to update the 2040
Growth Concept, the region's long-term vision and aspirations for managing growth.

On December 13, 2007, the Metro Council adopted an update to the federal component of the 2035 RTP, approved by federal transportation authorities on February 29, 2008. In March 2008, Metro staff began the state component of the update. The state component focuses on meeting state planning requirements to address population growth, state and regional land-use goals, mobility needs and economic goals. State planning requirements require that all projects and programs have a realistic funding strategy. The RTP will also address state policy initiatives to address climate change.

The update to the federal component identified a $7 billion gap between known resources and transportation needs. Metro staff will be working closely with local governments and transportation agencies throughout 2008 and into 2009 to develop realistic funding strategies to fill that gap. When completed, the state component will be integrated with the federal component to create a final RTP for public review and final adoption in Fall 2009.

To keep abreast of project developments and opportunities to provide input, please see the project web site at www.oregonmetro.gov/rtp, or write to Metro staff at rtp@oregonmetro.gov.
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***********************************************************
Phase II of the South Corridor Project will refine and construct the publicly adopted light rail alignment between Portland and Milwaukie to provide better access and mobility to a rapidly growing part of the metropolitan region. Earlier public study evaluated a number of options including bus rapid transit and commuter rail to address problems resulting from increasing traffic congestion and a lack of transportation choices for southeast neighborhoods. The community chose a light rail alignment between Portland and Milwaukie that will provide a connection to the existing MAX light rail system and easy access to places such as the airport, Beaverton and Gresham.

The South Corridor Project is a partnership led by Metro with the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), TriMet, Clackamas and Multnomah counties and the cities of Portland, Milwaukie and Oregon City.

Beginning April 2007, the South Corridor Project will prepare a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) to analyze the design, ridership, costs of construction, engineering, environmental impacts, traffic circulation and effect on neighborhoods. The SDEIS should be completed in the summer of 2008.

This analysis ensures that the benefits and impacts of the proposed alignment are fully understood and that the public has a chance to provide input on detailed design and project funding. Depending on local and federal approvals, construction could begin as early as 2011. Portland-Milwaukie MAX will be funded by federal and local dollars.

Studies for the South Corridor Project began in 1999. Phase I of the project is under construction on the downtown bus mall and along I-205 to Clackamas Town Center. Phase II will provide additional environmental analysis of the alignment between Portland and Milwaukie because areas and conditions may have changed and have not been examined recently.

Preliminary review of locally preferred alternative

Before undertaking the SDEIS, the South Corridor Project is reviewing the light rail alignment as defined by the community in the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) adopted in 2002. The review includes examining the cost effectiveness of the LPA and conditions that have changed since then. At present, the project team is initiating early conversations with stakeholders along the alignment to inform them of the start of the SDEIS and its scope and to obtain input on the LPA. The project team will use what it has learned from these conversations to help identify all design options to include in the SDEIS in addition to the LPA.
With new developments on the east and west side of the Willamette River around the Central Eastside and South Waterfront areas, consideration will be given to current and future transportation needs and opportunities in relation to the LPA. The South Corridor Project will also review the results of the Milwaukie Working Group from 2005. Because the Kellogg Lake site recommended by the Working Group is no longer viable for transit use, the proposed southern end terminus and park and ride locations need to be reviewed. The SDEIS will include the LPA, Working Group alignment, and other possible design options.

Public involvement and decision-making

The South Corridor Project will provide opportunities for public input throughout the SDEIS. Metro will maintain a project mailing list and communicate regularly with all affected parties along the alignment including businesses, property owners, neighborhoods, institutions and interested parties. In addition, a citizen committee will be formed to advise the South Corridor Project Steering Committee on a regular basis. Information and updates will be provided at open houses and public presentations, in newsletters and on Metro’s web site.

The South Corridor Project Steering Committee is responsible for making final recommendations regarding key decisions for the SDEIS. The Steering Committee is comprised of elected representatives from Clackamas and Multnomah counties; the cities of Milwaukie, Portland and Oregon City; and Metro, and executives from TriMet and the ODOT. This group will receive and review recommendations from the citizen committee and technical staff. Citizen committee and Steering Committee meetings are open to the public.

For more information

To learn more about the project or be added to the mailing list, call (503) 797-1755 or send an e-mail to trans@metro.dst.or.us. For information on Phase I of the South Corridor Project, visit www.metro-region.org.
What do Portland State University, OHSU, and OMSI have in common with Central Eastside, Sellwood/Moreland and Milwaukie? In the future, all will be linked by a new MAX light rail line from downtown Portland through southeast neighborhoods and into north Clackamas County. The Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail project - the second part of a two-phased plan to bring light rail to the southeast portion of the region – is in the final phase of environmental analysis, a supplemental draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS).

Metro is leading the project in partnership with TriMet, ODOT, Multnomah and Clackamas counties, and the cities of Portland, Milwaukie and Oregon City.

The project will extend the region’s popular light rail system on a new 6.5 mile alignment from downtown Portland, across the Willamette River, and south to Milwaukie or possibly Oak Grove. Project planning will continue – with opportunities for public input – through summer 2008. Construction could occur as soon as 2011.

A Brief History

The Portland to Milwaukie light rail alignment has been studied and evaluated several times over the past 25 years. In fact, it was one of the first corridors considered at the onset of regional light rail planning in the 1980s. The current project is Phase II of the South Corridor Study. Phase I resulted in the light rail project currently under construction on the downtown Portland transit mall and I-205.

The current study is re-evaluating the 2003 Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA), the light rail alignment recommended by the public. The SDEIS is updating the LPA for environmental changes since 2003 and consulting with communities about additional design options to consider. A growing regional population, changing land uses and emerging development opportunities in South Waterfront, the Central Eastside and downtown Milwaukie require a fresh look.

Alternatives
- No Build
- Light Rail Alternative

Alignment Options
- 2003 LPA, plus:
  - Four Willamette River crossing options
  - Tillamook Branch alignment option
  - Park Avenue extension option

Alternatives and Alignment Options

The SDEIS is considering two alternatives – the No Build and the Light Rail alternative. Basically this means looking at what the southeast region’s transportation options will be in the future with and without light rail. The No Build alternative provides a basis for comparing the benefits, costs and impacts for the 2003 LPA and alignment options.

The No Build considers existing transit services and facilities as well as planned improvements from the Regional Transportation Plan by 2025. It includes modest upgrades for existing bus service and additional park and ride facilities in the corridor, such as the already-planned 330-space park and ride at the former Southgate Cinema. The No Build alternative also includes current and planned road improvements, such as street network improvements and better I-5 access for South Waterfront.

The Light Rail alternative is a new 6.5-mile light rail line extending from the MAX network under construction on Portland’s downtown transit mall at SW Jackson Street to a southern terminus at either SE Lake Road in Milwaukie or SE Park Avenue near Oak Grove. The line features 11-13 new light rail stations and three...
to four new park and ride facilities with up to 2,600 new parking spaces. A key feature of the line will be a new bridge across the Willamette River between the Marquam and Ross Island bridges. The bridge would accommodate bikes, pedestrians, streetcar, light rail and possibly buses.

The Light Rail alternative generally follows the 2003 LPA alignment with three notable exceptions – at the river crossing and two areas south of SE Tacoma Street.

The Willamette River crossing location is being evaluated because of the desire to serve the growing South Waterfront district, which has evolved greatly since 2003. The LPA alignment extends from Harbor Drive to RiverPlace before crossing the river to OMSI. Four new crossing locations are also being studied. Each would extend the alignment further south along Harbor Drive before turning east to a new station in the future OHSU Schnitzer campus and crossing the river to station locations just south of OMSI.

In addition to the 2003 LPA, the Light Rail alternative also will examine two new options – the Tillamook Branch alignment and the SE Park Road extension. The LPA alignment parallels McLoughlin Boulevard south of Holgate before turning east at a Milwaukie park and ride station and turning south through downtown Milwaukie. The 2005 Milwaukie Working Group suggested another option using the Tillamook Branch alignment to the east of McLoughlin Boulevard south of SE Tacoma Street.

The Working Group also suggested a southern terminus of the line at a site on Kellogg Lake. This site is no longer viable for transit use so the exact location of the terminus and park and ride facility was reviewed. As a result, a proposal to extend the alignment further south of Milwaukie along McLoughlin Boulevard to a terminus at SE Park Avenue also will be studied in the SDEIS.
NORTH SEGMENT
SW Jackson St. to SE Holgate Blvd.

The North Segment of the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail project extends from the southern terminus of the downtown Portland transit mall at SW Jackson Street near PSU to the SE Holgate Boulevard station along SE 17th Avenue. This light rail segment features six or seven stations, a new transit bridge over the Willamette River between the Marquam and Ross Island bridges, and transit connections to Portland Streetcar, the Aerial Tram and the TriMet bus system. The exact number of light rail stations will depend on which Willamette River crossing alignment is eventually chosen as the preferred alternative.

The North Segment begins at the south end of the downtown transit mall, currently under construction, and extends east along SW Lincoln Street before continuing on one of five separate proposed alignments that cross the Willamette River.

2003 Locally Preferred Alternative

The 2003 Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) alignment crosses over the SW Harrison Street connector at Harbor Drive, continues east to RiverPlace, crosses underneath the Marquam Bridge and extends across the Willamette River to a station at OMSI. It then crosses at-grade or over the Oregon Pacific Railroad, and travels underneath the Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard viaduct before curving southeast along the Union Pacific Railroad right of way.

The other four Willamette River alignment options differ from the LPA by extending further south on the east side of the river, crossing at Harbor Drive to the South Waterfront district to provide better access to the neighborhood, future OHSU Schnitzer Campus and the Aerial Tram. The options are named for the approximate locations of the street connections they meet on both sides of the Willamette River – SW Meade or SW Porter on the west, and SE Sherman or SE Caruthers on the east.

For all four, RiverPlace would be served by an elevated station at Harbor Drive. The alignments continue south along SW Moody Avenue extending into South Waterfront, crossing the streetcar tracks and SW River Parkway at-grade and curving to the east along the future OHSU Schnitzer Campus. All four options feature an elevated station in the Schnitzer Campus to address potential floodplain issues and meet navigational clearance over the Willamette River. All four options also include a station south of OMSI and connections to the future Portland Streetcar Loop. The alignments then cross at-grade or over the Oregon Pacific Railroad, and travel underneath the Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard viaduct before curving southeast along the Union Pacific Railroad right of way where they rejoin the 2003 LPA.

The SDEIS will include analysis of two potential bridge types – a concrete segmental bridge and a cable-stay bridge. Either bridge would accommodate bikes, pedestrians, streetcar, light rail, and, possibly, buses. A transit-oriented bridge over the Willamette would be a new feature in Portland and promises to be a signature element of the entire Portland-Milwaukie light rail line.

The North Segment continues along the Union Pacific Rail right of way with a station at SE Clinton Street. The alignment crosses SE Powell Boulevard at SE 17th Avenue on a single track in order to share the 17th Avenue bridge. The North Segment continues along SE 17th Avenue with stops at SE Rhine Street and SE Holgate Boulevard.

(see map on other side)
For more information

To learn more about the project or get on the mailing list, call 503-797-1755 or send e-mail to trans@metro.dst.or.us. For information on Phase I of the South Corridor Project, visit www.metro-region.org.
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CENTRAL SEGMENT
SE Holgate Boulevard to SE Tacoma Street

The Central Segment of the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail extends from SE Holgate Boulevard to the SE Tacoma Street park and ride station. This short light rail segment features three or four stations and one park and ride facility with 600-1000 spaces. The exact number of stations and parking spaces will be determined as a result of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS).

The Central Segment begins at the SE Holgate Boulevard station and follows the 2003 Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) alignment. From SE Holgate Boulevard to just south of SE Schiller Street, the alignment runs on the center of SE 17th Avenue near the Brooklyn Rail Yard. Below SE Schiller Street, the alignment leaves SE 17th Avenue and runs along the east side of McLoughlin Boulevard before shifting slightly further east. Between SE Reedway Street and SE Tacoma Street the alignment is located midway between SE McLoughlin Boulevard and the Union Pacific rail line. The alignment segment features stations at Holgate, Bybee, Tacoma and, possibly, Harold.

In past studies of this corridor, there has been considerable consensus reached on the location of the alignment in this area. As a result, there are no alignment options for this segment. However, community input received since the LPA was adopted has resulted in an option for a station at SE Harold Street. This would be the closest station to Reed College and most likely would be an additional station rather than a substitute. Technical analysis and continued public input will determine whether this station is beneficial for the surrounding area and cost effective.
The South Segment of the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail project extends from the SE Tacoma Street park and ride station to a southern terminus at either SE Lake Road in Milwaukie or SE Park Avenue just north of Oak Grove. This light rail segment features up to five stations and three or four park and ride facilities with up to 2,600 spaces. The exact number of stations and parking facilities depends on which south segment alignments are eventually chosen as a result of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS).

2003 Locally Preferred Alternative
The South Segment begins near Johnson Creek and McLoughlin boulevards at the SE Tacoma Street park and ride station and continues south on one of two alignments. The 2003 Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) alignment continues south along the east side of McLoughlin Boulevard and crosses under the Springwater Trail. At SE Ochoco Street, the alignment diverges onto SE Main Street and continues to SE Milwaukie Road before turning east to the Milwaukie park and ride station. South of the Milwaukie park and ride, the alignment turns east to the Tillamook Branch line and crosses the Oregon Pacific Railroad freight line on a new overcrossing structure. The alignment remains along the east side of the Tillamook Branch line through Milwaukie and terminates at the SE Lake Road park and ride. Station options with this alternative are located at Tacoma, Milwaukie, Harrison and Lake.

Tillamook Branch Alignment options
The Tillamook Branch line alternative was recommended in 2005 by the Milwaukie Working Group. It turns to the southeast at the SE Tacoma Street park and ride station, crosses under the Springwater Trail and crosses over the Tillamook Branch rail line on the east side. The proposed light rail line reconnects with the LPA north of Highway 224 and continues south through downtown Milwaukie until it terminates further south at the SE Park Avenue park and ride station north of Oak Grove. Station options with this alternative are located at Tacoma, Monroe, Lake and Park.

Extension to Park Avenue
The LPA could also be constructed with the southern terminus at SE Park Avenue instead of at SE Lake Road. This alignment crosses over SE Lake Road matching the elevation of the existing freight rail trestle bridge over Kellogg Lake. It then overcrosses McLoughlin Boulevard on a structure, although one option will consider crossing the road at grade. An elevated crossing would require a potential station at SW Bluebird Street to be elevated also. The alignment then runs on the west side of McLoughlin Boulevard until it terminates at SE Park Avenue. Station options with this alternative are located at Tacoma, Milwaukie, Washington, Bluebird and Park.

(see map on other side)
For more information
To learn more about the project or get on the mailing list, call 503-797-1755 or send e-mail to trans@metro.dst.or.us. For information on Phase I of the South Corridor Project, visit www.metro-region.org.
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1. **What is the Portland-Milwaukie light rail project?**
   It is the proposed light rail service between Portland and Milwaukie also known as South Corridor Project Phase II. Phase I resulted in the light rail project currently under construction on the downtown Portland transit mall and I-205. The South Corridor Project, an analysis of transit options to serve communities in Southeast Portland and Clackamas County was initiated following Metro Council public “listening posts” held in 1999 to fully understand voter concerns and community preferences for transit service. After considering several alternative forms of transit, these communities – through their elected or appointed officials – eventually asked to reinstate light rail as part of the project, with some changes to previous proposals.

2. **Why is the project needed?**
   Portland State University forecasts that an additional 1 million people will move into the Portland region by 2030. The Clackamas area is expected to continue to be one of the fastest growing areas within the region. Population and employment growth in North Clackamas County will continue to exceed the area’s current transportation system. This growth has led to increased congestion and demand for expanded transit services that allow commuters to get to their destinations efficiently and safely. In addition to meeting local needs, light rail can help the Northwest reduce its share of a national dependency upon automobiles and fossil fuels. More trips on trains equates to fewer trips in cars and buses.

3. **What is the purpose of the project?**
   **Why should light rail be serve Milwaukie?**
   Serving transit riders in North Clackamas County and Southeast Portland to help them get to where they need to go in the most cost and time efficient manner is the main objective of the Portland-Milwaukie light rail project. There is significant unmet demand for transit in Clackamas County. This includes a need for sufficient park and ride facilities to better serve commuters, especially those south of Milwaukie.

4. **Why light rail instead of other transit options?**
   The 2000 South Corridor Alternatives Analysis compared busway, bus rapid transit, river transit, radial commuter rail, circumferential commuter rail, high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes and high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes. As this study was under way, a coalition of neighborhood groups and businesses lobbied for the inclusion of light rail among the modes to be considered. After detailed analysis and public review, it was determined to be the most efficient transit option. Light rail had a higher quality of service, it was faster than comparable options, it attracted the most transit riders and it helped transform land use in some areas by encouraging private investment. These reasons are discussed in more detail below.

   **Efficiency of operation** – Light rail trains move more people than a bus. Light rail trains can accommodate 266 people, while a bus can hold 51 riders. In 2004, the system operating cost per ride on MAX was $1 compared to $2.63 on a bus.

   **Quality of service** – Light rail trains run in a separate right of way and don’t get stuck in traffic. As a result, they are on time 90 percent of the time. Buses operating in mixed traffic are on time 78 percent of the time.

   Continued
Level of ridership – The Milwaukie-Portland light rail extension is forecast to have between 20,000 to 25,000 daily riders in 2025, which would reduce the number of miles driven in vehicles by approximately 20,000 per day.

Economic benefit – The public investment in light rail has triggered increased private investment in areas with MAX service. Approximately $6 billion in investments has been triggered along existing MAX lines.

Support of land use plans – Metro’s 2040 Growth Concept identifies seven regional centers and 30 town centers and calls for these centers to be linked by high capacity transit.

MAX attracts new riders – The current MAX lines have shown an ability to attract riders that do not otherwise use the transit system. Everywhere MAX has been built transit ridership has nearly doubled.

5. Has light rail been compared with a streetcar alternative for the area?
Not formally. In 2002, when other alternatives were under consideration, the streetcar was still evolving as a viable transit alternative. Research on how it has performed elsewhere suggests that it does not have adequate capacity. Growth projections indicate that streetcar ridership might “max out” too early to justify its own capital cost. Though adding additional cars could accommodate growing ridership, this would require an additional investment to expand or replace the system in the future. Added streetcar service would steadily slow the travel time, thereby reducing its efficiency.

6. Will the project consider a streetcar alternative?
Not likely. An informal study of a streetcar on Southeast 17th Avenue showed slower service than light rail. Replacing light rail with streetcar on the same alignment might reduce construction costs, but would increase operating costs. To provide the same level of service as light rail, more frequent streetcar trips would be required, which would require additional operators.

7. Why is streetcar being considered from Portland to Lake Oswego?
The existing rail corridor and the roadways between Lake Oswego and Portland are extremely narrow in some places. Adequate right of way is not available for a light rail system because of physical and engineering challenges such as a tunnel, three trestles, extensive and significant grade changes, sight distance challenges and water drainage issues.

8. How long is the proposed Portland-Milwaukie light rail alignment?
The alignment is 6.5 miles and would include approximately 10 stations and roughly 2,000 park and ride spaces. It would also include a new bridge for light rail, pedestrians, streetcars, buses and bicycles across the Willamette River.

9. What are the proposed design options in Milwaukie? In Portland?
For a look at the most current design proposed, go to www.metro-region.org/southcorridor and view project documents.

10. Why is the South Corridor important?
Hundreds of thousands of people live in the South Corridor with approximately one million more projected to arrive in the region in the next 20 years. Milwaukie is located at the crossroads of two important corridors that fan out from its center. One corridor is south to Oregon City, Canby and other rapidly growing areas of the region, and the other is east to Clackamas, Happy Valley and the Damascus area which is expected to be the future home of approximately 60,000 residents. In addition to reaching riders in these areas, the alignment serves Portland’s South Waterfront area and the inner eastside. Riders could use light rail to get to work, schools such as PSU, OHSU, OMSI and entertainment destinations.
1. What is the history of the South Corridor light rail project?
During the 1980s the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) developed a plan to double the width of Southeast McLoughlin Boulevard between Milwaukie and Portland to handle increasing amounts of traffic. Objections and concerns from the public led to the consideration of other transit options for the South Corridor.

During the late 1990s and again in 2002, ODOT, Metro, Portland, Milwaukie and others in the region examined a full array of transit options for this corridor. These options included:

- Busway
- Bus rapid transit improvements
- Circumferential commuter rail
- River transit
- High capacity vehicle (HOV) lanes
- Radial commuter rail
- Adding high capacity toll (HOT) lanes

In the mid-1990’s, voters turned down two ballot measures to fund the construction of light rail in the South Corridor. In 1999, Metro launched a series of public meetings to listen to and learn from the community in the South Corridor. Metro heard strong support for transit alternatives to traffic congestion in this corridor. In 2000, Metro commenced alternatives analysis focused on non-light rail options. Light rail was added to the 2002 analysis after many requests from neighborhoods in the corridor.

Based on the technical information included in environmental impact statements and extensive public testimony, in 2003 the city councils of Milwaukie and Portland, the boards of Clackamas and Multnomah counties, TriMet, ODOT and the Metro Council selected light rail from Milwaukie to Portland as the best option – also known as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA).

Since 2003, local conditions have changed enough that it is necessary to study possible modifications in the current environmental analysis.

2. What is the history of votes on light rail funding?
There have been a number of votes on funding light rail projects.

Between 1994 and 1998, there were three Oregon votes and one Clark County Washington vote on the financing of a bi-state south-north light rail line. Each vote was different in its scope and nature, as described below:

1990 A $125 million Westside ballot measure passed by 73 percent within the Portland region.

1994 Voters in the TriMet service district approved Measure 26-13 with a 63 percent yes vote. A proposed $475 million bond measure would have built a 26-mile light rail line from Clackamas County into Clark County, Washington. The measure represented only one piece of the proposed funding. Other funds were anticipated from Clark County, the states of Washington and Oregon and the federal government.

1995 In 1995, Clark County, Washington, voters rejected a ballot measure that would have raised $237 million for the Washington portion of the south-north light rail line plus a 9-mile extension north from Vancouver to Hazel Dell.

1996 Following the Clark County defeat, TriMet and Metro restructured the south-north light rail project and, in August 1995, the Oregon Legislature passed a $750 million transportation package. The package included $375 million in lottery-backed bonds for the project and $375 million for
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rural transportation projects around the state. Opponents of the package gathered enough signatures to refer the package to voters as 1996 State Ballot Measure 32. In November 1996, Oregon voters rejected the legislative package by a vote of 53 percent to 46 percent. While the measure failed statewide, it was approved by a majority of the voters within the TriMet service area. TriMet then began to focus on an “Oregon only” extension.

1998 Measure 26-74 was placed on the November 1998 ballot for an Oregon-only project. The Clark County portion was no longer included. The Oregon-only proposal was divided into two phases: the first would connect the Rose Quarter to Milwaukie and the second Milwaukie to Clackamas Town Center. The measure failed 52 to 48 percent, despite passing in Multnomah County.

1999 In light of the failed 1998 measure, elected officials hosted “listening posts” throughout the region to find out how community members thought transportation needs in the south-north corridor ought to be addressed. The feedback revealed public support for light rail in the northern portion of the corridor. In 2000, a study of non-light rail options in the southern portion of the corridor began.

1999 An alliance of neighborhood and business groups from Southeast Portland and Milwaukie asked the Metro Council to reconsider light rail between Portland and Milwaukie and along I-205. They expressed support for light rail at the listening posts and other public meetings held in the corridor.

2002 An alternatives analysis of a wide range of transit options culminated in a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS), which reviewed busway, bus rapid transit and light rail options.

2003 The 2002 SDEIS process concluded with adoption of a locally preferred alternative (LPA) in 2003 by the locally elected bodies of all the jurisdictions in the corridor. The LPA included a light rail alignment between Portland and Milwaukie as phase II. Phase I called for reconstruction of the downtown Portland bus mall to accommodate light rail and construction of a light rail line on I-205 between I-84 and Clackamas Town Center.

3. Why is light rail being studied between Portland and Milwaukie? Hasn’t it already been studied?
   The original light rail proposal has been modified periodically over the years, to fulfill various community preferences. In order to qualify for funding and meet regulatory requirements, the environmental data needs to be updated. In 2003, Southeast Portland and North Clackamas County (through votes by their locally elected officials) conveyed their support for further study of light rail. Specifically, they helped select two light rail lines: the I-205 line and the Portland-Milwaukie line. The 2007 South Corridor Project is updating the Portland-Milwaukie line with an environmental review to study the overall impacts and alignment variations related to transportation, land use, economic development, environmental impact, community livability and costs.

4. Didn’t Milwaukie north industrial businesses ask for changes to the light rail alignment?
   Yes. In 2004 a working group comprised of business and neighborhood leaders was formed to examine preferences in the north industrial area. The working group received a number of alternatives and mitigation strategies. It ultimately recommended that the light rail alignment travel through the north industrial area along the Tillamook Branch rail spur to the east instead of the street frontage along Southeast McLoughlin Boulevard near the old Southgate Theater site. The working group proposal also included a new terminus and a park and ride location at Kellogg Lake, with stations in Milwaukie. The proposal fell through when the recommended park and ride location was no longer available. The project is now reviewing the 2004 proposed alignment to see if a different terminus and park and ride location can be found.

5. What is different between the 2003 LPA and what is being studied today?
   Today the project is updating the locally preferred light rail alignment to reflect changes in the area and to consider additional community preferences since it was adopted in 2003. The project is evaluating different locations for the river crossing and terminus to reflect these changes.

Continued
6. What is light rail’s track record?
Have other lines built in the area met projected ridership numbers?

The Portland region has been an innovator in public transportation, developing light rail projects on time and under budget. Visitors from around the US and internationally come to tour and learn from Metro, TriMet and local cities. Existing rail lines have exceeded ridership expectations. For more information on light rail ridership, visit www.trimet.org/publications and search for the October 2006 report, “TriMet Ridership Statistics.”
1. **When would construction begin?**
   Depending on funding and other project approvals, construction could begin between 2011 and 2013.

2. **When would light rail service begin?**
   As early as 2014 or 2015.

3. **What is the proposed timeline for the project?**
   A simplified schedule for the project is shown below. “SDEIS” stands for Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, a document required by the federal government for a project like this.

4. **Will there be impacts to traffic, business or private property?**
   Construction of any major infrastructure project inevitably impacts traffic, businesses or neighboring residential areas. Through the SDEIS, the project will learn about the impacts and inconveniences posed in finer detail.

5. **Will light rail be noisy? Will walls and noise barriers be installed?**
   In general, light rail does not create significant noise impacts. However, noise impacts will be evaluated as a part of the SDEIS. Depending on the results, a mitigation plan, if necessary, will be suggested. Typical mitigation might involve barriers, sound walls or vegetation to block the noise impacts to nearby properties.

6. **What measures will be taken to protect private property and schools from crime?**
   Safety concerns will be evaluated as part of the project. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), a nationally recognized approach to designing safe public spaces, will be applied. These principles, along with community education programs will be developed and implemented in collaboration with local neighborhoods and schools. TriMet security collaborates with local police departments and community representatives to support the greatest degree of public safety. Light rail also brings more foot traffic which can contribute to a safe environment.

7. **How will impacted property owners and occupants be involved?**
   The project team has already begun talking with potentially impacted property owners. This will continue as more information about impacts becomes known through detailed engineering. A map of the alignment is available online at www.metro-region.org/southcorridor. For more information, call Metro’s offices at 503-797-1756.

---

**Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project**

**Simple Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDEIS Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Begins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8. **How will light rail affect the ODOT preservation project on McLoughlin Boulevard?**
The state is scheduled to improve the sections of Southeast McLoughlin Boulevard around 22nd Avenue in the summer of 2007. The light rail project could run through the southern portion of this project, a span of about six blocks. ODOT, Metro and Clackamas County are coordinating project time lines and design, as much as possible, to avoid unnecessary costs and project delays.

9. **How does light rail affect the Trolley Trail project?**
Two light rail design options consider a southern extension to Park Avenue. If the project were to extend south to Park Avenue, it would only impact about one half mile of the trail project. Preliminary analysis indicates the two projects could fit within the existing right of way. Clackamas County and Metro are coordinating the project design to lessen disruption to both projects. Depending upon how well construction schedules can be coordinated, some parts of the Trolley Trail may be postponed or have to be rebuilt along Southeast McLoughlin Boulevard between Bluebird Street and Park Avenue. Light rail is not proposed near the trail south of Park Avenue.

10. **Will the Trolley Trail run alongside the light rail?**
Depending on exactly where the light rail is built, the Trolley Trail may run parallel to the light rail south of Southeast Bluebird Street through Park Avenue. This is not unusual – there are many places around the country where light rail lines and pedestrian/bike paths are next to each other.

11. **Why are you building a new bridge across the Willamette River? Who would use the new bridge?**
The new bridge is planned in the context of the overall transportation system to relieve the Steel Bridge from being the only light rail entry point to downtown Portland. Existing bridges do not have the capacity for light rail and a new bridge could be located in a way that avoids travel in the wrong direction. The new bridge would accommodate bicycles, pedestrians, buses, light rail and streetcar.

12. **Why not use the Hawthorne Bridge?**
The use of the Hawthorne Bridge was studied the 2002 SDEIS and rejected in the 2003 LPA decision for a number of reasons:
   a. The Hawthorne Bridge is an important portal into the downtown area and adding light rail to this bridge would slow traffic and train operations. A Hawthorne alignment would not serve South Waterfront or Portland State University and would be difficult to tie into the existing light rail system.
   b. Significant structural changes would be required to lift the structure, the deck and its supports to accommodate light rail.
   c. Expanding the bridge (with or without light rail) would require an upgrade in order to meet current seismic standards.
   d. Multnomah County, the owner and operator of the bridge, did not support this option.

13. **Why are you considering moving the bridge south?**
We are studying an alternate river crossing that is slightly south of the adopted crossing to determine if there is an option that provides better service to both sides of the river. Specifically, the bridge could create an access point to OMSI on the east side and Portland State University and Oregon Health Sciences University (OHSU) and build on the region’s previous investment in adding light rail to the Portland Mall. This bridge would be located to provide a convenient transfer to the Tram, serving the 11,000 employees at OHSU’s Marquam Hill campus and the high growth area in South Waterfront, where 4,300 households and 12,000 to 13,000 jobs are projected.

14. **Isn’t the river crossing proposed in the LPA called the Caruthers Street crossing? What’s the difference between the Caruthers Street crossing and the design option called Caruthers-Meade?**
The river crossing adopted in 2003 was called the Caruthers Crossing but it did not actually go along Southeast Caruthers Street but Caruthers Street was the closest named street. The Caruthers-Meade design option is a different crossing that actually travels along Caruthers Street and lands on the future Meade Street on the west bank of the Willamette.
15. What type of bridge are you building? Who will maintain the bridge?
The proposal is to build a fixed span bridge that is high enough to provide clearance to river users. Examples of other fixed span bridges include the Marquam and Ross Island bridges. The bridge would be designed with input from the public, however a cable-stayed, through-truss bridge was the preferred option in 1998. TriMet would likely be responsible for bridge maintenance.

16. What are other potential ways the light rail system could be expanded in the region?
Potential future projects include extending light rail from the Expo Center to Vancouver, Washington as part of the Columbia River Crossing Project. Metro’s 2040 Growth Concept calls for linking regional centers with high capacity transit. Future connections to Oregon City from either Clackamas Regional Center or from Milwaukie may someday be considered along with a connection along the Southwest Barbur Boulevard corridor that could link Tigard Regional Center, Burlingame and Portland.

17. How much does this light rail proposal cost?
Early estimates indicate that the construction cost of the 2003 LPA would be approximately $880 in 2013 dollars. Once the project has identified local preferences for the design, the bridge crossing, the terminus and other features, a better estimate for construction costs will be determined.

18. What will Portland-Milwaukie light rail cost to operate and maintain?
Current estimates indicate that it would cost approximately $5-6 million per year to operate Portland-Milwaukie light rail.

19. What is the cost per passenger per trip?
Until we are able to calculate the construction, operating and maintenance cost we cannot calculate the exact cost per passenger per trip. On other light rail lines in the region, cost per passenger per trip ranges from $1.70 to $2 for adult riders. TriMet will pay for operations and maintenance with revenue from fares, payroll taxes, on-vehicle advertising, and other federal and state sources.

20. What is the fare per passenger per trip?
The Portland to Milwaukie line would adhere to the existing TriMet fare structure. The trip would require an all-zone ticket currently priced at $2. In general TriMet sets their fares based on overall operating costs. Current fares can be found on TriMet’s web site at www.trimet.org.

21. Wouldn’t roads be cheaper to build?
No. Roadways are expensive and can create significant impacts. Expanding Southeast McLoughlin Boulevard would require adding lanes, sidewalks, bike lanes and emergency lanes through Eastmoreland Park, the Sellwood and Brooklyn neighborhoods, and would require removal of dozens of houses and businesses. Improvements and widening would be required at the Highway 224, Southeast Tacoma Street overpass, Southeast 17th Avenue, Ross Island Bridge, and the MLK viaducts.

22. Will light rail go to a public vote?
If additional public bonds become necessary to finance construction, there would be a vote to authorize the bonds. A finance plan will be developed as part of the SDEIS process. The finance plan anticipates seeking 60 percent federal funding for the project. A local match of 40 percent will be required to qualify for federal funds. Depending upon how this local match can be achieved, a public vote may be considered for bonding authority.
1. How are community interests represented in this project?

The project is guided by a steering committee that is made up of elected officials from the partner agencies – Metro, TriMet, Clackamas and Multnomah counties, the cities of Portland, Milwaukie and Oregon City and the Oregon Department of Transportation. This committee makes policy decisions regarding the project.

A citizens advisory committee has also been formed to provide community-based guidance and feedback. Applications submitted from all areas of the project were reviewed and applicants were selected on the basis of experience, availability, ability to represent the citizens served and affected by the project, and credentials. Committee meetings are publicized by Metro and open to the public.

Partner agencies are receiving periodic project updates during the course of their regular public meeting schedules. A schedule of open houses, community meetings, press releases and event notices will accompany key project decisions.

2. What is the best way to stay informed about the project?

Send an email to trans@metro-region.org and ask to be added to the project mailing list to receive the project newsletter and notices for project meetings and events. Metro’s web site, www.metro-region.org/southcorridor, is the central source for project information and a good place to check routinely for current information. Metro’s project partners are also good sources of information.

3. What role do major employers, business groups and private investors play in this project?

Project staff provides outreach to neighborhoods, small business and larger employers alike. In turn, the community stakeholders can provide feedback on the project in a variety of ways.

4. Are there non-governmental forums for discussion of regional transit issues?

There are several online forums and community groups that host monthly discussions about current events. Neighborhood associations, booster clubs and business associations throughout the corridor have requested South Corridor presentations. If you would like a presentation to your community group, contact Phillip Kennedy Wong at 503-797-1755.

5. How can I find more detailed information?

The South Corridor project has a long history. A good deal of information is available on Metro’s web site at www.metro-region.org/southcorridor. Answers to very specific or technical questions may only be available in hard copy documents. Materials related to the study of transit service development in the South Corridor are being organized for review by Metro. Contact Metro at 503-797-1756 to schedule a reading room visit.

With new developments on the east and west side of the Willamette River around the Central Eastside and South Waterfront areas, consideration will be given to current and future transportation needs and opportunities in relation to the locally preferred alternative (LPA). The South Corridor Project team will also review the 2005 recommendations of a working group of Milwaukie business and neighborhood leaders. Because the Kellogg Lake site recommended by the working group is no longer viable for transit use, the proposed southern end terminus and park and ride locations need to be reviewed. The supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) will include the locally preferred alternative, working group alignment, and other possible design options.
Make your voice heard!

*What do you think about the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Project?*

We’re looking for your input between May 9 and noon on June 23, 2008.

The 45-day public comment period begins with the publication of the *Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS)*. This is your opportunity to learn about the project choices and what the analysis uncovered, to see what the impacts of the project look like, and let decision-makers know what you think.

Your input is critical to the project’s Steering Committee. They will consider public comments, a recommendation from the project Citizen Advisory Committee, and technical findings in developing a Locally Preferred Alternative for the project.

Steering Committee members include elected officials from Metro, the cities of Milwaukie, Portland and Oregon City, and Clackamas and Multnomah counties and appointed officials from TriMet and the Oregon Department of Transportation.

**Learn about the project choices**

**Review the SDEIS**

Visit the project web site and review the SDEIS and its Executive Summary, [www.oregonmetro.gov/southcorridor](http://www.oregonmetro.gov/southcorridor). If you prefer a CD or print copy of the document, call Metro at 503-797-1756 or email us at trans@oregonmetro.gov.

The six and one-half mile alignment between Milwaukie and Portland would provide additional transportation options for fast-growing communities with high traffic congestion in north Clackamas County and Southeast Portland.
Attend a project open house

Attend an open house and learn about the costs, impacts and benefits of the project options. The open houses offer the opportunity to review information, ask questions, and talk with project staff. The open houses also feature short project briefing throughout the evening, so drop-in at your convenience. The same information will be available at each open house.

May 21
Cleveland High School
3400 SE 26th Ave.,
Portland

May 22
Marriott Residence Inn
Broadway room
2115 SW River Pkwy,
Portland

May 27
Putnam High School
4950 SE Roethe Rd.,
Oak Grove

May 28
Milwaukie High School
11300 SE 23rd St.,
Milwaukie

Provide comments about the project

 ✓ Send email to trans@oregonmetro.gov.
 ✓ Record a voice message on Metro’s transportation hotline. Call (503) 797-1900, option 6.
 ✓ Provide oral testimony at the project public hearing. June 9, 5:30-8:30 p.m. at Metro, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland.
 ✓ Attend an open house and complete a comment card.
 ✓ Attend a Citizen Advisory Committee meeting. Visit the project web site for details.
 ✓ Write a letter and send it to the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Project, Metro 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland, OR 97232

Don’t hesitate to contact us if you have questions. Call Metro at (503) 797-1756 or send an email to the address above.
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232

Email: info@metro-region.org
Website: www.metro-region.org

Join the discussion!
Currently Metro and its partners are conducting an environmental analysis of the proposed Portland-Milwaukie light rail alignment including the station areas. If the proposed alignment is extended south to Park Avenue, it would bring MAX to North Clackamas County.

The station planning meeting is your opportunity to:
• learn about the light rail project
• provide input about what makes a good light rail station
• talk about ways to improve on good things already present in your community
• discuss new things that might benefit the area
• share ideas about what makes station areas attractive places for transit riders and the community.

Portland–Milwaukie
LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

You’re invited to discuss a potential light rail station for the Oak Grove area of Clackamas County.

6 to 8:30 p.m., Wednesday, March 12

Rose Villa Fellowship Hall
13505 SE River Road, Portland

Share your thoughts and ideas for the potential station and park and ride.

Don’t know where potential stations are? Visit www.metro-region.org/southcorridor to see or download a map of the alignment.

To ask a question or share a comment, send e-mail to trans@metro-region.org or call 503-797-1756.
Make your voice heard!
May 9 to noon June 23, 2008

The Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Project is nearing the public comment phase and we’re looking for your input. Learn about the project choices and what the analysis uncovered. See what the impacts of the project look like. Let decision-makers know what you think. After the 45-day public comment period, the project Steering Committee will use the public comments, along with a recommendation from the Citizen Advisory Committee and technical findings, to make a recommendation. This will go to each local jurisdiction who will forward a recommendation to the Metro Council for a vote in mid-summer.

For a copy of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement or project news and updates, visit www.oregonmetro.gov/southcorridor or call 503-797-1756.

SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Portland–Milwaukie LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

Provide public comment
May 9 to noon June 23, 2008

Attend an open house
6 to 8 p.m. Wednesday, May 21
Cleveland High School cafeteria, 3400 SE 26th Ave., Portland
6 to 8 p.m. Thursday, May 22
Marriott Residence Inn Broadway room, 2115 SW River Parkway, Portland
6 to 8 p.m. Tuesday, May 27
Putnam High School cafeteria, 4950 SE Roethle Rd., Oak Grove
6 to 8 p.m. Wednesday, May 28
Milwaukie High School commons, 11300 SE 23rd Ave., Milwaukie

Give testimony at a public hearing
5:30 to 8:30 p.m. Monday, June 9
Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland

Send comments via e-mail to trans@oregonmetro.gov

Send written comments to Portland Milwaukie Light Rail Project, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland, OR 97232

PROJECT PARTNERS
Metro
TriMet
City of Portland
City of Milwaukie
City of Oregon City
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Oregon Department of Transportation

Metro
Make your voice heard!
Comment on a light rail project that could connect Oak Grove, Milwaukie, Southeast and downtown Portland.

Public comment period
May 9 to noon June 23, 2008

Attend an open house
6 to 8 p.m. Wednesday, May 21
Cleveland High School cafeteria, 3400 SE 26th Ave., Portland

6 to 8 p.m. Thursday, May 22
Marriott Residence Inn Broadway room, 2115 SW River Parkway, Portland

6 to 8 p.m. Tuesday, May 27
Putnam High School cafeteria, 4950 SE Roethe Rd., Oak Grove

6 to 8 p.m. Wednesday, May 28
Milwaukie High School commons, 11300 SE 23rd Ave., Milwaukie

Give testimony at a public hearing
5:30 to 8:30 p.m. Monday, June 9
Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland

Send comments via e-mail
to trans@oregonmetro.gov

Send written comments
to Portland Milwaukie Light Rail Project, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland, OR 97232
Make your voice heard!
Comment on a light rail project that could connect Oak Grove, Milwaukie, Southeast and downtown Portland.

Public comment period May 9 to noon June 23, 2008

Give testimony at a public hearing
5:30 to 8:30 p.m. Monday, June 9
Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland

Send comments via e-mail
to trans@oregonmetro.gov

Send written comments
to Portland Milwaukie Light Rail Project,
600 NE Grand Ave., Portland, OR 97232

Review and comment on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation with Preliminary Findings of De Minimis Impacts to Public Parks

PROJECT PARTNERS
Metro
TriMet
City of Portland
City of Milwaukie
City of Oregon City
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Oregon Department of Transportation

FOR MORE INFORMATION
Visit www.oregonmetro.gov/southcorridor
or call 503-797-1756
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Media and Interested Parties

Citizen task force to help plan and design public safety for future light rail line

The Safety and Security Task Force for the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project is holding two workshops to begin recommending design principles to enhance safety and security features for the proposed line. The task force will work with safety and security experts and light rail designers. The public is invited to join the task force’s workshops.

The workshops are:

5 p.m. Wednesday, December 12
TriMet Headquarters Rooms C & D
4012 SE 17th Ave., Portland

6 p.m. Monday, December 17
Rowe Middle School Library
3606 SE Lake Rd., Milwaukie

The Safety and Security Task Force is comprised of local residents from Portland and North Clackamas County including Milwaukie and Oak Grove. Metro and TriMet set up the task force as a way for the public to provide local knowledge of the study area. Metro and TriMet hope to take full advantage of the eight years before the line is schedule to open to the public in 2015.

FOR MORE INFORMATION: Please contact Karen Withrow at (503) 797-1932.
Metro news release:

May 8, 2008

Contact: Karen Kane
(503) 7907-1942
Karen.Kane@oregonmetro.gov

Metro opens public comment period on alternatives to Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Project

Friday, May 9th marks the release of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) published by Metro, TriMet and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Project. The day also marks the beginning of a 45-day public comment period set to end at noon, Monday, June 23, 2008.

The SDEIS updates earlier light rail proposals. The document takes into account the latest job and population growth projections, and include new bridge alignments across the Willamette River between the Central Eastside and South Waterfront, the route through the North Industrial Area in Milwaukie, and the end of the line either at Lake Road in Milwaukie or Park Avenue in Oak Grove.

The SDEIS also includes a section that applies to the protection and preservation of parks, recreation areas, nature refuges and cultural or historic sites. (see “draft section 4(f) evaluation” below)

A number of public events have been scheduled to share information from the SDEIS and provide opportunities for public comment. Open house meetings will feature a project overview, SDEIS results by topic and an explanation of the steps to follow.

Four public meetings are scheduled. Project staff from Metro and TriMet will be on hand to answer questions on a drop-in basis from 6 to 8 p.m. on the following evenings:

Wednesday, May 21
Cleveland High School
3400 SE 26th Ave., Portland

Thursday, May 22
Marriott Residence Inn, Broadway room
2115 SW River Parkway, Portland

Tuesday, May 27
Putnam High School cafeteria
4950 SE Roethe Rd., Oak Grove

Wednesday, May 28
Milwaukie High School commons
In addition, project staff will **present basic project information** at the following upcoming farmers markets.

**Moreland farmers market**
May 14, 4:30 to 7:30 p.m.  
SE Bybee and SE 14th St.

**Oregon City farmers market**
May 17, 9 a.m. to 2 p.m.  
2051 Kaen Rd, Oregon City

**Milwaukie farmers market**
May 18, 9:30 to 2 p.m.  
Main St. across from City Hall in Milwaukie

Metro will also provide an opportunity for **public testimony** at a hearing before the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Project Steering Committee on June 9th, from 5:30 to 8:30 p.m. at Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Avenue in Portland.

**Written comments** are also accepted and should be submitted by email to trans@oregonmetro.gov or by mail to Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Project, c/o Metro, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland, OR, 97232. Comments can also be recorded on Metro’s transportation hotline at 503-797-1900, option 6. All comments must be received by noon on June 23.

Complete information on the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail project can be found on Metro’s website at www.oregonmetro.gov/southcorridor

Metro, the regional government that serves 1.4 million people who live in the 25 cities and three counties of the Portland metropolitan area, provides planning and other services that protect the nature and livability of our region. More information about Metro can be found online at www.oregonmetro.gov.

- more -

**Background:**

- The **SDEIS is required** under the National Environmental Policy Act because the transit project proposes to use FTA funding for a portion of construction costs.

- The **SDEIS updates** the 1998 South/North Corridor Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and the 2002 South Corridor SDEIS. In 2003, local jurisdictions and the Metro Council approved a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for a light rail alignment that crossed the Willamette River from downtown Portland and extended south through SE Portland with a southern terminus in Milwaukie.
• The current SDEIS takes into account the future growth in jobs and household forecast to occur along the corridor by the year 2030. The document describes the alternatives, and explains the short and long term benefits and impacts that would occur under the No Build or Light Rail Transit alternatives being considered. It also identifies possible mitigation actions to address potential adverse impacts.

• Light rail project choices include new bridge alignments between the Central Eastside and South Waterfront, the route through the North Industrial Area in Milwaukie, and the terminus of the line either at Lake Road in Milwaukie or Park Avenue in Oak Grove.

Next steps:

• Based upon the SDEIS and public comment, the Steering Committee will recommend a new Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) to include a recommendation on the alignment, station locations, terminus, and the location of the river crossing for the light rail line.

• The Project Steering Committee is comprised of elected officials from Metro, the cities of Milwaukie, Oregon City and Portland, Clackamas and Multnomah counties, executives from TriMet and the Oregon Department of Transportation and the chair of the Citizen Advisory Committee chair.

• The LPA recommendation will then go to each local jurisdiction for consideration and feedback.

• The Steering Committee will then forward a final recommendation to the Metro Council for a vote in mid-summer.

Draft section 4(f) evaluation:

• This section is a federally required analysis, and includes a preliminary de minimis determination. De minimis impacts on publicly owned parks, recreation areas and wildlife and waterfowl refuges are defined as those that do not "adversely affect the activities, features and attributes" of the Section 4(f) resource.

• The evaluation found four uses of park resources along the alignment. Initial studies found that impacts from the line may be minor enough that they would not, with mitigation, adversely affect the activities, features and attributes of the parks. If the U.S. Department of Transportation concurs with this finding, it can approve the use of parkland as proposed.
Make your voice heard!
Comment on a light rail project that could connect Oak Grove, Milwaukie, Southeast and downtown Portland.

Public comment period
May 9 to noon June 23, 2008

Attend project open houses
6 to 8 p.m. Wednesday, May 21
Cleveland High School cafeteria,
3400 SE 26th Ave., Portland

6 to 8 p.m. Thursday, May 22
Marriott Residence Inn Broadway room,
2115 SW River Parkway, Portland

6 to 8 p.m. Tuesday, May 27
Putnam High School cafeteria,
4950 SE Roethle Rd., Oak Grove

6 to 8 p.m. Wednesday, May 28
Milwaukie High School commons,
11300 SE 23rd Ave., Milwaukie

Testify at a public hearing
5:30 to 8:30 p.m. Monday, June 9
Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland

Send comments via e-mail to trans@oregonmetro.gov

Send written comments to
Portland Milwaukie Light Rail Project,
600 NE Grand Ave., Portland, OR 97232

Record a comment on Metro's transportation hotline at 503-797-1900, option 6

For more information, visit www.oregonmetro.gov/southcorridor or call 503-797-1756.

Portland–Milwaukie
LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

Metro

Review and comment on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation with Preliminary Findings of De Minimis Impacts to Public Parks.
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<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigdon, Ralph</td>
<td>27, 26, 75, 90, 409, 414</td>
<td>Voeller, Paul and Sharon</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, Joseph E., Jr.</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>Vogel, Julie</td>
<td>86, 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Ann and John</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>Wacek, Hal</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, Richard N.</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>Walsh, Dee</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouyer, Alice</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Walsh, Thomas J.</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruda, Sam</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>Waner, Cameron</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell, Pat</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>Warner, Chris</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutledge, Catherine</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>Wasko, Beth</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samojlovski, Goran</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>Watkins, John</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savas, Paul</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>Watson, Dorothy</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawtelle, Mark and Elizabeth</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>Weintraub, Haralee</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawyer, Fred</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>Weislogel, David J.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schacht, Colleen</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Werts, Maggie</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt, Henry</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>White, John</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Willamette Pedestrian Coalition Board 430  Wright, Julie 5
Williams, Mark 27  Wyss, Loren L. 308
Wingren, Karl 300  Yates, Daniel 25, 34, 436, 440
Winkel, Jan 301  Zalkow, Dan 309
Wisner, Julie 302, 303  Zeiler, Susan 310
Wisner, Patty 304  Zipagang, Joseph 311
Woods, Dawn 433