



Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with A

Ordered by first name

Contents

2019 0331 Aaron	7
2019 0329 Aaron Abrams	7
2019 0314 Aaron Andrade	8
2019 0327 Aaron B. Strong	8
2019 0401 Aaron Bini	8
2019 0304 Aaron Brown	8
2019 0307 Aaron Brown	10
2019 0312 Aaron Brown	10
2019 0318 Aaron Brown	10
2019 0402 Aaron Brown	13
2019 0326 Aaron Choate	13
2019 0401 Aaron Golub	14
2019 0401 Aaron Kirk Douglas	15
2019 0401 Aaron Kuehn	15
2019 0401 Abby Peterson	16
2019 0319 Abigail Hazlett	16
2019 0312 Abraham Sutfin	16
2019 0328 Adam Brunelle	17
2019 0326 Adam C. Foltzer	17
2019 0226 Adam Kimbrough	18
2019 0313 Adam Kimbrough	18
2019 0313 Adam Kimbrough 2	18
2019 0329 Adam Kimbrough	18
2019 0327 Adam Manwaring	18
2019 0320 Adam Pitts	19



2019 0402 Adam Robins	19
2019 0327 Adam Smedberg	19
2019 0327 Adam Weis.....	19
2019 0325 Adin Eichler.....	20
2019 0327 Adrian Purkey	20
2019 0326 Adriana.....	20
2019 0319 Adrien Lee.....	20
2019 0329 Adrienne Dickinson	21
2019 0326 Adrienne Leverette.....	21
2019 0330 AJ Ore.....	22
2019 0329 Alan J Winter.....	29
2019 0401 Alan Kessler.....	29
2019 0226 Alan Winter	31
2019 0402 Alastair Drong	31
2019 0329 Aleeza Jill Nussbaum.....	31
2019 0000 Alejandra Prado	32
2019 0325 Alejandro Chavez.....	32
2019 0000 Alex and Christian Grand	32
2019 0402 Alex Dikeman	33
2019 0301 Alex Gamboa Grand	33
2019 0327 Alex Johnson	33
2019 0326 Alex Michel.....	33
2019 0331 Alex Morken	33
2019 0228 Alex Page.....	34
2019 0312 Alex Woolery.....	34
2019 0330 Alexander Emery	34
2019 0401 Alexander Grasley	35
2019 0402 Alexander Leeding	35
2019 0402 Alexandra Zimmermann.....	37
2019 0311 Alexis Johnson.....	38



2019 0326 Alexis Peterka	38
2019 0328 Ali Jones	38
2019 0330 Alice Corbin.....	39
2019 0219 Alice Shapiro.....	39
2019 0226 Alice Shapiro.....	39
2019 0312 Alicia Cohen.....	40
2019 0221 Alicia Johnson.....	40
2019 0323 Alisa	40
2019 0329 Alison Dennis	41
2019 0326 Alison Kastner.....	41
2019 0401 Alison Lucas.....	42
2019 0402 Alison Rhea.....	42
2019 0402 Allan Rudwick et al.....	43
2019 0221 Allan Rudwick	44
2019 0325 Allan Rudwick	45
2019 0401 Alan Rudwick	51
2019 0312 Allen Rudwick	51
2019 0329 Allen Vogt.....	52
2019 0401 Allison Cloo	52
2019 0327 Allison Sliter	52
2019 0307 Allyse Heartwell	54
2019 0327 Alon Raab	54
2019 0312 Althea and Timur Ender	54
2019 0331 Amanda Caffall	56
2019 0000 Amanda Kimball.....	56
2019 0401 Amanda Gilmore	56
2019 0402 Amanda Plyley	57
2019 0327 Amanda Poole	57
2019 0226 Amanda Rhoades	57
2019 0308 Amanda Wickham.....	57



2019 0402 Amanda Zuniga.....	58
2019 0225 Amber Canavan	58
2019 0402 Amelia Good	59
2019 0327 Amie Riley and Joe Buck	59
2019 0402 Amy	60
2019 0313 Amy Borden	60
2019 0329 Amy Borden	60
2019 0401 Amy Hall.....	60
2019 0226 Amy Hansen	61
2019 0330 Amy Hansen	61
2019 0309 Amy Iannone.....	61
2019 0331 Amy Murray.....	62
2019 0226 Amy Pate	62
2019 0227 Amy Robbins.....	62
2019 0326 Amy Subach.....	62
2019 0402 Ana Berry	63
2019 0315 Ana Tighe.....	63
2019 0303 Ana Wyssmann.....	63
2019 0308 Anandi van Diepen-Hedayat	63
2019 0401 Andrea Hamberg.....	64
2019 0402 Andrea Pisani.....	65
2019 0318 Andreas.....	66
2019 0304 Andrejs Galenieks.....	66
2019 0318 Andrew Clyde.....	66
2019 0401 Andrew Crampton	66
2019 0305 Andrew Fleming	67
2019 0000 Andrew Holtz.....	67
2019 0401 Andrew Kaiser.....	67
2019 0325 Andrew M.....	67
2019 0329 Andrew Martin.....	67

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with A



2019 0326 Andrew McCollough.....	68
2019 0402 Andrew Neerman.....	68
2019 0326 Andrew P Leyva.....	69
2019 0322 Andrew Pomeroy.....	69
2019 0401 Andrew Schwartz.....	69
2019 0401 Andrew Singelakis.....	70
2019 0327 Andrew Winterman.....	70
2019 0327 Andrey Bratchikov.....	70
2019 0225 Andy McMillan.....	70
2019 0401 Andy Palmquist.....	71
2019 0331 Angela Dicianno.....	71
2019 0226 Angela Zehava.....	72
2019 0331 Anika Ghirnikar.....	72
2019 0226 Anissa Pemberton.....	72
2019 0402 Anita Bigelow.....	73
2019 0326 Anita Lindsay.....	74
2019 0218 Ann Triebwasser.....	74
2019 0317 Anna.....	74
2019 0401 Anna Belais.....	75
2019 0319 Anna Bell-Hibbs.....	75
2019 0226 Anna Cowen.....	75
2019 0329 Anna Cowen.....	75
2019 0313 Anna Fritz.....	75
2019 0331 Anna Kelly.....	76
2019 0311 Anna Longfield.....	76
2019 0225 Anne Bryant.....	76
2019 0331 Anne Elizabeth Hawley.....	77
2019 0307 Anonymous.....	77
2019 0307 Anonymous 2.....	77
2019 0307 Anonymous 3.....	77

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with A



2019 0307 Anonymous 4	78
2019 0329 Anonymous	78
2019 0327 Antonella Mancini.....	79
2019 0327 Antonella Pagani.....	79
2019 0000 April Robbins.....	79
2019 0315 April Streeter	80
2019 0324 Aquiles Montas	80
2019 0215 Art Lewellan	80
2019 0312 Art Lewellan	80
2019 0000 Art Lewellan	81
2019 0227 Art Lewellen	81
2019 0226 Arwen Myers	82
2019 0329 Ashley Haight.....	82
2019 0401 Ashley Henry.....	82
2019 0401 Aubrey Jessen	83
2019 0329 Audrey.....	83
2019 0401 Audrey Groce.....	84
2019 0331 August Kroll.....	84
2019 0325 Austin Magleby	84
2019 0401 Aven Handley-Merk	84
2019 0425 Avian Ciganko-Ford	84
2019 0325 Avril Carrillo.....	85



2019 0331 Aaron

Comment: I am a Portlander commenting on the proposed I-5 Rose Quarter expansion. While state government seems to consider this a priority, the people of the actual surrounding area have many other things they would rather see the money go towards - from our public schools system to affordable housing or even our parks system. Even within the confines solely of transportation, we and the greater area (including a significant portion of the rest of Oregon) would benefit more in all realms (air quality and emissions, decreased congestion, etc.) from measures that have larger and more sustained impact, such as public transportation. (Even improvements to bicycle and walking infrastructure or even electric car charging infrastructure would be more effective uses of this money.) Independent of whether this project goes through or not, it clearly needs a new environmental impact study. Several flaws in the study that has already performed make its usefulness highly suspect, including one huge flaw (the assumption of a nonexistent new 1-5 bridge over the Columbia). (Though, if we can get Washington and the feds to agree to help pay to send the Max across the Columbia, then that's worth pursuing.) The immediate neighborhoods, the people of the state of Oregon, and US taxpayers (many folks in this area have seen their taxes rise due to new federal legislation, while less and less goes to anything that meaningfully affects us) deserve this at the least. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Aaron Abrams

Comment: I'm writing to express my deep opposition to the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project. The idea that we would spend at least half a billion dollars on a project that will increase carbon intensive infrastructure in the midst of a climate crisis is immoral and unconscionable. In addition, it is clear that this project will not actually relieve congestion due to induced demand. When you factor in the health and safety impacts to Tubman middle school, the clearly substandard pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure that has been proposed, and the inadequate access to background data, it all adds up to a terrible project for our region.

Particularly galling is the fact that a solution is already available to ODOT. Congestion pricing would reduce congestion, reduce driving, and eliminate the need for this project all together.

I encourage ODOT to rethink this project all together. At the very least, ODOT should commit to a full EIS process. It's impacts to public health and safety will be large and widespread. You owe it to the public to look harder at how this project will affect communities in the area, especially since these communities were already devastated by freeway building in the past.

This project has far too many questions to move forward without more study. I will actively support candidates that oppose this project, and will not vote for, donate to, or volunteer for any candidate that supports this project.

You have an ethical and moral obligation as public servants to think harder about this project. I encourage you to live up to these obligations, and to your obligation to future generations.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0314 Aaron Andrade

Comment: I'm deeply concerned about climate change. I know that adding freeway space to encourage more vehicles is going in the wrong direction. We need a radical rethinking of our lifestyle and energy use priorities. Please recognize that freeway expansion has never decreased congestion, care about the air that our children (such as those at Harriet Tubman Middle School) will breathe, and think long term, channeling the massive expense into initiatives that encourage sustainable behaviors.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Aaron B. Strong

Comment: I am in support of the upgrade for the I5 freeway initiative. I have lived in the Lloyd Center area since 1977 and traffic has presented terrible traffic concerns.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Aaron Bini

Comment: The proposed Rose Quarter I-5 expansion is just plainly and simply an awful idea. Induced demand: you've likely heard it hundreds of times in other comments being submitted. That's because it's very real, and exactly why this is such a stupid idea. This will do nothing to solve congestion problems in Portland. I do support tolling. Start there and use money received to improve public mass transit options. We do the planet no favors by trying to get more people into cars on our roads. Oh also, it's absolutely unacceptable that ODOT assumes the existence of the Columbia River Crossing in it's travel time projections for this highway expansion proposal. That bridge never got built! You're lying to the people of Portland, and I call bull!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0304 Aaron Brown

No More Freeways

Comment: Request for Additional Data, Figures, Appendices not Included in ODOT's Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion Environmental Assessment Document.

Good morning. Please find our letter attached - The No More Freeway Expansions Coalition requests additional data, figures, and appendices not included in ODOT's Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion Environmental Assessment document released on February 15th. We look forward to your correspondence.

The No More Freeway Expansions Coalition wishes to thank the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) for their willingness to extend the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion Environmental Assessment public comment period an additional two weeks. As our coalition reviews the documents included in ODOT's Environmental Assessment, it appears that certain key significant data are not included in the report. ODOT released the "Traffic Operations



Analysis Summary: 1-5 Broadway Weidler Interchange Improvements" (TOAS) document received by HOR as "Appendix A <<Footnote 1>> ." The document, however is listed as a "Draft," with a publication date of January 21, 2015. The document appears to be missing four Figures (Figures 11, 12, 13 and 14) as well as Appendices B, C, D, E, F, and G. Community members working with our coalition called the ODOT Senior Environmental Project Manager at the phone number listed in this document on February 24th to learn more about this incomplete report, but as of March 4th we have not yet received any clarifications or answers to our questions about this incomplete document.

The No More Freeways Coalition explicitly requests a confirmation from ODOT that this 2015 version of the TOAS document is the most recent version of this study, and additional clarity regarding whether the Build vs No Build assessments are based on traffic projections for the year 2035 or 2045. The 2015 TAOS report includes traffic projections to 2035, whereas the rest of the EA documents appear to be measuring the project against 2045 traffic patterns. These discrepancies make it difficult for our organization to independently verify and assess ODOT's claims about the proposed freeway expansion would impact traffic (and therefore air pollution and carbon emissions) on the corridor.

Additionally, the No More Freeway Coalition requests that ODOT please provide us the following data sets and appendices that are currently missing from the documents provided by the Environmental Assessment released on February 15:

- Synchro Output worksheets for all local intersections, for both existing and future conditions
- VISSIM calibration details and outputs for the highway modeling
- NCHRP 255/765 worksheets used to derive future volumes
- Any available updated version of the Traffic Operations Analysis Summary consultant report, complete with missing figures and appendices.

Access to these data sets and appendices is imperative for our concerned community members to accurately understand ODOT's calculations and assertions. This information will allow community members to independently verify ODOT's claims about the impacts this proposed freeway expansion will have on our planet's carbon emissions, our children's lungs, our region's traffic congestion, and our local neighborhood's traffic patterns.

Please send these documents to our nomorefreewayspx@gmail.com email address at your earliest convenience.

Thank you very much for your ongoing cooperation and assistance throughout this public comment period.

FOOTNOTES:

1 This document can be found online on ODOT's 1-5 Rose Quarter website:
[https://i5rosequarter.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/I5RQ Traffic-Technical-Report 010819 Appendix- A.pdf](https://i5rosequarter.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/I5RQ_Traffic-Technical-Report_010819_Appendix-A.pdf)



Attachments: [2019 0304 Aaron Brown ATT](#)

2019 0307 Aaron Brown

Comment: I oppose this project, and request ODOT release their data on traffic projections No More Freeways requested.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Aaron Brown

Comment: Good evening. My name is Aaron Brown. I live in the St. Johns neighborhood of north Portland. Back in May of 1980, I was born. I was born in Titusville, Florida. My dad worked at NASA, which was really cool. Speaking of NASA, one month after I was born, James Hansen testified at congress, federal congress, when air quality was 350parts per million of carbon. So we've known about this for 30 years. And the entire 30 years of my life we have emitted half of all the carbon that exists in the atmosphere in those last 30 years. In those last 30 years, I've had nothing but gas lighting. Every single time, I've been aware of climate change my entire life and there's been this constant belief that someone will get around to it eventually. Well, we lost a certain election or an election didn't go that way, or well, next legislative session. We're out of time. I understand that there are political realities. There are physics realities. There's only so much carbon that we can put in the atmosphere. 40 percent of Oregon's carbon emissions come from transportation. This is climate denialism. All of this -- and frankly, I would accuse ODOT of gaslighting, but you're not even making the data available for us to review it. Your entire claims that this will reduce global warming, emissions, air quality, pollution and traffic congestion are based on a dataset that you didn't even provide in the environmental assessment. We've only got 20 days left of your 45 day public comment period, which you only extended to us because Commissioner Eudaly gave us a lending hand. This meeting is only here because they had to shame you into looking me in the eye and telling me that you're okay with future generations, the children in this room, the children that many folks here have wondering what side their parents were on in terms of standing up for a planet that maybe will be able to feed future generations. As to whether coastal cities like the one I was born in will be under water by the time I am a couple years older. My parents are here today to support me. I hope each of you are here to support your future generations. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0318 Aaron Brown

No More Freeways

Comment: Request for Full 45 Day Public Comment Period for ODOT's Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion EA.

The No More Freeway Expansions Coalition is writing to ask the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) to honor their stated promise to hold a forty-five day public comment



period for the community to respond to the agency's Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion Environmental Assessment document. Please find our full letter attached. We look forward to hearing from ODOT regarding our request for that the agency fulfill its original promise of adequate provision of time for public comment on this \$500 million freeway expansion.

The No More Freeway Expansions Coalition is writing to ask the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) to honor their stated promise to hold a forty-five day public comment period for the community to respond to the Environmental Assessment. Many crucial documents, data sets, figures, and appendices necessary for our community group to independently verify ODOT's claims about this project were lacking from the original, incomplete version of the Environmental Assessment document originally released by ODOT on February 15.

ODOT only made these data available on March 13 - they were posted on the Rose Quarter project website a full nine days after our community group formally requested the information, which by all accounts should have been included in the original EA document. <<Footnote 1>> The data provided (Synchro output worksheets, Alternative for the AM/PM peak periods, VISSIM model outputs and calibration report, Volume Forecasts for the 1-5 mainline, Build Alternative for the AM and PM peak periods, and the full Traffic Operations Analysis Summary and full collection of Appendices) represents over 632 pages of technical, quantitative measurements about bike, transit and automobile traffic flow on the freeway itself and the surrounding neighborhood streets.

It is difficult to overstate the centrality of these up-until-recently-missing data sets to ODOT's claims about the purported impacts this project will have on the neighboring community.

Without these data, it is simply impossible to independently assess ODOT's claims about how this freeway expansion will impact the local community. ODOT's assertion that the proposed Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion will somehow improve traffic congestion, ambient air pollution or carbon emissions is a bold one - it flies in the face of decades of empirical research about urban freeway expansion projects across the country. Our community leaders believe we deserve more than nineteen days (and only thirteen business days!) to look over the six hundred and thirty two pages of data that are the heart of whether this half-billion dollar freeway expansion proposal will impact our state's carbon emissions, regional traffic congestion or local rates of asthma and diabetes.

Our community group asserts that adequate provision of forty five days to review these data sets would require ODOT to receive public comment on the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion Project up until Saturday, April 27, 2019. We stress that we are not asking for an extension of the public comment period, but merely requesting that the agency acts in good faith and provides the forty-five days to respond to a complete Environmental Assessment document that we were originally promised by the agency. In a letter dated January 11, ODOT denied our request for an extension of the public comment period, but noted "...once the comment period begins, we will consider if an extension is necessary based on feedback received after publication of the document."<<Footnote 2>>



Given the inadequately short amount of time between today and ODOT's original April 1st deadline for Public Comment, the overwhelming centrality of the only-recently-provided 632 pages of data to ODOT's assertions of the public impact of this proposed freeway expansion, and the overwhelming sentiments of concern about this freeway widening proposal expressed by the public at the March 12th public hearing, <<Footnote 3>> we are asking ODOT to ensure our community has a full forty-five days to review the full Environmental Assessment document with relevant and necessary data included. We welcome and encourage local elected officials to join us in asking ODOT to fulfill their promise of government transparency and meaningful opportunity for public comment in regards to a proposed \$500 million freeway expansion in the backyard of Harriet Tubman Middle School.

FOOTNOTES:

1 A copy of our letter to ODOT requesting this data is available here:

<https://nomorefreewayspx.fires.wordpress.com/2019/03/030419-nmf-request-for-additional-ea-data.pdf>

2 We also wish to emphasize that our coalition had flagged the limitations of a truncated public comment period in a letter we sent to ODOT on November 28, 2018. Our letter, cosigned by 32 elected officials, small business owners, and leaders of local nonprofit advocacy organizations, specifically asked for a sixty-day extension of the public comment period. It stated that "As community advocates, local business owners and elected officials concerned about the impacts this project may have on the North Portland community and the region as a whole, we are concerned that the 30-day public comment period will not give community advocates enough time to meaningfully review and provide feedback on ODOT's findings. By initiating a thirty-day public comment period in late January, the ability of community members and stakeholders to weigh in on the proposal is severely dampened."

Our original request for an extension can be found on the No More Freeways website:

https://gallery.mailchimp.com/33eee76771d2f4f3df7221428/fires/7a9d2360-272d-4ddb-b311-c4b1081d784b/11281860Day_Extension_Request_Letter.pdf

ODOT didn't respond to our request for over forty-four days, and denied our request by responding at 4:35pm on Friday, January 11. A copy of ODOT's letter, in which the consideration of a potential extension due to community feedback after publication is mentioned, is available here: https://nomorefreewayspx.fires.wordpress.com/2019/03/i-Srosequarter_responseletter_011119-1.pdf

3 "Opponents Dominate Hearing On Portland Rose Quarter 1-5 Expansion Project" Oregon Public Broadcasting, March 12 2019. <https://www.opb.org/news/article/portland-oregon-interstate-5-rose-quarter-expansion-hearing/>

"Rose Quarter freeway critics dominate meeting, then Chloe Eudaly throws curveball." The Oregonian. March 13, 2019. <https://www.oregonlive.com/commuting/2019/03/rose-quarter-freeway-critics-dominate-meeting-then-chloe-eudaly-throws-curveball.htm>



A full round-up of news coverage of the public hearing on Tuesday March 12 is available here: <https://nomorefreewayspx.com/2019/03/15/overwhelming-turnout-for-the-good-guys-at-odot-hearing/>

Attachments: [2019 0318 Aaron Brown ATT](#)

2019 0402 Aaron Brown

Comment: For the past nineteen months (and especially for the past month and a half), I've spent an enormous amount of my own personal and professional time writing angry letters to ODOT. Letters to ODOT sound like the name of some urban planners' regrettable punk rock band they played bass in back in college, but it adequately assesses the general state of how I've spent much of 2019. I, along with literally hundreds of other community members, have been attending dozens of community meetings and watching ODOT speak demonstrable untruths with barely-concealed slight-of-hands, and spent many a rainy weekend pouring through egregiously depressing data about climate change, air pollution, traffic congestion, and traffic fatalities to make our case that this project is a damning piece of evidence of the urgency with which metropolitan America needs to retire the freeway industrial complex.

But instead, with my last five minutes before the public comment period closes, I want to write a quick love letter. A love letter to the dozens of parents I met at Tubman Middle School, figuring out how to build a PTSA that will stick up for their entire community and learn how to work together despite having individuals from enormously different backgrounds. A love letter to the individuals who have taken their personal trauma stemming from losing a loved one to senseless traffic violence and weaponized these unspeakable losses into voices that clamor for government agencies to be more vigilant in their investments to prevent future tragedies. A love letter to the youth who are increasingly organizing to take over the world and prevent the older generation from dooming us to climate apocalypse. A love letter to the hundreds of community members who have shown up to dig through ODOT's public records and, frankly, out-hustle your staff to point out the obvious clerical errors that you hoped to hide from public scrutiny. A love letter to the good community members and citizens who have stood up for freeway revolts in the past, present, and future of my hometown. A love letter to all who are working to understand the intersections of transportation, climate, social justice, white supremacy, the patriarchy, and are working to untangle all of these for a more verdant and sustainable future.

Thank you, ODOT, for giving me an excuse to wallow in the trenches for the past few months. Please kill this damn project.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Aaron Choate

Comment: I previously engaged in the online open house and submitted comments regarding the proposed I-5 changes in the Rose Quarter. After viewing the website I stated that I did not support any changes at freeway level and only supported changes on the ped/bike level above the freeway at street level. Having read more about the project, I now support no changes



whatsoever as the total impact on pedestrian, bike, and public transit throughput will be negligible, instead causing delays and creating inaccessible grades. This proposal masquerades as a green project, instead prioritizing vehicle traffic, increasing emissions, and encroaching on Harriet Tubman Middle School and the Albina N/NE Portland neighborhoods, a site of historical displacement and ongoing climate injustice. The changes ODOT is proposing would only perpetuate these issues while offering no solutions. I therefore in good conscience cannot support any the changes proposed and encourage you to consider abandoning the project.

If the goals of ODOT are to increase efficiency and reduce congestion, please instead implement tolling or time-of-use pricing, with these funds dedicated to supporting sustainable transportation--walking, biking, and public transportation.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Aaron Golub

Comment: My comment and questions pertaining to the issue of future demand and VMT in the project area. The detailed operation modeling presented in “Traffic Operations Analysis Summary DRAFT” show an overall increase in traffic speeds in the build scenario (e.g. Page 13). A similar analysis, but perhaps based on a different methodology, was performed to evaluate the ability of value pricing on the same facility. Those results can be found in the “Portland Metro Area Value Pricing Feasibility Analysis - Round 1 Concept Evaluation and Recommendations Technical Memorandum #3 https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Value%20Pricing%20PAC/VP_TM3-Final-InitialConceptEvaluation.pdf “ Analysis included the proposed I-5 Rose Quarter improvement project, among many others (excerpt from page 11 of that report below). That analysis found that future year performance was significantly degraded by 2027 (excerpt from page 15 of that report below). I did not have a chance to examine the exact assumption behind future demand for the facility but it is strange that the results of the analyses focusing on the same facility point to such different results. The effects of your projections of increased travel speeds is a reduction in congestion and therefore greenhouse gas emissions and energy use. The modeling for the value pricing analysis would have shown the opposite – the facility had become overloaded with future travelers and emission will likely go up. Please address this explicit discrepancy in your responses to public comment. Even beside the discrepancy between these two analyses, it strikes me as very unlikely that future speed in the Rose Quarter project area will remain as high as you predict. Future residents will see the improved performance and switch to using the facility, perhaps from other modes or other roadways – thereby filling the facility back to congested operation. This phenomenon of induced demand is well proven in numerous academic studies. Please address the issue of induced demand in your response to public comment. Thank you, Aaron Golub Page 11: “Concept 1 – Baseline, were evaluated for the year 2027. The baseline conditions reflect projects in the adopted Regional Transportation Plan, including roadway, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects, that are identified for construction by 2027. The year 2027 was selected due to the availability of modeling data, including anticipated population and employment growth with corresponding land use and travel



demand, for that time horizon from Metro planners and modelers. This list also includes three high-priority projects that the Oregon Legislature identified in House Bill 2017 for project development and construction: OR 217 northbound and southbound widening, Interstate 205 Stafford Road to OR 213 widening and the Interstate 5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project. In total, the project list includes over 700 regional multimodal transportation investments that were submitted by transportation agencies in the region and have been approved by Metro Council.” Page 15: “Analysis: Under Concept 1 – Baseline, significant congestion will exist in 2027 on the I-5 and I-205 study corridors, even with all the improvements listed in the Regional Transportation Plan. This congestion impacts not only speed, but also the number of vehicles that the facility can accommodate (throughput), with consequential impacts upon quality of life, economic vitality, and vehicle emissions in the region. Traffic Operations § Hyper-congestion in the Concept 1 – Baseline is currently occurring on widespread areas of I-5, and on a significant number of areas on I-205 in the morning peak, the afternoon peak, or both depending on the location. This means that, especially on I-5, many highway segments on the study corridors do not operate near their optimum throughput today or in forecast year 2027. It is likely that this will continue and worsen into the future. § At optimum throughput, just prior to congested conditions setting in, a freeway carries about 1,900 to 2,200 vehicles per hour per lane. For example, existing traffic data reveals that on I-5 between Portland and the Columbia River, the average vehicle throughput per lane during peak periods is about 960 vehicles per lane per hour – approximately 50 percent of what would be expected if the freeway were functioning efficiently. § Hyper-congestion also impacts speeds, which are averaging approximately 60 mph during off peak periods and drops to approximately 10 mph during peak periods. § In the PM peak about 21% of trips on I-5 and 25% of trips on I-205 are 3 miles or less in length. Short trips on I-5 and I-205 in the study corridors that have viable alternative travel routes contribute to congestion experienced within the study corridors.”

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Aaron Kirk Douglas

Comment: Lets spend the half billion on better transit, implementation of HOV lanes, and implementation of tolls to reduce those bottlenecks. I think the data provided by other investigations and experts has demonstrated sufficiently that widening the roadway will not reduce crashes or accidents, will result in more cars on the road overall, and will not improve air quality or reduce greenhouse gas emissions. There are many other options for this type of expenditure (like say the I-5 Bridge over the Columbia?)

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Aaron Kuehn

Comment: I moved with my family to Portland to benefit from a city and a state committed to innovation and a healthy sustainable future. I was enthusiastic about the positive leadership of projects like the Tilikum crossing, a car-free multi-modal bridge. That bridge has rightly become a vibrant centerpiece of this city. People live in cities to be around other people, not to be



around cars and trucks. Cars and trucks and their grossly outsize infrastructure incorrectly dominate the space, the sound scape, the time, the air, the climate, and the finances of city, robbing us of our communities, our time and places together. We should be removing automobile infrastructure from this city, correcting the mistake, healing the city, and reclaiming the space for people. For ODOT to force this out-dated injustice upon us is inherently wrong, and makes me question my decision to reside in this state.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Abby Peterson

Comment: Expanding our freeway will only negatively impact our climate and our students at Harriet Tubman. They are already severely impacted and should not continue to be disappointed in adults that have not served them well.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0319 Abigail Hazlett

Comment: I'm writing to state my objection to the proposed Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project. There is absolutely no evidence that widening the freeway will solve traffic congestion. ODOT's own hired consultants admit that this project won't address recurring traffic congestion on this corridor. I would urge ODOT to consider investing funds in other roadway improvements (for example improving 82nd) or delaying the project until a more prudent plan can be developed. I am a resident of North Portland and am just as impacted by traffic congestion as others, but I want to see a solution that moves toward reducing reliance on single occupancy vehicles and improves our community rather than a band-aid solution that won't make a meaningful difference in congestion, disrupts the community, threatens vulnerable populations like the students at Tubman Elementary, and does nothing to mitigate the environmental impact of car travel. I believe ODOT wants to do good work and this project is not good work. I don't support the project as proposed and I urge ODOT not to proceed.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Abraham Sutfin

Comment: 1) On page 26 of the EA, ODOT states, the Build Alternative would not create new capacity or add substantial capacity to the existing highway. Can someone please tell the public why this is a selling point by ODOT but it's clearly contradicted in the EA? 2) Noise is a form of pollution that doesn't seem to have anyone's attention. As someone who lives within blocks of the freeway I can attest to how loud the freeway is. This is something that will not go away regardless of the way the cars are powered. 3) Having a park or community space on top of a freeway (lid) is a backhanded way for people to experience green space and a sleazy way to tie the old neighborhood to the new.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0328 Adam Brunelle

Comment: PLEASE do not allow this tragic misuse of taxpayer funds to occur. We have so many priorities worthy of \$500 million in investments, and many of them would do incredible things for working people. Freeway expansion will only worsen air quality, further invest in fossil fuel infrastructure (highways), and *it will not reduce traffic.* This project has been hastily approved with little foresight and understanding of community needs. Throwing money at lane widening in response to our increasing traffic problem is the kind of reactionary thinking that needs to go extinct. We need many of the investments in bike and pedestrian infrastructure that were promised with this package, and we need *all* of the money allocated for this project to go to improving pedestrian and bike safety in our city. Far too many people are dying on our streets simply crossing the road, like happened in my neighborhood at 92nd & Holgate by one of our city's biggest, most popular parks. The fact that ODOT used Columbia River crossing assumptions is incredibly problematic and frustrating, and it seems little has been learned since that last failed attempt. The community won't accept this project. We won't accept that you didn't do an Environmental Impact Statement, which is an absolutely necessary action for a half \$\$\$\$\$ billion project (\$500,000,000) that will have significant negative impacts on school-aged kids. Imagine the positive impact we could have on these kids if we made their streets and transit safer and more effective!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Adam C. Foltzer

Comment: I simply cannot believe we're contemplating a freeway expansion at a time when:

- Our climate is getting worse every year, with midwest flooding being only the latest symptom of our overreliance on carbon emissions
- We see that environmental injustice falls overwhelmingly on our neighbors who are already marginalized, from Flint's water to the students at Harriet Tubman having to cancel recess
- We have seen in study after study that induced demand means that congestion will return just as soon as we expand the freeway
- Our TriMet and C-Tran systems are in need of investment, and underserve many of our neighborhoods

How can we possibly believe that this is the best way to spend half a billion dollars? It would be better to set the money on fire than to spend it on this project, but the amount of good it could do if put into transit, pedestrian safety, and cycling infrastructure would be historic.

Please do the right thing and cancel this freeway expansion.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0226 Adam Kimbrough

Comment: I support any initiative to expand existing or for construction of new highway or interstate routes through and around Portland. Our city and population has grown far beyond what the current infrastructure is capable of handling, and will only continue to grow. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0313 Adam Kimbrough

Comment: Please expand Portland's highways!!!! No more bike lines with out more roads.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0313 Adam Kimbrough 2

Comment: As a young adult living in the Mississippi neighborhood, and commuter to downtown Portland, I fully support any freeway expansion. We do not need more bike lines, we do not need more light rail, we need more lanes for car traffic and in addition, a larger bypass for north and south bound freight traffic. I support expanding Portland freeways.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Adam Kimbrough

Comment: PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE EXPAND THE HIGHWAY. We desperately need to grow and expand our transportation routes as the city expands, and north and south bound freight via trucks increases.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Adam Manwaring

Comment: One of the reasons I love Portland is that it's one of the most foot and bike friendly cities in the country. For decades Portland has been moving towards a vision that roads are not just for cars, that having people out and about on sidewalks is a good thing, and that having cohesive neighborhoods is important. Highway expansion undoes all of that. The vision for Portland should not be to develop it like small midwestern cities that have lots of highways, bad air, and empty sidewalks. Nobody likes to visit those cities. And their downtowns are basically huge parking lots.

If the goal is to reduce congestion, the plans should be to offer more affordable housing closer to urban centers and make driving less necessary, not more. Make things more affordable and available, invest in people, not traffic; neighborhoods, not highways.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0320 Adam Pitts

Comment: Let's try mass transit instead. I'm thinking about trains for mass transit. More efficient, less energy, less traffic, less pollution. Too many cars and too much pollution as is. Expanding roads will only make more people drive. The cycle will never end until it is too late.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Adam Robins

Comment: As a North Portland resident who drives, cycles, walks, and takes transit to get around the city, please cancel this mid-20th century era thinking and halt all work on expanding the freeway. The proposed \$500 million price tag, which we all know is going to expand from there, is a down-payment on the backwards direction Portland is taking away from sensible transportation alternatives and a step closer to climate collapse.

The bottleneck argument is ridiculous, and that's a never-ending game of whack-a-mole. Spend hundreds of millions of dollars here and find another bottleneck within months and then start the whole process over.

This money would be much better spent on transportation alternatives and a move away from a fossil-fuel dependent car culture. Just think what it could do for eliminating transit fares, or providing enhance bike and pedestrian infrastructure.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Adam Smedberg

Comment: Bad deal. Brings more cars, more pollution, and more problems. Does not improve the lives of Portlanders.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Adam Weis

Comment: ODOT's environmental assessment for the Rose Quarter project considers only two alternatives: either we spend about \$500 million on expanding the capacity of I5 or we do nothing and instead we take that cash, throw some gasoline on it, and burn it.

Well... ODOT isn't literally suggesting we burn money, but by failing to consider what other uses we could put these dollars towards, that is essentially the frame they are setting. Anyone who's ever managed a household budget knows that doesn't reflect reality in a world of limited resources. In the real world there are trade-offs. Anytime we spend money on something there's something else we're giving up. If ODOT wants to justify this project, the critical question they need to answer through an environmental impact report is not whether the proposed improvements will marginally improve sporadic episodes of congestion or reduce fender benders, it's whether - in light of the state's environmental, transportation, land use, and equity goals - widening I5 is the best and highest use of \$500 million. That's a higher bar to clear than



whether or not a project is better than just taking the cash and burning it. To make a case for the rose quarter project ODOT should prepare a report that genuinely considers alternative approaches to the regional problems of congestion and safety. This would presumably include a study of the likely impacts of congestion pricing and transit expansion. It would also consider a scenario in which the Columbia River bridge is not expanded.

I give this environmental assessment an F for failing to address the prompt.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Adin Eichler

Comment: I live very near the Banfield Freeway. It's a noisy eyesore that significantly lowers the neighborhood's quality of life.

We don't need any more freeways. We need more access to more frequent public transportation, not only for our generation but for the very future of the Earth. We cannot continue to make sacrifices to the automobile industry that has wrought so much destruction to our world.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Adrian Purkey

Comment: I am in support of the Broadway Corridor project

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Adriana

Comment: Don do anything else to Portland we dont need it. Focus on get homes for veterans. And homeless. Helping kids with college insteading if expending roads.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0319 Adrien Lee

Comment: Why is this even under consideration when we have evidence that freeway expansion doesn't solve congestion and when the consequences to our kids' ability to breathe clean air is clear? It amazes me every day how much parents will gripe about vaccines and trans people using bathrooms while dooming their children to a climate apocalypse. Shame on them and y'all. NO FREEWAY EXPANSION. As someone who spends 2.5+ hours a day on a bus, and as someone who kinda wants the earth to be habitable when I get to be retirement age, I do. not. want. more. cars. on. the. road. What's the matter with y'all, honestly?

Attachments: N/A



2019 0329 Adrienne Dickinson

Comment: We grew up high school years on in Los Angeles County, went to college there, in the days of smog so bad we could not see foothills, Mt. Baldy et al which arose at basically the end of our street. This was in the late 60s. Lots of environmental laws clamped down on emissions of cars and factories and really helped air quality improve! Science is good! But lots of people kept moving in, KEEP pouring in and three lane freeways with moving traffic have become five and six lane, (thats ten lanes across!) freeways with massive miles of literally stopped cars, parking lots slowly inching into the distance as far as the eye can see. We had left LONG before this time, but we can hardly bear to go back and visit survivors in the family down there in Los Angeles County. The more freeways and wider freeways they build, the more and more and more drivers and people keep coming and driving, with no end, no improvement, less life, less air, less quality of life, less view, less joy, less health, less time for living and family, more crowding, more frustration, more cramping of spirit.

This is not the future we want or you want for Portland,

Building more and wider freeways is not the answer, and don't waste our money.

Listen to all the creative other ideas. There are better ways!

Fossil fuels are over.

Electric buses and trains, more bicycles, better parklike pedestrian paths, more community enterprises spread around so people can get to good places without driving, keep brainstorming!

We can do it! Be more creative. Just say no to the nightmare you will only make worse with more of the same problem!

We love our Earth. Fossil fuel automobiles are death to the planet. Let's face it.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Adrienne Leverette

Comment: I am writing to express my strong opposition to the I5 Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project. I am a Portlander and a mother, and I am stunned that in 2019 we are still considering spending massive amounts of money on the failed paradigm of urban freeways. There is simply no morally acceptable justification for making such an expenditure, given that the guaranteed harm will far outweigh the meager and dubious benefits of the project. Freeways do not accommodate traffic; they create it. ODOT's own hired consultants admit that this project won't address recurring traffic congestion on this corridor.

Aggravating as traffic is, what's really at stake here is the health of people and the environment. We simply cannot keep making choices that prioritize single occupancy vehicles over the well-being of school children and our carbon emission reduction goals. It's backwards, destructive thinking, and we can ill afford it.



I have been dismayed by the strange misinformation and specious arguments being made in favor of this freeway expansion. The idea that this project would somehow reduce emissions is patently absurd. We need to spend our effort and our money on projects that will make a positive difference both for the community and the environment. The I5 Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion does not meet those basic criteria.

If traffic congestion and safety are the actual concerns, we can alleviate those problems much more cheaply: by implementing congestion pricing, and increasing investments in public transportation.

We need a better vision for the Albina neighborhood: one that restores the urban fabric and contains the freeway in every way possible. We need a better vision for regional mobility: one that shows we have hope for our children and hope to avoid climate crisis. We can't keep making the same mistakes. This project is a mistake.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 AJ Ore

Comment: I am writing to express significant reservations regarding the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project Environmental Assessment, to indicate opposition to the project as presented, to suggest mitigation and modified design should the project move forward as presented, and to request that ODOT and FHWA complete a more rigorous Environmental Impact Statement process to evaluate the substantial shortcomings of the project that are not properly captured, evaluated, and mitigated in the Environmental Assessment.

Project Need

ODOT claims this project is needed for safety. However, in the executive summary of the Safety Technical Report, ODOT states that, of the 881 crashes in the project area between 2011 and 2015, the only fatality was due to a combination of a pedestrian illegally on the roadway and alcohol; neither of those factors would have been obviated had this project been in place. Additionally, the safety report indicates that the majority of the crashes were property damage-only, rear-end collisions that generally resulted from drivers following too closely. This project would not resolve those safety issues on the freeway itself.

On top of that, the local street "improvements" described by the project would do little or nothing to improve safety, and will in fact only encourage more reckless driving and speeding as a result of larger turn radii and prioritization of asphalt and driving space over sidewalks, bike lanes, transit priority, and open space.

To better address safety in the Portland region, \$500 million could be MUCH better spent on any number of high-crash, high injury corridors in the Portland metro area, such as Columbia, Lombard, 82nd, or Powell, corridors where there are actually higher documented instance of serious and fatal injuries that could be mitigated and reduced through proper investment.

In terms of operations and reliability in the Rose Quarter, the state already has a project underway that will address this need: tolling. To better address operations and reliability, ODOT



should focus on expediting the implementation of the proposed tolling of I-5. It is concerning that this project does not evaluate the effects of tolling, on either the no-build or build scenarios (or as a separate scenario). Changes in traffic patterns as a result of implementation of tolling should be a part of the traffic analysis on this project.

Regarding Broadway/Weidler interchange operations, ODOT's proposed "improvements" will generally and significantly degrade the existing network for walking, biking, and transit in the Rose Quarter, and decrease safety conditions in the local roadway network.

Turn Radii & Travel Lanes on Wheeler

This project introduces much wider turn radii than currently exists on every corner of the Broadway/Weidler/Victoria/Williams block, as well as on the northwest and southeast corners of Weidler/Williams. Particularly for the turns from Victoria to Broadway, and from Williams to Weidler, there is more than enough existing space for a truck to make a left turn given a standard urban street corner radius. Each of those corners currently has a fairly standard turn radius that still allows for trucks to safely make turns onto the receiving street. While wide turning radii would make it easier for trucks to make turns at these locations, current conditions prove that it is not actually necessary to provide them. Providing these extra wide turn radii significantly degrades the pedestrian environment by lengthening crossings and encouraging higher auto speeds entering the turns. If there is truly a need for improving truck turning at these corners, ODOT should install mountable truck aprons that allow trucks to make improved turns while still directing auto drivers around a tighter curb, thus slowing speeds to a safer level and generally reducing pedestrian crossing distances. Additionally, if drivers are to be given a free-flow turn movement at these intersections, it is VITAL that leading pedestrian intervals are provided to allow pedestrians to safely cross the intersection without intimidation and the increased risk of being struck by careless, speeding, and/or inattentive drivers.

The project also appears to significantly widen the turn radius at the northwest corner of Wheeler and Ramsay, which seems completely unnecessary given that there is already essentially a slip lane (i.e. Center Street) from Vancouver/Wheeler to Winning Way. If such a wide turning radius is necessary here, the Center Street alignment should be removed entirely (leaving only a stub designed as a woonerf for parking garage access). This would also allow the large grassy, tree-covered space to remain as usable open space and even be expanded. If the realigned Center Street is being designed to allow direct access to the Moda Center parking garage, it should have, at most, two lanes, directly aligned with the parking garage entrances. The right-most lane can also serve as a right-turn lane for access to Winning Way, obviating the need to provide right-turn access from SB Wheeler to Winning (or at least allowing the existing turn radius to remain unmodified). Access to Center Street from Vancouver should also be designed to have the streets meet as close as perpendicularly as possible, and have a tight turn radius to minimize the distance that vulnerable road users are exposed to fast-moving turning vehicles.

The drawings also seem to indicate that southbound Wheeler would be widened to two lanes from Winning to Multnomah (currently, Wheeler is one lane leaving Winning, and widens to two lanes about halfway between Winning and Multnomah). The existing configuration of Wheeler



between Winning and Multnomah is sufficient; widening will only encourage higher volumes and speeds approaching the Rose Quarter Transit Center. IF Wheeler were widened, the right-most lane should be designated as a transit-only lane, transitioning to a BAT lane no more than 200 feet from the intersection with Multnomah (approximately where the solid line separating the existing turn lanes is today).

As designed, these project elements substantially degrade conditions for pedestrians in the Rose Quarter in order to speed up cars and trucks, which is counter to a number of PBOT and state-wide safety, mode split, and prioritization goals.

Vancouver sidewalk

ODOT also proposes the complete removal of the west side sidewalk on Vancouver approaching Broadway. The utility of this sidewalk has been continuously reduced for years, and has currently been narrowed to an unusable point, such that the sidewalk has officially been closed. However, particularly given the proposed closure of the Flint bridge, it is vital that this sidewalk remain open and connected to the north side of Broadway. Especially if the Vancouver bridge is being rebuilt anyway, it should be a straightforward design modification to have the travel lanes jog slightly to the east to accommodate this sidewalk. An added benefit will be that a safe refuge can be provided where the sidewalk meets Broadway, allowing a place of rest for those who are unable to cross both Vancouver and the I-5 off-ramp on one signal.

Highway Covers/Lids:

The proposed highway lid between Williams, Vancouver, Hancock, and Broadway is insufficient as currently conceived. This lid should entirely cover the freeway on this block, leaving only the I-5 on-ramp exposed in order to create an actual usable space. The lid covering the on-ramp in this same block should be increased in size as well, as far back toward Broadway as safe height clearances will allow. Additionally, the lid on the north side of Dixon should stretch from Flint all the way to Vancouver, and not just cover the northbound lanes of I-5.

All of the proposed freeway lids should additionally be designed to actually be able to accommodate trees, grass, and other landscaping, including proper irrigation, and not just be built as large concrete expanses that can serve no purpose and would look just like empty parking lots. Even better would be designing the lids to a structural quality that multi-story building could be built atop them.

Clackamas bridge:

I am very concerned about the design of the proposed Clackamas bridge. The graphics that ODOT has shown to date indicate a sweeping but direct connection onto Williams just south of Weidler, which may be adequate (although a southbound bike lane should be provided to connect from the bridge to Wheeler for those heading toward the Rose Quarter Transit Center, Moda Center, or other destinations to the south). My primary concern is that other drawings (particularly looking at Appendix C to the Historic Resources Report) show multiple switchbacks, one with a very tight radius, that present comfort, safety, and visibility concerns, particularly considering conflicts between bike riders heading downhill and gaining speed and people walking or biking uphill around potentially blind corners. The existing switchback near the Steel



Bridge (from the Esplanade to Lloyd Boulevard) is an example of this type of design in practice, which is woefully inadequate for existing volumes at that location and for more than minimal volumes at the proposed Clackamas bridge.

Any bridge design should have direct connections without switchbacks on both sides, even if that means a wider swing to the south to accommodate the grade change. ODOT should additionally consider a stair component on the west side that would allow able-bodied pedestrians more direct access.

Hancock/Dixon bridge:

Similar to the Clackamas bridge, the public-facing Hancock bridge drawings show a smooth and straight connection from the Hancock bridge to Broadway using the Flint alignment. However the drawings in Appendix C to the Historic Resources Report clearly show multiple switchbacks in this same location, which present the same concerns related to comfort, safety, and visibility. Even an elevator would be a superior design to the drawn configuration shown in Appendix C to the Historic Resources Report. If this connection is built with switchbacks, it should include a stair component with bicycle tire runners, so that able-bodied individuals can avoid the switchback.

Between the two proposed bridges, there is not nearly enough detailed information to do a complete analysis (including grade changes and ADA-required slopes) that would allow for an honest assessment of the adequacy of these connections in consideration of the overall project.

Local street improvements:

As presented to the community, the local street improvements concerning bikeways appear generally neutral or favorable. However, I do have a number of concerns.

1. How does ODOT propose to handle the signalization at Williams and Hancock to move bike riders from the right side to the left side?
2. How and where will ODOT/PBOT transition bike riders on Vancouver from the right side of the street to the left side prior to Hancock?
3. Will the bike lanes be built as drawn? I.e. the entire length of Hancock/Dixon, Broadway, and Weidler, curbtight, with some form of proper protection, at least from Ross to 1st? Or will the final bike lanes be narrow, paint-only and/or for shorter lengths (barely better than existing conditions)? The final design of these facilities will significantly affect any analysis of the adequacy of such designs.
4. This project should develop BAT or transit-only lanes for the streetcar on both Broadway and Weidler, and for the bus routes on both Williams and Vancouver from Wheeler to Hancock. Only vehicles that are making left turns or transitioning to left-turn lanes adjacent to the streetcar lane should be driving on the streetcar tracks once this project is complete. These improvements will be necessary to ensure that the project does not degrade transit performance once completed.
5. The project as drawn appears to include a two-way bike lane on Williams between Broadway and Hancock, which would be 10 feet at its narrowest point. Considering that the



Williams corridor is one of the busiest bike routes in the city, a 10 foot wide two-way path is in no way sufficient to safely handle reasonably expected volumes of bike traffic. Instead of widening the on-ramp to I-5 northbound to two lanes, the project should instead retain a single lane on the on-ramp to I-5 northbound, which would allow the northbound Williams vehicle lane to be shifted west far enough to provide a two-foot cycle track of proper width (20 feet).

6. All sidewalks within the construction footprint must be built out to minimum PBOT standards. None of the roadway changes should result in narrower sidewalks than exist today.

Rose Quarter Transit Center + Tree Removal

The addition of new permanent structure at the Rose Quarter Transit Center appears to require the removal of a number of large, mature trees, which will have significant impacts on the built environment, specifically on conditions for those waiting for trains or buses at this location. Mitigation for any tree removals as part of this project should include a commitment to replace every removed tree with at least two new trees as close to the removed trees as feasible.

Eastbank Esplanade

The currently released plans call for an expansion to southbound I-5 at the intersection with I-84, and an expansion of the southbound I-5 to I-84 ramp. It appears this widening would result in new freeway structure covering a portion or the entirety of the Eastbank Esplanade for an indeterminate distance (not clear from the drawings, but demonstrated graphically in a recent BikePortland article), which is a significant change in setting and experience for use of the park.

It also appears from the drawings in the Section 4(f) analysis that there will be a new, permanent overhead structure that partially or fully covers the switchback landing on the path from the Eastbank Esplanade to Lloyd Boulevard. I am concerned with changes to natural light in this location, as transitioning from daylight to under-structure shadow and back again at an already tight switchback location is likely to result in increased risk of collisions between users of the path. A permanent covering of the main Esplanade or of this switchback landing is likely to lead to long-term, persistent unauthorized camping conditions as are currently experienced where Lloyd Boulevard crosses under the existing I-5 structure, which effectively narrow the usable space and degrade safety conditions for all users of the facility.

Any negative impacts to the Esplanade as part of this project (particularly new visual impacts and/or changes in setting from new permanent above-path infrastructure) are unacceptable, and must be avoided entirely or else significantly mitigated. I discuss temporary mitigation below, but in terms of permanent mitigation, if ODOT is going to impact the Esplanade as indicated, ODOT should commit to widening the Esplanade path in the vicinity of impacts to a minimum of 20 feet, and to create a new ramp connection to the switchback connector to Lloyd (connecting to the south end of the switchback) to reduce the conflicts that occur at the bottom of the existing ramp. ODOT should additionally commit that no vertical elements (i.e. concrete columns) will be placed within the path itself.

Additional permanent mitigation should include widening the current pinch point of the connection on Lloyd Boulevard between the Esplanade connector and NE 1st Ave. One option for obtaining this width may be converting Lloyd Blvd to one southbound-only lane from Oregon



to 1st and using the space from the remaining lane to widen the sidewalk/path here. NE 1st could be converted to one-way northbound from Lloyd to Oregon (this would have the benefit of removing a conflict point at the intersection of Lloyd and 1st), and Oregon could be converted to two-way traffic by removing on-street parking between Lloyd and 1st.

Additionally, the lack of detail related to temporary closures or detours for the Esplanade in the Section 4(f) analysis (particularly the lack of completion of Appendix C to the Section 4(f) report) is concerning, as there is no way to holistically evaluate the temporary or permanent impacts to the Esplanade without this information. Mitigation on the Esplanade during construction can and should include a commitment to keep the Esplanade open for the entirety of the project (including its connections to Lloyd, the Steel Bridge, and the Burnside Bridge); if that is infeasible due to construction requirements, a true alternative/detour should be provided. Any detour to the west side of the river should include a commitment for new temporary dedicated biking and walking space on nearby bridges (i.e. Burnside or Morrison), even if that results in the closure of one or more general purpose lanes on those bridges. Any detour on the east side that requires the use of MLK to reach points south should include conversion of a travel lane to a two-way cycle track to minimize conflicts between people on bikes and people walking on the narrow sidewalk on the MLK bridge over I-84. Any temporary detour constructed on the east side that would allow for the path to remain open during construction must be, at a minimum, of equal width to the existing Esplanade, and should be developed in such a way that closures of the detour path during construction are minimized or non-existent.

ODOT must also carefully consider the impact of large-scale events on any west side detour (such as Fleet Week or the many concerts/festivals in the waterfront park that limit access and add restrictions on already constrained corridors). Fleet Week particularly puts major restrictions on the area immediately south of the Steel Bridge on the west side of the river, and if an Esplanade detour sends people that direction during Fleet Week, there will be massive conflicts and bottlenecks for all path users. Additionally, any construction that closes the Esplanade seems equally likely to require closures of Lloyd Boulevard and/or its sidewalk/path where Lloyd goes underneath I-5 currently. This would result in the need for additional clear detours, and would result in significant out-of-direction travel for those walking or biking to the Esplanade and/or Steel Bridge crossing.

Post-construction mitigation should include commitments to minimize closures due to freeway maintenance events, to ensure those closure occur outside of regular commuting hours and are very clearly marked and detoured, and to schedule those closures during less busy winter months whenever feasible.

Transit Detours

This project as proposed would result in significant impacts to transit during the length of construction (including the streetcar and lines 4, 17 44, and possibly on many more lines during possible construction near the Rose Quarter Transit Center). There may be additional impacts to Line 6 due to diversion as a result of construction closures on I-5. Every effort should be made to mitigate these impacts, including through temporary relocation of streetcar tracks, temporary bus-only lanes, and committing to minimize or avoid any detours at the Rose Quarter



Transit Center. For instance, if Lines 4 and 44 are detoured to MLK/Grand, mitigation may include bus only lanes on MLK, Grand, and Multnomah.

Traffic Detours

Any traffic detours as a result of closures to Vancouver and Williams should avoid Flint Ave at all costs due to the presence of Harriet Tubman Middle School. This project should not be creating a traffic detour that runs directly in front of a middle school. Instead, drivers should be diverted to I-5, Interstate, or MLK.

Tolling as an Alternative

The Portland region and ODOT are currently working with the federal government on the potential for tolling of I-5, including the section that this EA addresses. Because tolling of the I-5 corridor is reasonably foreseeable, ODOT should be analyzing tolling as one of the project alternatives (or as a baseline condition for the no-build and build alternatives). I suspect that, with a tolling alternative, most of the congestion issues that are used as justification for this project would disappear. It is surprising that this project would assume that the Columbia River Crossing would be built as part of its analysis (despite the well-documented challenges this project has faced), but not tolling, which will likely have a significant impact on the projections used in evaluating this project.

Process

I have significant concerns about how the process for this Environmental Assessment has rolled out. At the release of the EA, there were significant amounts of data and information missing from the report that are necessary for a full and open analysis of the proposed activities and impacts. It is difficult for the public to trust that ODOT has accurately evaluated the project when key information is withheld from the public. As it can take significant amounts of time for even experts in the field to review all of the documents and analysis for this project, the clock on the public comment period should not have begun until a complete EA (with all of its supporting data) was provided to the public. Instead, bits and pieces of additional data and information have come out over the course of the public review period (including design files indicating a much more significant impact on the Esplanade than indicated in the EA and Section 4(f) analysis, which was provided less than a week before the public comment period was set to close). Considering that portions of the EA documentation are still represented by placeholder text, it would be impossible for the public to truly review this EA in an informed and accurate manner; therefore, the public comment period should be extended until 45 days following the complete release of the EA and all its supporting documentation.

Delay

I did not see a rigorous evaluation of delays and impacts to bus riders, bike riders, or pedestrians (either during construction or in the year of analysis) in the EA's analysis. Please provide a comprehensive review of delays and impacts to these users. The preferred alternative should ultimately provide IMPROVEMENTS to travel times for these users, not delays, and should minimize any other negative impacts to these users.



Conclusion

Due to the many issues cited above (along with significant community opposition or concern, including from Portland Public Schools, the Portland Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committees, the Audobon Society, OPAL Environmental Justice, the Community Cycling Center, the Sierra Club, Oregon Walks, NAACP Portland, and the Eliot and Irvington Neighborhood Associations), I am requesting that a more vigorous Environmental Impact Statement be conducted and additional mitigation be developed, as this Environmental Assessment lacks the rigor, detail, and public process to adequately analyze the myriad impacts this project will have in its vicinity. An EIS should include consideration of tolling as either a baseline condition or a separate set of alternatives for analysis.

Failing such analysis and lacking a more complete and acceptable plan for mitigating the many negative impacts of this project, the no-build alternative is far preferable to the build alternative. I am also requesting that the project incorporate the suggestions contained within this letter in future designs, such that if the project does move forward in its current form, improvements can be made to minimize the significant negative impacts the project will have locally.

Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Alan J Winter

Comment: I am opposed to any more freeway building including a new Columbia Crossing bridge. These will not solve but increase the congestion and pollution problems. It's time to find environmentally sound solutions like public transportation.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Alan Kessler

Comment: The Rose Quarter project, as documented in the draft Environmental Analysis (EA) would have substantial unmitigated negative impacts on our environment, social institutions, public spaces, local and global natural resources, multi-modal transportation networks, historically-marginalized communities, and the Portland Metropolitan region at large. As such, a finding of no significant impact is inappropriate, and the project should not move forward without a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

The City of Portland and Oregon Metro have established policies (Footnote 1) to encourage walking, bicycling, and transit over the use of private automobiles. Nonetheless, transit usage has been stagnant or declining, which is attributable (Footnote 2) to degradation of service as TriMet buses are mired in car traffic. These delays have largely been caused or exacerbated by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) single-minded focus on movement of vehicles, rather than the movement of people and goods. With the present draft EA, ODOT has proposed a half-billion dollar freeway widening project which, under its own modeling, will further slow TriMet buses and will not have any positive long-term impact on vehicle congestion.



ODOT, focused squarely on the single, outdated, discipline of Level of Service, has made no attempt to model on a per-rider level the impacts the slower buses will have on the movement of transit riders. This fails to meet the local or federal policies of increasing accessibility and mobility of people and freight.

The Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) policies requiring an interdisciplinary approach, robust public process, and full consideration of potential alternatives.

The public process during the development of, and during the comment period on the draft has been deeply flawed. Even though the Oregon legislature directed ODOT to evaluate congestion pricing, and even though ODOT's own procedures manual requires consideration of such transit demand techniques (Footnote 3), ODOT has intentionally segregated process around the widening process from its consideration of value pricing. Congestion pricing is exactly the type of alternative that should be studied in detail in an EIS before proceeding with a disruptive, expensive, urban freeway project.

ODOT has also not provided information sufficient to understand whether it could build a project with the same performance outcomes at a lower cost. The current plan includes portions with gigantic medians: sufficient space in the right-of-way to add additional lanes for the cost of paint; yet the EA does not consider or model this potential. If the purpose of the width is not to add more capacity later it is not clear why ODOT would include the incredible cost to acquire and pave so much surplus urban real estate. In that case, an alternative scenario using the minimum amount of additional land should be considered. If the purpose is to allow for more capacity later, this fact should be disclosed and the impacts should be modeled.

Many other alternatives have been discussed in the public realm, but have apparently not been considered by ODOT. Removal --or temporal closure-- of some of the urban ramps could dramatically improve the flow of goods and people at minimal expense and impact. Removal of I-5 entirely (e.g. re-designating I-205 as I-5 in the Metro area and deconstructing the current I-5 infrastructure) would have dramatic positive impacts on our city, natural resources, carbon consumption, environmental justice, and modal goals, and may not create any additional long-term mobility problems. These options should be studied and discussed in an EIS as well.

Unfortunately, the public has no way of knowing what ODOT has considered or its reasons for rejecting those alternatives. ODOT has been reticent to release information--even about the plan discussed in the EA-- and has been deceptive with the information it has released. For example, only last week the public learned of ODOT's plan to build above a portion of the Eastbank Esplanade. This should have been made during the planning process and should have been described fairly in the 4(f) statement; it was obfuscated. Likewise, it was only through the careful sleuthing of a local economist that the public learned about ODOT's counterfactual assumption that the abandoned Columbia River Crossing was complete and operational in 2015 to generate numbers for its traffic simulation modeling; this came out after the agency had publicly denied it.

ODOT has not even been truthful with respect to the process itself. In a public hearing before the school board, an ODOT representative told officials that an EA and an EIS require the same level of detail and process. She argued that the board members did not need to request an EIS,



even though there were concerns about the effects of the project on one of its schools, because the processes for the two documents were the same.

In order to provide the opportunity for a full and honest assessment of the proposed projects and the most promising alternatives, the public should have the benefit of a full EIS. I respectfully submit that the ODOT has failed in its attempt to show that there will be no substantial impact. Moreover, there is no proposed mitigation for the many impacts that are apparent even with the limited data available. The draft EA should be withdrawn or rejected by the FHWA. ODOT should instead prepare an EIS; hopefully, it will do so with an honest and open public process.

1 See, e.g., <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2017/06/02/RTP2018-Vision-Goals-201706.pdf> and <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/690972>.

2 <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/686896>

3 <https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Planning/Documents/APMv2.pdf>

Attachments: [2019 0401 Alan Kessler ATT](#)

2019 0226 Alan Winter

Comment: PortlNd needs to invest in environmentally sound solutions to our transportation issues. I drive that section of I-5 by the Rose Quarter often. Please consider this not expanding the problem.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Alastair Drong

Comment: If there's anything the 60s, 70s, and 80s have taught us, it's that widening city roads only hurts neighborhoods. In the 90s and early 2000s, we've been discovering that widening sidewalks, adding bike lanes, adding additional transit options (including street cars, shared bikes, and yes, even the dreaded scooters), and even going so far as to completely close off streets to cars has a positive impact on fostering growth in neighborhoods. Experiments with this in New York, Amsterdam, Chicago, and London has proven this to be true. Expansion of roads and interstates, on the other hand, has proven again and again to only draw more traffic through and area, but not TO it.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Aleeza Jill Nussbaum

Comment: My name is Aleeza and I'm writing to let you know of my strong feelings regarding the I-5 expansion proposal. Im told the period for public comment is drawing to a close so I just want to quickly say that im against it! I dont usually write emails like I should. It hard for me for all the usual reasons and then some that I won't go into here. So please dont mistake the brevity, or the seemingly borrowed talking points for a lack of passion on this issue. I am, as is



every local voting adult I know, terrified about what we are doing to the climate. I think this proposal would take us significantly farther in the wrong direction on climate change. Furthermore most people dont want it. The effects on air quality and other concerns have also not been thoroughly studied and should be. Even more depressing is that highway expansion hasnt proven to achieve its intended purpose in other cities. Why ruin the the reputation of such a special city as ours? People like it here, are drawn to it, admire it for precisely the opposite kinds of choices we've historically made. We have always been innovative and ahead of our time on city planning and preservation of the environment. Why would we ever want to mess up the biggest thing weve got going for us? Please give us a full environmental impact statement before even considering proceeding any further. Also please consider other ways all that money could be used to solve problems in forward thinking ways.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0000 Alejandra Prado

Local 1503 Carpenters

Comment: I am for it because, of safety reasons. Also to make travel time faster boosting jobs also helps the economi.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Alejandro Chavez

Comment: This freeway expansion will do nothing to help congestion, many studies have shown that adding lanes just means more people will choose driving as a commuting method, thus worsening or keeping traffic the same. Portland needs to focus more on bettering our public transit instead of strengthening a failed system (highways/cars). Build more light rail, BRT lanes and bike lanes. NOT bigger highways. A big reason I love living in Portland is never having to use highways, and if we increased that it would change the way this city is viewed and make it much much more unappealing. Do not make Portland into LA.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0000 Alex and Christian Grand

Comment: Based on the recent EA and based on my understanding that freeway enhancements are bad for the environment and don't ease traffic, I move that Portland not move forward with the proposed Rose Quarter Project.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0402 Alex Dikeman

Comment: I would like to urge you to forgo the expansion plans. As it currently stands, the extra pollution would be harmful to the children at the Middle School next door, and it wouldn't even help with the congestion issues.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0301 Alex Gamboa Grand

Comment: Do not widen the freeway please. Please focus on public transportation instead.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Alex Johnson

Comment: Please do not expand the freeway! I write this as a commuter who has to sit in this exact traffic (I-5 between interstate and south waterfront) every day that I drive to work. However, I also bike to work, and the number one motivator for me biking to work is the traffic. So many more people could carpool or bike, and additional public transportation could be added. Freeway expansions are always a band aid, and as climate change worsens, I personally believe the era of every person commuting alone in a 5-passenger vehicle is nearing it's end. So you may very well expand the freeway just to find that new regulatory policies and cultural changes are already reducing traffic. Thank you for listening, and please do not expand the freeway! If you don't build it, we will bike/carpool/max to work!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Alex Michel

Comment: Research has consistently shown that freeway expansions do little to alleviate gridlock and congestion and instead have a history of increasing traffic. Please consider re-purposing this funding to sustainable transit alternatives such as bike lanes, buses, or improved pedestrian walkways. I oppose freeway expansion!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Alex Morken

Comment: I am a resident of North Portland who often commutes by both car and bicycle to downtown Portland. When commuting by car, I travel through the proposed project site and I see no need to spend \$500 million dollars on easing traffic there for what is mainly single occupancy vehicles. I would like my money spent on promoting less single occupancy transportation and to reduce congestion through other means than what has been proposed by PBOT/ODOT. Basically, I feel any solution to this problem other than the one proposed would be better (as long as it involves decreasing single occupancy vehicles).



On top of that, I am concerned about the impact on the east bank esplanade, the school in the neighborhood, and the fact that widening/adding lanes has historically done nothing to ease congestion on the roads. What does ease congestion is increasing the efficacy of public transportation, adding tolls to roads, and providing greater access to other methods of transportation.

Finally, I am disheartened by the way the agencies have handled this project. They have been on the attack, aggressively pushing a single agenda, while seemingly using bad data sets (CRC crossing traffic

estimates) and not doing their due diligence and conflating different environmental impact studies that are not at all the same.

Please stop spending money supporting an unnecessary increase of use of fossil fuels and start decreasing our reliance on outdated methods of moving people around our cities. We have done enough damage and it's time we stop the bleeding.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0228 Alex Page

Comment: I thought Oregon was better than this. I thought people looked to us for progressive transportation planning. But, no. It appears, after reading your open house materials, that you're cooking the data for your department's gain. Ignoring induced demand, using pedestrian deaths as reason to add lanes? Carving highways through Tubman? ...Robert Moses would be proud. ODOT really is full of fossilized engineers.

I was skeptical before, but now I'm just angry.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Alex Woolery

Comment: My name is Alex and I am writing to oppose the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project. It is unnecessary, incredibly costly at \$500 million, would do nothing to address the issue of traffic congestion (even according to ODOT's own studies), and is a full-on climate-exacerbating disaster when we must do everything we can to reduce our impact. Please put this money slated for this disastrous freeway project towards projects we actually *need*, that could help all of our community and help reduce pollution and our climate impact, such as improved public transit lines, rail infrastructure, and improvements for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Alexander Emery

Comment: I don't want the i5 project and I strongly distrust the findings of the environmental assessment as it is strongly contradicted by knowledge creators with less personal links to the



project like universities. I think many people in the world of sociology would also classify the orwellian language around environmental Justice as a form of racist green washing.

Given such stark contrast between the language used and math used in the environmental assessment, who in government is financially or otherwise responsible in the case that their knowledge turns out to be corrupted by corporate greed and pollution increases in the area from diesel exhaust? Will they be held responsible for their lies and treason?

I work in the Rose quarter and am aware of how little the current laws around car exhaust are enforced in order to promote favored industry like trucking. Maybe you should find out how many people die from the current exhaust and find creative ways to get those numbers reduced by getting people off the freeway instead of inducing new demand at huge costs to the society. Maybe some of the violence of pollution should be reversed and trickle upward towards the wealthy as a penalty and deterrent for future crimes.

<<...>>

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Alexander Grasley

Comment: We cannot afford to continue to expand the use of high emissions vehicles. The resources going towards this freeway expansion would be better spent on improving public access to alternative and more environmentally friendly modes of transportation, including walking, cycling, public transport, etc. This freeway expansion will not effectively reduce traffic or congestion long-term, and will only exacerbate our current climate crisis by putting more vehicles on the road. As Oregonians, we should lead the nation in sustainable and environmentally friendly transportation and reduce our dependence on vehicles that use fossil fuels.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Alexander Leeding

Comment: If approved to move forward as outlined in current ODOT project plans, the Rose Quarter Improvement Project (RQIP) will be a financial boondoggle that will impact air pollution, livability, active transportation routes, and climate as we know it in the Rose Quarter/Lower Albina area.

It is difficult to decide on where to begin in describing the massive disservice that ODOT has done in every step of this project planning process. From obscuring and manipulating data and not allowing independent groups to verify traffic projection data, to attempting to limit the period of public comment, ODOT's business practices in the instance of the RQIP project go directly against any semblance of an open and fair government and are nothing short of bureaucratic malfeasance.

Even if one ignores the negative externalities that would result from the RQIP as is, it would be remiss not to mention ODOT's poor track record in staying within budget of large capital



projects. ODOT estimates the cost of the RQIP project to total approximately \$500,000,000. Given ODOT's track record in budgeting (Highway 20 between Corvallis-Newport project went overbudget by \$256M or 332% of initial bid, MLK/Grand Viaduct went overbudget by \$67M or more than 300% of original project costs), it is very likely that this project if moved forward will incur large cost overruns. Even if we (generously) assumed the average amount of cost overrun on ODOT projects (27%) the RQIP's cost overrun would be \$135,000,000 or a little more than 25% of Tri-Met's annual operating budget. These cost overruns would have to be covered by funds otherwise earmarked for maintenance or the implementation of more pressing and important ODOT projects, such as safety improvements to ODOT-owned city highways such as 82nd Avenue or Powell Blvd.

Despite the high price tag of the RQIP, the project as proposed will do nothing to ease long-term congestion, and cause deleterious impacts to residents in the area. The proposed expansion of 48 feet to make room for these new lanes, which are billed as auxiliary lanes but are shown in ODOT's own plans as full travel lanes will create induced demand for vehicle traffic, increasing emissions and pollution and do nothing to actually relieve traffic. ODOT also has used inaccurate data to draw results within their Environmental Assessment -- showing that greenhouse gas emissions will decrease with the building of this project (assuming an increase in fuel efficiency), and basing all projections about traffic and emission levels assuming that a new bridge connecting Portland and Vancouver over the Columbia River will be built. Air pollution is also a major issue surrounding this project, and ODOT has done very little to begin to address concerns about the impact of additional freeway capacity. A prime example of this is Harriet Tubman Middle School, located less than 200 feet from I-5. A 2003 EPA study showed that Harriet Tubman Middle School is ranked in the bottom 1 percent national for air quality. A widening of the freeway would increase greenhouse gas emissions and further lower air quality for students at Harriet Tubman and for residents in the immediate area.

Plans released by ODOT for the RQIP completely go against and even undo any semblance of working towards a multimodal mixed-use environment in the immediate area around the proposed project. With regards to transit, travel lanes are expanded on the width of Broadway between Williams and First, but do nothing to give transit any priority. ODOT's own environmental assessment admits that transit times will be slower if the project gets built. As the Rose Quarter is a major transit hub, this will negatively affect transit-riders and may encourage transit-riders to switch modes to less sustainable methods such as single occupancy personal vehicle travel.

For bike infrastructure, the project impact would be even worse and discourage casual riders or new riders and stagnate bicycle mode share. The removal of the Flint Street overpass and subsequent replacement of bike infrastructure as outlined in the RQIP such as the Hancock-Dixon crossing includes bicycle lanes at a 10% incline grade; the MUP replacement for the Flint overpass would be a 5% switchback. For comparison, the Tilikum Crossing's grade is 5%. These replacements will not only discourage active transportation methods such as cycling and walking, but also directly contradict the City's own Transportation System Plan with regards on implementation of Major City Bikeways. Even where there is no new bicycle infrastructure built, the RQIP would negatively affect the appeal of existing infrastructure. An expansion of the



southbound lanes by the I-5/I-84 interchange would require an acquisition of an easement by the Eastbank Esplanade and periodic closure of the Esplanade to allow ODOT ramp access, as well as result in the new lane directly overhanging the Esplanade, creating an increase in noise pollution, decreasing availability of green space and most likely necessitating the construction of additional support columns. In short, the addition of unsuitable bicycle infrastructure and the diminution of appeal of existing infrastructure will be a negative effect on the mode-share of bicycling in the area.

Additionally, proposed components of the RQIP such as highway caps would attempt to help reconnect the fragmented lower Albina neighborhood, but are not close to sufficient as outlined in the current RQIP. Highway caps, while a step in the right direction, are insufficient as laid out in current plans and do not meet land use plans as mandated by the City of Portland. The caps as proposed would be built to minimum specifications and primarily used for construction staging, and would not be able to support even greenspace. Caps should be reinforced and support types of development, even if it is low-density construction. We do not need more vacant, underutilized spaces in such a central part of our City. Even Portland Parks & Recreation has submitted a letter raising concerns about these caps, citing the "fragmentations of the greenspaces, with the larger pieces isolated by vehicular traffic and thus of limited utility".

ODOT also has done a poor job of community relations during this period of public comment. Several local organizations with large and vocal constituencies including, but not limited to Albina Vision Trust, The Street Trust, Oregon Walks, Portland Public Schools, and citizen pedestrian and cycling advisory committees from PBOT have all shared serious reservations about this project and at the very least, calling for a full Environmental Impact Statement. ODOT has stonewalled these groups and the constituents of the area at every turn during the public comment period and at open houses, and have taken few, if any steps to receive feedback about this project outside of the bare minimum required.

As shown above, ODOT has not even begun to fully assess the long-term impacts that this project would have on several levels, nor have they studied the feasibility of alternative solutions to the Rose Quarter bottleneck and congestion easing outside of the addition of lanes. At the very least moving forward, ODOT needs to be honest and unbiased in presenting the impact of this project to the public, fully study alternatives to an expansion (including but not limited to decongestion pricing), and undergo a full Environmental Impact Assessment. This will allow the true nature of this project come to light and allow the public citizenry to have an open, honest debate on how this project, if it does move forward, will affect citizens in the years to come.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Alexandra Zimmermann

Comment: This project is a gross misrepresentation of what should be done in the Portland metro area. It is unconscionable to build the I-5/Rose Quarter freeway expansion as represented in the plans and documents released by ODOT. From misconstruing construction and final project impacts to the existing bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities and claiming that the project will provide any improvement in accessibility or travel time, to miscalculating the



volume of traffic that would move through the area and deliberately manipulating the purpose of the project and any supposed "benefit" that might come through the freeway lids/noise mitigation/emissions produced/reunification of lower Albina, ODOT has not done its due diligence to the community, the city, or the region. A full EIS must be required of this project, with a new public review and comment period that begins only after all project data, drawings, reports, and supplemental materials have been made available and accessible to the public. Additionally, all analyses that are performed in an attempt to justify the project must be calculated based on existing, current conditions and leave out numbers or manipulation of numbers for potential long-term projects that are conceptual at best and only exist in long-term planning documents. The money for this project should be reappropriated to the City of Portland through a jurisdictional transfer, and I urge ODOT to move forward with implementation of congestion pricing and tolling on all major freeways as their first goal for improving our transportation system.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Alexis Johnson

Comment: Want to be added to the mailing list

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Alexis Peterka

Comment: As a daily bike commuter and member of the NE Portland community, I oppose the Rose Quarter Freeway expansion. It will NOT reduce auto traffic congestion, and will worsen conditions for the residents of a historically African American neighborhood by increasing air pollution and decreasing livability.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Ali Jones

Comment: This is a to register a big no to the Rose Quarter expansion.

Harriet Tubman already has curtailed recess due to poor air quality; the health of all of us living along the I-5 corridor should count for more- especially since the expansion won't solve actually solve congestion.

The project is a non-solution solution and therefore, a waste of money, a waste of health, and a waste of Portland's urban planning reputation.

Ali Jones

NE Portland home owner

Attachments: N/A



2019 0330 Alice Corbin

Comment: You are mistaken. The pavement that you propose to add to I5, despite your nomenclature, will be new additional lanes. They will draw in more traffic and will fill up, with the end result that we'll have the same congestion as before, with more cars and greater pollution.

In addition, removing Flint will make it difficult to impossible for me to get into NE any longer. I'm aging, and don't think that I can make a 10% grade on a bike any more. Heck, I'm not sure I could do it on foot.

We have reached the point in history where we desperately need to discourage travel with high carbon emissions (like driving) and encourage travel with low or none (like walking and biking). This project would encourage the former and discourage the latter. It is entirely the wrong direction to take.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0219 Alice Shapiro

Comment: I have been involved with the climate/environmental/climate justice movement for quite a long time. Portland has done much (at least in theory) to protect the environment. However, freeway expansion is counter to Oregon's climate goals.

Since 40% of Oregon's carbon emissions come from transportation we must concentrate our expenditures on improving and expanding public transportation and make it easier for people to drive less and to walk and bike more.

Climate change is a serious problem which is already affecting the lives of Oregonians. Please do not expand any highways. Additionally, air pollution will increase (especially at the already hazardous Harriet Tubman school) and studies have shown that traffic congestion is not mitigated by such expansion projects.

I oppose the 1.8 mile freeway widening project through North Portland's Rose Quarter.

Protect our climate future and our immediate health.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Alice Shapiro

Comment: I grew up in Los Angeles and was there as a young adult driver. I still return to visit family occasionally. More and more freeways have been built there and never is there less congestion--always more. Expanding freeways does not relieve congestion--your own studies have shown that. And, as you know, 40% of Oregon's pollution, including greenhouse gas emissions, results from the transportation sector. We are committed to meeting our climate goals--expansion is counter to that. I also have two young granddaughters, ages 8 and 10, who attend school in North Portland. This expansion would negatively affect their health and the health of all!!! Please do not approve this expansion.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Alicia Cohen

Comment: Hi, my name is Alicia Cohen. I am the parent of two children, young children, ages 13 and 9. I am profoundly concerned about their future. We are in midst of a climate crisis and emergency through scale and scope is really -- has been described by the UN's IPCC report as dire in ways that humanity has never faced before, and it's given us 12 years to completely turn this -- not ship of state, but ship of all states around. So it's really all hands on deck. And I think the green new deal is the scale of mobilization that's required, but we can't wait for that unfortunately. Trump is in the White House and so we need -- and I thank you so much, the amazing citizens, I am so honored to have as my fellows for and against. And I really sympathize with people concerned about congestion pricing. I hope that we can find a way to price congestion that makes it affordable for everyone to use the freeways in a fair and equitable way. But we need the level of citizens, the level of ODOT, you know, at the city government level, the state government level, all meet together and everything has to relate to climate. We have to bring carbon down. Experts have made it clear. The studies make it clear. We all know that expanding the freeways does not bring pollution down. Yes, we'll have electric cars and that will be great. Right now we have 10 years. We need to get busy and we need to get serious and we need to take carbon seriously in the short term. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0221 Alicia Johnson

Comment: I am unable to attend the public comment hearing but I wanted to express my dismay at seeing the project of I5 expansion move forward. Widening highways will not solve Portland's congestion and does nothing to support alternate forms of transit, which are essential for a carbon neutral future. Please reconsider and use the allocated of funds in a way that will benefit Portland in a more useful and environmentally conscious way.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0323 Alisa

Comment: It is concerning that 'no more freeways PDX' is unwilling to hear dissenting opinions. How does anybody expect to have a public discussion when those providing a platform only listen to views that they agree with?

I was having a discussion in the FB group but the admins in that group decided they did not like my opinion and took away my ability to comment. It just confirms what I already knew. That is that radical leftists do not value any other viewpoint that is not their own. That is why Trump got elected. Many many people see this for what it truly is.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0329 Alison Dennis

Comment: Hello, my name is Alison Dennis, and I'm writing to you as a Portland resident who is vehemently opposed to the I-5 Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion. I navigate the city primarily by bicycle and also by transit and am deeply concerned about the dangers of Climate Change and the effects of pollution on our city's air. I try to stay as active as possible and walking and bicycling are a big part of that, but it's become more difficult as I try to manage my asthma amid growing air pollution in the city and regional, Climate Change related forest fires. I've also seen the city fail to retain its status as a leader in alternative transportation. The rise in automobiles on the streets has made non-motorized transportation more difficult and dangerous and the city and state have shown a saddening lack of political will to create safe, accessible alternatives to SOV commutes for many people, but this is the only way to truly tackle the root cause of congestion.

It is absurd to me that that ODOT wants to spend \$450 million to build more freeway lanes when 40% of Oregon emissions come from transportation and when Climate Change poses the greatest threat to human civilization. This is a huge step backwards! The project will also not even provide long-term congestion relief, because of the well-documented reality of induced demand. The only way to properly relieve auto congestion is to create viable alternatives to driving and incentivize them while de-incentivizing driving. We need to be investing this money in public transportation and safer, more accessible pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, which is also generally much more cost effective than freeway widening.

I'm also concerned about the effects this project would have on the health and connectivity of the neighborhood. The proposed surface street changes would not be an improvement to pedestrian and bicycle accessibility. The Flint Street Bridge is a vital part of cycling infrastructure that should not be removed, and the newly built infrastructure fails to provide the same connectivity. The expansion also threatens to increase health risks faced by students at nearby Harriet Tubman Middle School. It is unconscionable to put our city's children at risk for a project that doesn't even provide long-term solutions to congestion.

In addition to expressing my opposition to the freeway widening project, I would like to request that ODOT make a full Environmental Impact Statement. This should include research into other alternatives to reduce congestion, such as increased mass transit, congestion pricing and improved active transportation infrastructure.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Alison Kastner

Comment: I bike through the area slated for expansion every day and have done so for 12 years. There are limited ways to get downtown by bicycle as is.

Tearing this area up will displace all of the walkers and cyclists who use this area not to mention disrupting an area that has historically been the focus of unwanted development. The result will be more, not less traffic, with people who don't live in the community driving through on their



way to somewhere else. It will cost a fortune, damage the environment and result in more traffic that will soon be as snarled as if no expansion ever took place.

Surely there are better solutions than to build and build and build. It is unsustainable. Please do a proper environmental impact assessment and reconsider this expansion that will be irreversible.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Alison Lucas

Comment: I live in North Portland and bike commute downtown every weekday, and I am strongly opposed to this project. Expanding the freeway will encourage even more traffic (induced demand!) and increase air pollution.

This expensive project is using funds that could much better be used to build more public transit or pedestrian/cycling focused projects--things that will help us fight climate change and grow our city sustainably.

I understand that cars continue to be an important transit method for many people, but if we want to be thinking about how we are going to keep our city liveable and how we want to support the environment over the next 20-50 years, people need more environmentally friendly transit options. We want to ride our bikes, and we want to take clean public transportation; use these funds instead make these options more available to us.

Please don't build this project and make us and our children regret it for the rest of our lifetimes in Portland. Congestion pricing should be implemented, and this expansion project should be scrapped!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Alison Rhea

Comment: I am taking time from my business day to implore you to not expand I-5 at the Rose Quarter.

I am concerned about the following issues:

- Expanding freeways is not an effective strategy for reducing congestion. ODOT has failed to make the case for why this project should move forward.
- ODOT should fully evaluate proven strategies such as congestion pricing and investment in public transportation before spending a half billion dollars to expand a short stretch of highway.
- The project is entirely at odds with the City of Portland's Climate Agenda. 40% of Oregon's emissions are from the transportation sector. We need to focus on strategies that reduce dependency on cars, not perpetuate 1950s style highway projects.
- At the same time that ODOT is proposing to spend nearly half a billion dollars on expanding I-5, the region continues to neglect serious road safety problems in East Portland.



- The project will increase air pollution in the backyard of Harriet Tubman Middle School, which already has some of the worse air quality in the state.

For a project with an estimated cost of over \$500 million, I feel the projected community benefits are just not there - while the opportunity cost of using these funds shelves other deserving projects with tangible safety improvements or opportunities to decarbonize our transportation system.

I respectfully ask you to rethink this project and find some other more environmentally conscience way to address traffic congestion!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Allan Rudwick et al

Comment: To those in power and those on the project team-

We are very concerned about the proposed I-5 widening project near Broadway. This project is the wrong one for our city, our neighborhood and the greater Portland region. Allan has been closely watching this project develop since before 2010, when the planning process was started and the Stakeholder Advisory Committee was formed. Allan submitted some of the '70 designs' that were proposed through the planning process. The project certainly took on a "less bad" feel over the course of that process; nevertheless we have ended up with a project that fails the community on many levels.

Firstly, safety. This intersection is relatively safe. Our family travels through this interchange area at least 10 times per week on foot, bicycle or by car. Things are not that bad on the surface streets or the highway with the current configuration. I'll quote the Eliot Neighborhood Association:

Safety

ODOT has pitched this project to neighborhoods as a way to move more vehicles more quickly through the Rose Quarter, both on I-5 and on surface streets. Higher speeds and increased throughput on surface roads increase the chances a driver will kill or maim another road user. Our transportation network should prioritize safety instead of speed.

The removal of Flint bridge appears to place cyclists onto either a very steep road or in mixed traffic with motor vehicles. We are aware the current renderings are not finalized, but it appears bikes are an afterthought and will be squeezed in where it is possible at the last minute, likely leading to unsafe outcomes.

Many dangerous intersections in this area have had multiple bicycle and pedestrian crashes and deaths in the past. These include Broadway/I-5/Williams and Broadway/Flint intersections. The lives that have been lost are a testament to the bad engineering decisions made in the past, and the incremental improvements made throughout the years reflect learnings on how to make the streets safer. Redesigning all of the streets in the area may place us back in a situation where we have to live with untested designs at the risk of more accidents, injuries and fatalities.



ODOT's own data indicate that the area in question does not experience dangerous accidents at a higher than average rate. If safety is our priority, we the public would get the best bang for our buck by investing in major safety overhauls on surface streets which double as state highways in East Portland.

Secondly, this project is an example of extreme fiscal irresponsibility. We have a system that is working with bridges that are not about to fall down, but we are considering replacing what we have with an "improved" or widened facility. The data used to justify this widening seems highly suspect based on public data that was not included in the Environmental Assessment document. This widening does not appear to have any fiscal benefits apart from lining the wallets of contractors who will design and build the project. We would be way better off making a bunch of small changes that actually improve quality of life across the city than on spending almost half a billion dollars on one interchange that is currently functional. Perhaps this plan could be put on the shelf until after the existing facility needs replacement post-earthquake or at the end of its lifespan in a hundred years or so.

Thirdly, the urban design of this area is a shame. The freeway has reduced property values around the Rose Quarter area and it is almost completely devoid of any urban life. Part of the reason bicycles are so prevalent in the area is that the destinations are too far apart to walk to. The proposed design is a complete failure to fix the urban character in this area, in fact it will be moved in completely the wrong direction. If we can't make this area feel like a part of the city, this project should be viewed as a complete failure. During the stakeholder process, there were big aspirations of patching up the street network to rebuild the city in this area. It seems like it might be easier to do this with the current design than what we have seen proposed here. ODOT may not have the technical expertise to make it happen, but there are organizations that could use their imagination in a better way to make this area feel like a neighborhood again. Reducing traffic throughput is a big part of that which is the opposite of what this project appears to be doing.

Lastly, construction impacts. Since our family and many residents of North and Northeast Portland travel through this interchange repeatedly and live around it, the construction impacts of a project like this will fall on us the hardest. From ruining one of the best cycling facilities in the entire city for several years to putting a huge volume of traffic right in front of Tubman middle school, this project appears to have major impacts - much more than the claimed "finding of no significant impact" that the Environmental Assessment has done currently has proposed.

Please do everything in your power to kill this project as soon as possible, and if delay is the best you can do then please demand a full Environmental Impact Statement to figure out how to mitigate/fix the bad designs and huge impacts that this project will have on residents in our neighborhood and ourselves.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0221 Allan Rudwick

Comment: I have been following the I-5 Broadway/Weidler project from the beginning.



This project will set in concrete the built environment for several generations in the Rose Quarter area. If we build something expensive at this interchange, it is essential makes our community stronger. The project as currently proposed is roughly as good for the community and urban fabric as the existing infrastructure. Yes, the sidewalks will be slightly wider, and everything will sparkle with that new concrete smell, but honestly this project is just polishing the <<...>> that is this interchange. (An ODOT staffer used this expression at a meeting several years ago.) The new "neighborhood connections" that the project is building are equivalent and possibly worse than the existing ones - we'll have one local street connection to the north similar in function to N Flint St now, and the pedestrian bridge being proposed to the south is so circuitous that it provides no travel time improvement over walking on existing streets and may only be slight more comfortable to walk on.

The highway widening underneath the freeway is the only reason ODOT is proposing this project in the first place - this is their main dream for the interchange, but I think that widening the highway in this area is a mistake. Congestion will not substantially change from today due to 2 reasons. a) The major bottlenecks in all directions around this interchange will limit any benefit from increased capacity in this area. b) Any increased capacity will be immediately consumed by latent demand - that is people who want to drive but think it is too much of a pain with current traffic levels.

Why would we spend \$500 Million on this interchange? It isn't falling down and spending more than \$100 per Oregonian on one interchange in Portland is not good stewardship of state funds. If we care about congestion - we should not build any new highways until we can get a congestion tolling scheme on all metro area highways. This will prove if drivers are willing to pay for roadway capacity increases or if we can shift enough trips to alternative modes like walking, biking, travel time shifting or simply not taking low-value trips.

I realize that these types of mega-projects are jobs programs, but building ourselves a monument to driving, continuing same failed policies of the past 70 years is a major mistake and will only set us back.

I know there are other reasons that many oppose the project and I think some of them have been blown out of proportion, but I think that from a cost-benefit analysis we should take a hard look at all transportation projects and make sure we are getting value for our limited tax dollars. This Project would easily fail that test.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Allan Rudwick

Eliot Neighborhood Association Land Use and Transportation Committee

Comment: Message: Approved Minutes from the Eliot Neighborhood Association Land Use & Transportation Committee from 3/11/19.

Minutes submitted by Allan Rudwick.

About 20 people were in attendance.



Presenters: Doug Siu (ODOT), Stacey Thomas (ODOT Consultant HDR), Aaron Brown (No More Freeways PDX)

From Committee: Brad Baker, Allan Rudwick, Jonathan Konkol

7:05 Rose Quarter I-5 Expansion + Questions

Decades of planning - state has tried multiple times to widen this part of I-5. The presenters claim it was built too small originally and especially with I-405 going in it became a problem.

They mentioned the 2010-12 planning workshops which Eliot NA was a stakeholder to. Allan mentioned that Eliot attended all meetings and voted no

If built (they use language that implies it is guaranteed). There will be a 4 year construction window, with phases so not all roads will be closed at all times.

There are 3 major highways connecting in the area. I5 and 84 were built in the 60s, I-405 early 70s.

In 1987, the 'Greeley-Banfield' proposal would have further decimated the city grid.

A modified greeley-banfield proposal existed from 1990-96 and was abandoned due to public pressure.

In 2007, ODOT commissioned a design workshop. In the 2010-12 timeframe "70 designs" were considered. (Editorial- Allan submitted at least 6 of these with MS Paint).

The presentation uses the word "Improvements" many many times. However just because something is changing doesn't make it an improvement. (Editorial- Allan thinks this word should be used more carefully.)

Public comment: "Isn't this project a continuation of i5 cutting through neighborhood" and not a healing in any way. Public comment is cut down- only constructive comments and clarifications to the presentation will be encouraged until later.

Currently: Heavily used area by all modes of traffic.

New structures will be "Seismically resilient" although current ones are not near the top of the list of risks.

Highway covers will provide more space for bicycles and pedestrians

This project is projected to save 2.5 million hours of travel annually within project constraints area. Details in traffic operations section of EA documents.

"Vision zero" project will improve safety for all modes through the area.

Hancock Dixon overpass will change the way streets are connected and remove the Flint overpass.

Video shown with a "Drivers view" of the area.



Freeway lids: Why the hole in the cover? Ventilation and emergency access. This is still the overview phase. "A lot of design to get to still." (Editorial: often the design phase public is told that the project is already past the point where we can make changes.)

Pollution is going to be "the same" with giant lid and ventilation - just possibly shifted a few feet based on where gaps in the lids are. If we had a "tunnel air wouldn't be filtered just moved outside the tunnel.

New construction would be to a 9.2 earthquake standard or better.

Most pollution is from Diesel pre-2008 trucks.

Owner of trucking company below Bridges on attendance

On the lids: we can have trees, parks. "Anything we want"

Buildings on them versus what type of buildings? Possibly we could have a 1-2 story building but probably not a 6-story one. Possibly 3-story in some spots

Can't dig out i5 due to disruption to traffic.

Lots of non local traffic on the freeway. Need access control to keep people safe. Buildings need access.

Certain properties affected by this project. Block by block impacts are different.

Ownership model... ODOT would let city of Portland own & manage buildings if they were built on top.

All of this is to say that "green space" is most likely. Specifically "Parks" surrounded by lots of polluted air.

ODOT and City worked together on process - this was "not an ODOT managed process [in 2010-12]"

Public Comments: Air quality modeling. Tubman students not supposed to go outside currently. Will this be worse with this project?

Noise concerns - this will make things louder for us.

Brilliant ideas wanted for how to use LIDs

Caps for construction staging - Doug said this was not true, there are cheaper ways to do staging. This is different than what other project staff have told us in the past

Public Comment: Other Freeway caps: Seattle freeway park? LID i5 group working on it currently.

What assumptions are made about Regional VMT with and without project? Consultant will get back to us.

Environmental phase over a year. 1000+ comments

How do we see this as different? Goal is to not displace unlike previous versions. Findings are of "no significant impact" - this is a legal term.



Jobs: Investment in small businesses to work on project. Construction and design firms.

Auxillary lanes - pitched as a net win. They have been successful along 217 and I-5.

Economic benefits to area? No Cost Benefit Analysis has been done.

This is a National Environmental Project Assessment (NEPA). Needed for federal matching funding.

Currently they are defining scope, design criteria

Public Question: Does the "No build" traffic modeling include other freeway projects. Answer: Master model that includes lots of other regional freeway projects. Some trends included, some not. Tolling not included.

Air quality and noise, environmental Justice

Project area, each category gets its own area

Problems trying to solve:

405 SB to 84, many vehicles getting on i5 just to go 1 exit

Project will be fairly neutral for travel times on local streets. Some slightly faster, slower. Report is blaming bicyclists for traffic slow down due to new signal phasing.

Neighborhood. Are speeds being lowered for safety or anything? A road diet on N Wheeler proposed near the Moda center.

There are no projections with congestion pricing modelled.

They are "separate projects". This doesn't factor that in to that one.

Public comment: No build scenario... Is there a seismic upgrade?

Consultant: Paralyzes whole state if any link goes down?

Public comment: Amazed by Thompson water issues, dirt seems to be unstable under columns of I-5 north of project area by Thompson.

Project is trying to create space for pedestrians and cyclists on each block

No additional transit with this project

Project was coupled with North-Northeast quadrant plan. Supposedly integrated with city's plans

Public concern: Ramps steeper than standards. Why are we putting in. When it's not an improvement. Short answer is output of previous planning. 9% due to existing grade. Can't give final grade but aware of grade challenges

MUP is to fix grade challenges

Air quality trends... Are the blue lines matching current data? National graph shows improvement but local may not



Difference is so small not to be an impact to human health. Slightly shorter distance. Benefit? Shouldn't consider as benefit

Benefits exist outside of project

Hoping for existing regulations to help pollution

Which freeways did we should we locally look too show this is a good idea

Local projects 217 to 205

Capital highway to 217 i5 South

Seen operational improvements exceeding expectations for aux lane projects

Neighborhood effect? Threshold for human health?

Construction vehicles, dust control.

During construction, traffic down Flint. Flint causing pedestrians to get hit already. Traffic volumes measured at wrong time? Chaos in front of Tubman

A lot of potential traffic in front of school

\$12M on air quality at Tubman already

"Traffic management plan and control plan"

In talks with PPS

Goal of project, taking traffic away from Flint

Portland versus ODOT. City supposedly at table

Why should these kids bear burden if i5 construction

Do boosters of project want their kids at Tubman? Guessing their kids aren't going to Tubman. There's going to be an impact, we need to mitigate

When we get to next phase, everyone gets to put in their comments. Conversations are active with PPS

A long time to work this out

"Not acceptable to send that volume through a school zone"

Next phase is design if all goes well.

No more freeways presentation

Dozens of buttons tomorrow

\$500 m

4 major platforms

Air quality

Induced demand



Environmental Justice

Worst census tract for air quality

Climate change

Driving is too energy intensive

Invest in transit

40% emissions in Oregon for transportation

We need to drive less

Safety

No traffic fatalities in a decade

ODOT owns much more dangerous facilities

No datasets included in EA document. Response from ODOT: will Fulfill request. We're already 23 days in. [since this meeting, documents came out]

FHWA said they would prefer the numbers not be released. Don't want to release information that is modifiable. Trying to get to this quickly. EA provides methodology and outputs.

What is the Delta VMT (Vehicle Miles Travelled projection)? Information to be sent to us.

Harriet Tubman PTA in opposition

PPS had over promised and under delivered on Tubman so they are swamped with other efforts.

Comments now make a difference. Eliot has posted ways to comment online.

Comments affect legal standing to sue in the future.

Public Comment: Pastor lunch that ODOT talked to - Had no more freeways talked to them? They are just a small group of volunteers but they would talk to if we connected them.

Other freeway widening projects increasing VMT in state. Goal needs to be VMT reduction for Climate reasons.

Does ODOT have prioritization of non car modes? They look for opportunities. Most things are affecting city jurisdiction. Need to make improvements. What kinds of things would help that are under ODOT's jurisdiction? We have issues in transportation planning with solos. Funding streams. Colors of money make it hard to spend on transit.

ODOT can prioritize non car

If no more freeways is successful, what's next

Ultimately personal opinion swaying. Idea of auxiliary lane seems different than through lanes

NMF: Within Urban growth boundary, shouldn't widen anything before congestion pricing



Would you call a plumber to fix a leak or buy a new \$500 Million sink first? No congestion pricing in model is fatal flaw to this project- should do congestion project first.

We have to stop motordom. It's so nice to be outside of a car.

Freeway industrial complex is benefitting from this project

Motion to approve Minutes: Approved 3-0

Motion: Write another letter regarding I-5 Project (still in opposition)

Attachments: [2019 0325 Allan Rudwick ATT \(Eliot Neighborhood Association\)](#)

2019 0401 Alan Rudwick

Comment: Hi there. I have been working with some friends to help collect some of the things people are saying about this project online. Certain communities of Portlanders have been very active and vocal about opposing this project for a number of reasons. Please add these twitter comments to the public record. The text is below and an excel document with the data is attached. There are more replies to these tweets below.

Attachments: [2019 0401 Alan Rudwick ATT1](#); [2019 0401 Alan Rudwick ATT2](#)

2019 0312 Allen Rudwick

Eliot Neighborhood Association

Comment: My name is Allen Rudwick. I have represented the Eliot Neighborhood Association since the beginning of the previous round of public engagement, 2010. I thought I was giving a really important speech. I was going to convince someone into changing their vote at the end of that process, and turns out that everyone had already made up their minds. Sam Chase talked in the beginning today about how there's lots of development happening in the Lloyd District. It's, like, yeah, it's happening right next to the MAX. Right around the highway we have this huge void area where no one wants to be in these empty lots. A highway project is not going to solve that. It's still going to be right next to the highway, which is noisy and uncomfortable to be around. This project from the very beginning, I sat through 20-plus meetings, got a lot of free food. There always was this, okay, we're going to widen the highway underneath so what do we want on top. If we wanted to -- like, this is a highway widening project. The others threw the word "improvement" around. Oh, my god, I'm sick of the word "improvement." Just because you're changing something doesn't make it an improvement. We need to build a lot of stuff. I love that all the trades people are here and, like, you guys are going to be a huge part of us building the new future that we want. Unfortunately, I don't think this project is part of that. If this were a jobs project, we could build almost anything we want and provide jobs. If this were an environmental project, we should try and get people out of their cars. Is this an environmental justice project? I mean, come on. This is not an environmental justice project. If this is a congestion project, we should be doing congestion pricing. So I wish we could free engineers who put a lot of time and energy, and the consultants, all of the dollars that go into



that into solving problems that the city and citizens actually want. There's a lot of drive here to build a better city and I hope that we can do that, just not this one. Thanks.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Allen Vogt

Comment: I do not support the proposed Rose Quarter project.

Relieving congestion is an important part of improving our transportation system, but this project will not address that goal. However, there are numerous studies that show that adding highway space leads no improvement in traffic levels due to induced demand. Increased supply with no accompanying increase in price just lead to more use! In fact the only proven method to decrease traffic volume is through market (congestion) pricing. We need to implement congestion pricing!

There are some that argue that the cost of congestion pricing (tolls) would fall on inequitably on the poor. However, this ignores the fact that drivers tend to be wealthier than non-drivers and that there are many alternative investment opportunities available (transit) that would benefit low income citizens more than the proposed project.

Finally, 40% of carbon emissions come from transportation. In order to meet our stated carbon reduction goals, not investing in carbon intensive projects is a no brainer. Meeting goals that will impact our children and generations to come is a moral imperative. How can we not incorporate carbon reduction goals in public project evaluations?

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Allison Cloo

Comment: I drive across Portland every day in order to get from my home in Sandy to my office in Tigard. Many people are forced to make similar commutes as the result of jobs moving or needing to relocate their own families. I know that others like myself are still opposed to a freeway expansion that would do little to improve congestion. More cars will fill the gap. It's a never-ending race and the only winner is pollution from the cars and the concrete itself as it releases CO2.

I strongly urge you to re-prioritize public transportation and bike/pedestrian access as a way to reduce traffic where possible.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Allison Sliter

Comment: I'm writing in opposition to the Rose Quarter freeway expansion project. We don't need to speed up driving times just to slow down other forms of transportation, it's inconsistent with our climate change policy goals, it increases pollution and air toxics in the vicinity of a school, and it's a whole lot of money that could be better spent elsewhere.



I'm currently a car-commuter. I live in SE Portland and drive to Beaverton every day. And I hate it. I hate every second spent in my car. But taking my commute from a 40 minute commute to a 35 minute commute would change my experience of my drive not at all. I drive because the transit option is brittle (I can miss transfers too easily) and takes too long. If I had a transit option that took less than an hour, I would 100% take that. Saving me 5 minutes on a drive actually makes my quality of life worse than it would if you gave me good service to Beaverton.

We're relatively blessed in the NW for having a lot of our electricity generated by renewables already and our mild climate means we spend little energy on heating and cool - so the remaining carbon emissions are overwhelmingly coming from transportation. Most Oregonians are burning fossil fuels with every vehicle mile they drive. Do you really believe that we can continue to have the internal-combustion, single occupant vehicle be the dominant form of transportation and not drown in our oceans in the next 100 years? My kids are 1 and 5. If we have any hope of them growing up in at least a tolerable climate as I've had, people need to drive less. Not more. Not even the same amount. And people don't change their ways unless they have to.

And people have! The VMT in Portland has been descending slowly since 1995. That's no accident - we have had comprehensive active transportation policies to improve access to cycling and transit, to improve networks and to make it less painful to give up the car. There *are* good alternatives to driving in Portland. Let's not make them less good.

Cars have gotten cleaner in the last 50 years but they still put out airborne toxins. Diesel engines put out carcinogenic fine particulates. My daughter and I both have asthma - which is exacerbated by ozone. Increasing the amount of idling cars next to a school is unconscionable.

Here is a short list of things I would spend \$500M on instead:

- the Sullivan Gulch bike bridge
- Dedicated BRT lanes
- Light Rail to Tigard
- Sidewalks in Outer SE
- Safe pedestrian crossing on all 5 lane arterial
- Road diets for Hawthorne Blvd, Cesar Chavez,
- New coaches for the Street Car
- Extending the Orange Line to Oregon City
- Extending the Yellow Line to Clark County
- Extending the Green Line to Oregon City
- Emergency, Temporary, and Permanent Housing for the folks living on the I205 MUP
- Frequent Service on the 17-Holgate line
- Bring Back Fareless Square



- Amtrak service improvements between Portland and Eugene

Literally any of these would be better - as none of them are likely to increase VMT in the Portland Metro area.

Thanks for reading, if you did!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 Allyse Heartwell

Comment: According to EA data, the project will increase vehicle miles traveled and overall vehicle trips. Given the GHG emissions goals of both Portland and metro, this seems like it should be a no-go. We should not be building things that encourage people to drive more, hard stop. Public monies are better spent—indeed urgently needed—for infrastructure that reduces personal vehicle use, like public transit and bike safety improvements. I strongly support the portions of the project that make neighborhood walking and biking safer. But inasmuch as improving traffic flow = more trips made. I find it hard to believe that emissions will be reduced. And that's just not good enough in 2019. Do better.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Alon Raab

Comment: I am writing to express my strong opposition to the planned Rose Quarter freeway expansion. Research conducted over many years has clearly shown that expanding freeways does not solve congestion and that the damage to our health, livability and the planet's survival is a price that is not worth paying.

Please reject this idea and instead focus and dedicate resources to improve public transportation (more frequent and free), add trams and ferries in Portland, expand inter-city train service (including 'bullet trains'), and create safe and protected bicycle lanes and infrastructure, as bicycles are among the best ways to combat greenhouse gas emissions.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Althea and Timur Ender

Comment: We are writing to provide comments as it relates to the Environmental Assessment for the I-5 highway expansion project.

Air Quality

I am deeply concerned about air quality. Until recently, our infant child was enrolled at a daycare facility on N. Flint immediately adjacent to this project area for 6 months. The air quality issues surrounding the existing poor air quality in this area was the single most important driving factor in taking her out of daycare and moving our child to another location. We were able to switch daycares because we had the means; many of our child's classmates do not have the luxury to make that choice. During our morning walks to daycare on the Flint street



bridge, I could hear my 6 month old infant child cough due to the poor air quality. When I saw 2 year old kids playing outside, I couldn't help but notice the exposure to poor air quality that they were surrounded by. It is my opinion that this highway expansion project will only make this worse by attracting more cars and therefore more congestion and idling vehicles.

Surface streets

One of the best things cities can do to encourage sustainability is to provide opportunities for safe, convenient options for biking and walking. The Flint street bridge is one of the most used bicycle corridors anywhere in a major US city. It is unacceptable that this project does not replace this bridge or restore the grid network to provide this direct access. The extra effort required by people who bike under the proposed plan should be considered in the EA as a negative environmental impact. If biking is less convenient, people will likely shift to other modes which impacts the environmental health of this district and the city.

Funding

Highway expansion mega projects are notorious for cost overruns. Further, this funding can be allocated elsewhere where the safety need is greater given that it is a discretionary decision by state lawmakers and not federally obligated funds. Arterials in East Portland are statistically much more deadly than this stretch of I-5. No one denies that a highway should have a shoulder but a lot of people feel that highway widening with added lanes and providing a shoulder is not worth the \$500 million cost when there are other more pressing community priorities as expressed by neighborhood and advocacy groups.

Tolling

Tolling is the single policy that actually solves congestion. This should be implemented first, ensuring that it is equitable for all involved. We need to make our transportation system work for freight and people who need to drive. Tolling the corridor would remove discretionary trips off of the system and could also improve transit, biking, and walking. This should proceed any effort to widen the highway.

Data

The claims surrounding greenhouse gas emissions being reduced under the plan to build more highway lanes ignores the concept of induced demand and is not a believable assertion. I am curious as to what this claim is based off of.

"The Build Alternative would not create new capacity or add substantial capacity to the existing highway." This is from the EA and I find it to be both untrue and misleading. The proposed project does add highway lanes and therefore capacity. The simple truth is that the build proposal has more lanes than what is there today even if they connect ramps throughout the corridor. More lanes induce the demand for more driving which means air quality, congestion, and climate change are all pushed in the wrong direction. The inability to acknowledge the principle of induced demand is a failure of the environmental assessment.

Conclusion



I feel the items mentioned above are not adequately addressed in the EA and I think it is critical that this project have a full Environmental Impact Statement if it is to move forward. The best alternative would be to reallocate the funding to arterials where people are actually dying, toll the I-5 corridor, and to improve surface streets above the highway without expanding the I-5 corridor.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Amanda Caffall

Comment: Please do not widen I-5 in Portland. Please do not spend \$500M on roads that will significantly degrade public transit and public spaces. We can't road-build our way out of population growth. We certainly shouldn't try to if we care about climate change, and, if we care about the future habitability of the planet, we do.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0000 Amanda Kimball

Comment: The proposed crossing bridge to replace the Flint St bridge has unreasonably steep grade; a 5% grade is already a sweaty haul up possibly including biking from a raised position, but a 9% grade seems unreasonably challenging. How can you guarantee or conclude that widening the freeway and increasing the flow of traffic will reduce crashes when ODOT's own data suggests that a majority of crashes are due to high speeds? The reduction of greenhouse gasses from the whole project is only 0.2%, is there really no cleaner way to build this project?

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Amanda Gilmore

Comment: Expanding the I-5 freeway is a short sighted solution to a more integrated problem that Portland is facing. There isn't a *single* city that has successfully relieved traffic congestion by expanding a freeway, and based on our current rate of expansion, adding lanes won't even keep up. We should be channeling our resources into making our mass transit systems faster, more reliable, and more accessible to more Portlanders.

Or even better, create a network of bicycle expressway lanes in the style of the Netherlands or Denmark. Portland already has a strong bicycle culture and infrastructure, and not only would redoubling our investments in it be more environmentally friendly, it will make for a pleasanter and more equitable city.

I don't own a car because it's unnecessarily expensive. By investing in cleaner and environmentally sustainable infrastructure, we're also enabling lower income Portlanders to travel, regardless of whether they can afford a car.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0402 Amanda Plyley

Comment: I'm writing to express opposition to the freeway expansion in the Rose Quarter. I believe that adding more lanes just encourages more single car drivers. I would like to see other solutions explored to traffic congestion. I commute approximately 5.5 miles everyday between SE Portland and John's Landing. Instead of driving my (fuel efficient) car, I choose to ride my bike or take the bus. It takes equal or less time than driving. I think this is the healthiest choice for me and for my fellow citizens of Portland. I would like to see our spending prioritized on projects that help more people access rapid transit instead of individual cars on highways. I believe the communities who are adjacent to the proposed expansion deserve an Environmental Impact Statement and to have their health concerns treated seriously. More car traffic through Portland is not a healthy choice for people or our climate, in the short term or the long term. Thank you for your attention to the widespread community input on this matter.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Amanda Poole

Comment: Please no freeway expansion!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Amanda Rhoades

Comment: I'm interested in a paper copy of the environmental assessment that I could pick up and take home with me. Is that something that's available and if so, what is the cost?

Attachments: N/A

2019 0308 Amanda Wickham

Comment: I strongly oppose the freeway expansion project for the I-5 Rose Quarter. Los Angeles spent \$1 billion widening a section of the 405 freeway; after five years of construction, rush hour commute times increased or were exactly the same. So after millions of dollars in wasted money, negative environmental impacts, displacement of local communities (predominately populated by people of color), and years of grumpy travelers stuck in delays and detours, the net result is the same. Why would we try the same failed strategy here? That is a maddening waste of resources, especially at a time when our community needs to be making the necessary changes to combat further climate change and prepare for the future in a climate-changed world in the absence of federal leadership. Investment in public transportation, biking, and walking must be the priority for our city's future.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0402 Amanda Zuniga

Comment: I am writing to voice my opposition to the Rose Quarter freeway expansion. Surely you recognize that this is not the vision of Portland in which the community has worked so hard to build since the last era of redevelopment from urban renewal and policies of racial discrimination in NE Portland. I recognize that many other voices have written to express the issues with the expansion, and I would like to reiterate the ones that I feel should provide enough context to vote against this proposal.

Data has clearly illustrated that traffic congestion cannot and will not be solved by widening a freeway. Long term, this project will fail to address the ultimate issue which is reliance on fossil fuels and single occupied vehicles. Not to mention that the impact of increased vehicular traffic exposes students and staff at nearby Harriet Tubman Middle School to increased air pollution. The current proposal fails to address the vulnerability of the population at Harriet Tubman.

If Oregon wants to truly commit to fighting against climate change, then why are we proposing to spend \$500 million (likely more) towards a project that does nothing to decrease the overall carbon output from transportation. More innovative approaches such as decongestion pricing and rapid bus transit lanes provide a much easier avenue to implement to address the issues of bottleneck congestion.

Nevertheless, if any of the aforementioned points fail to convince you that the freeway expansion should be opposed, please consider the fact that ODOT's data has been questioned by experts and professionals in the field of traffic engineering and environmental science. The community asks that ODOT provide a full Environmental Impact Statement to focus on the health and safety impacts of this project. A collaborative and thorough process must be followed before making changes to Portland at such a grand scale. Please consider how decisions made today with misleading and inaccurate information will impact our future.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0225 Amber Canavan

Comment: I am a resident of Sellwood-Moreland neighborhood in SE Portland and I oppose the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion plan. While I share ownership of a car with my husband, I drive a little as possible and take public transportation or use my bicycle as much as possible. I love Portland because it is a city willing to invest in non-car infrastructure, which is why it is baffling that so much money might be spent increasing the footprint of the freeway. Please instead use this money for public transportation such as bicycle, bus, or Max improvements that will really tackle air quality, carbon emissions, public health, and congestion relief.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0402 Amelia Good

Comment: I strongly believe that the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project will not only fail to deliver the improvements it promises, but it will have an overall detrimental effect on Portland, the state of Oregon, and our planet.

ODOT's primary motivation is to improve traffic flow on I5 through Portland. To get buy-in from the city, they're throwing in the sweeteners of freeway caps and some nominal pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure improvements. All of this for the high price of half a billion dollars and years of construction, assuming all goes as planned.

The changes to pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure are treated too much as an afterthought in this plan. The sparse details currently available have caused both the PBOT Bicycle Advisory Committee and Pedestrian Advisory Committee to endorse the No Build alternative. One concrete detail of the bike plan that particularly concerns me is the removal of the quiet Flint Street bridge, and diversion of bike traffic onto a main car thoroughfare with an unprotected bike lane. I worry that these types of concerns will fall to the wayside as the project moves forward with priority #1: the freeway.

In terms of mitigating congestion, I believe the overall approach of widening the freeway with additional entry and exit lanes simply will not work. If vehicle volumes were to stay the same, then yes, the additional capacity might provide for more smoothly flowing traffic. However, history has proven time and again that this temporarily unencumbered flow will only invite more driving, recreating just as much congestion within a few short years, and this time with more cars. This phenomenon of induced demand cannot be overlooked (as it was in the EA), especially in light of Portland's growing population.

Once we acknowledge that the increased freeway capacity will result in more vehicle miles traveled (VMT), the claim in the EA that vehicle emissions could go down as a result of this project is laughable. This project has the potential to dramatically increase emissions as well as pollution in the immediate area, and the EA completely failed to consider anything beyond a best case scenario of zero VMT increase.

As global warming looms large in the next couple decades, we have a responsibility to decrease emissions as much as possible. Since the transportation sector makes up such a large share of greenhouse gas emissions in Oregon as well as globally, we must take an extra critical look at these types of projects to ensure that they are moving us in the right direction. Committing resources to make driving easier is questionable to begin with, and the I5 RQIP purposely ignores its environmental consequences, inadequately modifies infrastructure for alternative modes, all while failing to mitigate congestion on I5. No build!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Amie Riley and Joe Buck

Comment: The madness has to stop. Congestion is increasing because people around the country are coming to the Portland area for a particular way of life, let's cultivate what they came



her for versus an easier commute. We say this as commuters ourselves! Let's stay committed to our ethics of sustainability and community care by investing this vast sum into transportation solutions that will serve all of us with long term vision.

Students at Harriet Tubman middle school can't play outside because of I5 emissions already, Exxon just spent almost 4 million dollars promoting a fossil fuel future in Facebook ads, and there are 1000s of statistics and stories just like this. As a new mother of an incredible new little girl, when I imagine her future as a Portland citizen I must ask why this is a path we are doubling down on? Can we not envision any better ways to invest half a billion dollars in our steps towards a Portland of the future? Do not build this expansion. Just don't do it.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Amy

Comment: We do NOT need any more freeways in Portland! Stop turning this city into a car exhaust wasteland! We have enough freeways! Freeways destroy the city's beauty and the nature around it. Keep Portland the way it is and encourage people to ride share or take alternate transportation. New freeways are NOT the answer. The people of Portland don't want them.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0313 Amy Borden

Comment: Please don't invest in projects that don't actively reduce driving, and have been proven to do so, such as congestion pricing. This is also an awful plan for area school children's air quality. Let's be the city we tell people we are.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Amy Borden

Comment: This plan seemed dicey in the first place, especially considering climate change and pollution affecting Harriet Tubman Middle School, but the recent revelation that ODET is not even modeling in good faith by including traffic patterns and congestion from the I5 plan that's all but dead, means I no longer trust ODET to serve in the public interest. I oppose this plan.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Amy Hall

Comment: I've lived in Portland, Oregon for 20 years and have two teenagers who already are embracing the wonderful public transit options we have available in this city. We only have a little over a decade to lower carbon emissions (based on IPPC report) or we will be locked into an unsustainable future. We need to be lowering carbon emissions and not creating more cars



on the road. Please don't create the infrastructure that will increase our issues of air pollution. Adding expansions is the wrong direction.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Amy Hansen

Comment: As a mother, I support increasing our reliance on public transportation, rather than encouraging individual vehicle travel.

Transportation emissions account for 40% of greenhouse gas emissions in Oregon, so why would we invest \$500 million dollars in a project that would add capacity for traffic? New transportation infrastructure projects must address our crises with climate change, air quality, and equity, not make them worse. Unfortunately, the proposed I-5 Rose Quarter Expansion Project-- like all other freeway expansion projects-- will increase traffic congestion, carbon emissions, and air pollution, and do so right in the backyard of Harriet Tubman Middle School where the pollution is already so bad that public health experts recommend students forgo outdoor recess.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Amy Hansen

Comment: As a mother who cherishes our State's beautiful ecosystems, I kindly ask for a full Environmental Impact Statement. I am concerned that ODOT's truncated Environmental Assessment document simply isn't focused enough on the significant impacts to health and public safety this project represents. Let's instead more fully study alternatives (including decongestion pricing!) to this expansion with a full Environmental Impact Statement.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0309 Amy Iannone

Comment: I would like to record my disapproval for any plans to create more space for more fossil fuel burning vehicles. No more freeway expansions! Mother Nature is done with her warnings. All plans for transportation solutions from here on out need to not include anything that supports more fossil fuel emissions. Solutions need to be electric. Solutions need to be out of the box thinking.

How about offices have access to more showers & safe parking for more bike commuting? How about more investment in technical improvements so more people can work at home more days of the week? How about investing in a lot more public transportation that reaches more neighborhoods and free public transportation on weekends/evenings?

I know there are many innovative solutions from experts in preventing climate change. This is where we need to be headed. My kids deserve to want children of their own. I never thought I'd



dissuade them from having kids, but our leaders don't seem to be taking this issue seriously. No more freeways!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Amy Murray

Comment: Please do not widen I-5 in Portland. Please do not spend \$500M on roads that will significantly degrade public transit and public spaces.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Amy Pate

Comment: Freeway expansions are an old-fashioned, outdated solution to an ever increasing problem. We should be thinking of the future and using technology to improve our cities and our lives. Lead us into the future.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0227 Amy Robbins

Comment: Regarding the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project. Please scrap this project. I'm originally from Southern California and know very well that widening freeways is pointless. They become clogged again in no time, and it encourages the commuting lifestyle which simply increases pollution and speeds climate change. Spend the money on projects that decrease the number of vehicles on the road and make roads safer for all users. Then toll the roads and bridges to pay for their maintenance and more projects that reduce greenhouse emissions. Focus those projects in areas that have suffered the most from past bad practices. We've all been brainwashed to believe our lifestyle is just fine. It's not. It needs to change. Facilitate projects that move us into a stable and healthy future, not ones that reinforce a 1950's world view.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Amy Subach

Comment: Freeway expansion would take Portland backwards: air quality near the expansion would worsen; congestion would drop for a year or two then go back to how it was or worse; and more people would be encouraged to take single occupancy vehicle trips. This expansion is not only a waste of money, especially when you factor in the risk of a cascading subduction zone earthquake over the next 50 years. We should be investing in efficient public transit and alternatives to cars. For the good of our children, and for ourselves, and for the entire planet, I beg you to stop this freeway expansion and use the money to bring Portland and SW Washington into the future and the fight to stop Climate Change.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0402 Ana Berry

Comment: Please oh please don't waste an estimated \$500 million on expanding a freeway through the center of our beautiful east side. You all know we can do better for the planet and for Portlanders by continuing to invest in bicycle friendly, public transportation, and pedestrian options. OHSU sets a great model and precedent for Portland by offering kickbacks for alternative transportation and making parking almost prohibitively expensive... Please think outside the box. You expand the freeway and more people drive, and congestion continues, as does pollution. that's how it will go and you know it!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0315 Ana Tighe

Comment: The major thing that sets Portland apart from other cities is that, in general, we have not followed the herd for transportation planning. I am an avid bicycle commuter, and I have met people who moved to Portland specifically because of the cycling infrastructure. Improving alternative transportation options is what will bring Portland the most gains for the future.

ODOT has done nothing to prove this project will in any way improve congestion on the I-5, which usually experiences a bottleneck at the Interstate bridge, which will not be helped by wasting money building more freeway space in the Rose Quarter. Back when I used to commute from NE Portland to Tigard every day this is what I saw-- a huge backup from the bridge.

You need to release the data about how much congestion this will relieve, and if it doesn't show a significant improvement then for the good of Portland, abandon this project. I don't trust you and the majority of commenters at the meeting Wednesday don't trust you either.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0303 Ana Wyssmann

Comment: No more freeways! Portland's culture is strong enough to navigate this without a big freeway expansion. We can commit as citizens to lowering our footprint. We can set goals as citizens to carpool and opt out of car time. We can set an example.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0308 Anandi van Diepen-Hedayat

Comment: This proposal is so diametrically opposed to what decision-makers should have learned from decades of research by planners, engineers, and environmental scientists. I almost cannot believe we are really considering this in Oregon. I'm joining No More Freeways PDX because freeway expansion has not and will never reduce congestion. We know this. Freeway expansion is tantamount to denying climate change. And this project will cause health harms to Portlanders, and represents a huge environmental injustice. Those in power will be



guilty of severe malpractice if they allow this misguided project to harm us for generations to come.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Andrea Hamberg

Comment: I am terrified about climate change, around the world and in my community. The forests we love are burning beyond control, damaging our wild lands, our agriculture, our drinking water, and our air. Weather systems are out of control, dumping massive flooding rains in some places and contributing to endless drought elsewhere. New diseases are entering our region. Ozone is threatening our very literal hearts and brains.

People around me are having children and I am amazed at their hopefulness in the face of our society's seemingly unending commitment to fossil fuels. A commitment we have despite the clear consensus that we are upending the very systems in which humans evolved to survive; with investments like this freeway expansion we're doubling down on that destruction.

We must stop. We must stop building and expanding roads. There are other, compelling strategies for reducing congestion on this stretch of highway. Strategies like subsidized and free transit passes on a fast and frequent network of buses; like the 20-minute communities the Metro Regional Government and the City of Portland have both committed to, ensuring that a trip to the store does not require a trip on the freeway; like fully-implemented bicycle and pedestrian master plans to ensure that everyone, no matter where they live in the City of Portland, can safely use their bodies to get around their communities; strategies like ODOT's investigation into tolling, and also congestion pricing. The City of Portland and Multnomah County have committed to ending the use of fossil fuels by 2050. And yet, your Draft EA did not fully investigate these climate-friendly congestion-reduction options. You cannot call this an honest assessment of a no-build scenario without taking into account strategies for reducing local vehicle travel.

And more immediately, your Draft EA also did not adequately address air pollution more broadly. While you used the EPA Moves Model to determine regional air quality impacts from this project, you failed to project impacts at the local level. And, in fact, that is the air we all breathe as we drive on the freeway, bike over the freeway, attend school on the edge of the freeway, live or work adjacent to the freeway. When I'm next to the freeway I don't breathe a regional average, I breathe pollution from construction and traffic that's occurring right next to me. That air is the air that can trigger an asthma attack, that contributes to poor birth outcomes and a higher incidence of stroke and Alzheimers in nearby residents. That air is the air I care about, and the only way to know if that air is safe enough to breathe is for you to model the effects of construction and operation at the local level, taking into consideration local conditions that could impact local concentrations, such as topography, meteorology, and buildings. In addition, that assessment needs to include modeling of air toxics and criteria pollutants such as small particulate matter, with data sufficient for determining potential impacts to human health.



This Draft EA has found that traffic safety will improve; however this section of highway is not on the City of Portland or Metro High Crash Networks. Addressing safety on those roadways should be of the highest priority, and fewer resources are available for addressing dangerous stretches of road if we spend \$500 million here. In addition, the fatalities that have been mentioned in the course of this analysis (such as by ODOT staff in local transportation conversations) have causes that are not impacted by roadway design (such as suicide). This EA has not made the case that the region's transportation system will be safer because of the substantial investments proposed on this 1-mile stretch of highway.

Indeed, it seems the roads will be less safe and less convenient for people who bike and walk. The Draft EA shows significant impacts for walking, biking and transit during construction, and slower transit times after construction. In addition, none of the promised biking and walking investments look anything like initial proposals. In an increasingly dense city, in an increasingly dangerous climate, we must double down on our commitment to climate-friendly and healthy active travel.

And, all of this is happening in the historic Albina community. Haven't we done enough harm here? Vanport, Emmanuel Hospital, I-5. Every single "investment" we have made in this part of the city in the last 100 years has come at the expense of the Black/African American members of our community. We must stop and ground an analysis of all projects in this community with an environmental justice/racial equity lens. We need an honest reckoning of the impact of racial bias in our institutions.

And finally, this Draft EA finds benefits to historically under served communities, yet researchers at Portland State University recommend that children at Harriet Tubman (a majority-minority school), have recess indoors because of poor air quality. And there is insufficient information in the EA to determine how air quality at the school will be impacted by construction and operation of I-5.

I do not find your findings of insignificant impacts to be credible. A project of this size requires a full Environmental Impact Statement, with: detailed air quality monitoring of localized impacts; a full analysis of the safety implications at the project site and surrounding road network; a clear plan for supporting active travel during construction and operation; the honest consideration of all no build options, including a significant increase in investments in active transportation and the implementation of congestion pricing; a environmental justice review of the project, including an analysis of past injustices and impacts; and a full consideration of the human health and economic costs of climate change.

I request that you conduct a full impact statement.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Andrea Pisani

Comment: No comment provided

Attachments: N/A



2019 0318 Andreas

Comment: This project if, if implemented, will be a giant boondoggle, cost far over budget, leave Portlanders indebted because of automotive worship, and does not support the espoused values of the City.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0304 Andrejs Galeniaks

Comment: Having lived in and studied a number of cities that have chosen to expand their freeways, I can honestly say that those are cities I least wanted to live in. Portland is a unique city and community and freeway expansion is not the answer to congestion issues (which are not even that bad here). This is not central Florida or southern California and we don't need endless freeway construction projects or wider freeways. There's no need to pave over potentially valuable land for a project that will outgrow itself within a few years. Induced demand is not rocket science and this is not the 1970's, 80's or 90's where the 'answer' to traffic is to throw more money into freeway construction projects. Don't devalue Portland please.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0318 Andrew Clyde

Comment: I've been a small business owner in Portland for 5 years now and one of the reasons I moved here is because I thought it was a forward thinking city. I moved from Texas where they do this add a lane a mile nonsense all the time and let me tell you, that just doesn't work. I would love to see the money go to fixing the streets we already have and looking into more public transit.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Andrew Crampton

Comment: I am very disappointed with ODOT's inconsistent, inaccurate, and inadequate public outreach and public comment process. ODOT has not allowed adequate time for members of the public and partner agencies to review ODOT prepared technical documents during the EA comment period. I would recommend ODOT extend the public comment period in order to allow adoption of an open, collaborative, and transparent public process with an iterative design approach. This will establish trust between ODOT and community partners and result in a project that better meets the needs of the community, environment, and regional transportation system.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0305 Andrew Fleming

Comment: Congestion won't improve. Freeway expansion has never solved traffic congestion, in any North American city, anywhere. Ever! ODOT's own hired consultants admit that this project won't address recurring traffic congestion on this corridor.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0000 Andrew Holtz

Comment: The project benefits do not justify the cost. If we are going to spend about \$500 million, we should get much more than just slightly better air quality and greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, even if there are some safety improvements, again the project is not cost-effective. Far greater reductions in injuries and fatalities could be achieved by putting the resources into dedicated safety projects at high priority locations. Even if we had money to spare (and we don't) this project does not produce benefits that justify the expense.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Andrew Kaiser

Comment: Please no more freeway expansions! I live near the rose quarter and I don't want the expansion to ruin the livability of my neighborhood. It won't fix the problem!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Andrew M

Comment: Freeway expansions incentivizes more traffic. More lanes equals more merging and more slowdown. This stretch could be used more efficiently instead of adding lanes and extending the highway. Use the money on public transit cause it's the right call.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Andrew Martin

Comment: One project justification is safety. The EA fails to describe how highway widening (auxiliary lanes) will improve safety. Project materials note that these lanes will "improve" travel speeds, which one assumes means increase travel speeds. The EA also notes that speed greatly increases severity of collisions. At the same time, the safety analysis notes that a majority of crashes are the result of 'following too closely'. In this regard, the proposed widening on I-5 fails to meet the project needs, specifically I-5 Safety, and does not accomplish the goals, specifically "... improve safety for all modes on the transportation network...". The highway cap and bike/ped improvements do meet these goals, but auxiliary lanes do not. Further, the EA fails to consider all alternatives. ODOT recently conducted a value pricing study that would address many of the same issues. A combination of value pricing (which ODOT found would reduce congestion and improve reliability) and bicycle pedestrian improvements reasonably



could meet the project Needs, Goals, and Objectives. Arguably a combination of value pricing and bike/ped improvements would meet the PNGOs better than highway widening and bike/ped improvements would. Oregonians are unable to compare these alternatives because value pricing was not considered. I believe this is a serious flaw in the EA and fails to allow for informed decision making.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Andrew McCollough

Comment: I entirely reject the premise that Oregon's future lies in adding to the sunk costs of the obsolete fossil fuel industry and I urge ODOT to put their money into infrastructure projects that will benefit all Oregonians far into the future. Freeways fail to achieve ODOT's and other Oregonian's goals because:

- * Freeways do not reduce congestion in the medium or long term. Multiple studies show that congestion pricing reduces trips while freeway expansion increase trips. And therefore pollution.
- * Expanding freeways bring pollution closer to where people live and cause severe negative health effects.
- * Investing further in obsolete technology reduces funds available for Oregon's to invest in the transportation technology that a robust and resilient Portland will need in the future. Specifically, bus, rail, ferry, bike, and pedestrian infrastructure.
- * The proposed expansion destroys historically underprivileged neighborhoods.

In short, the proposed freeway expansion is a poor use of public resource, shortchanges Oregon's future, poses a threat to public health and safety, and will destroy or severely compromise already precarious neighborhoods. I oppose this freeway expansion and I urge ODOT to immediately cease this project.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Andrew Neerman

Comment: As a business owner located on N Mississippi, I'd like to register my disapproval of ODOT's proposal to expand capacity on I-5 through Lower Albina.

At a time when we are facing catastrophic climate change we need to be urgently exploring ways to reduce demand for single-occupancy vehicle use. This proposal, despite ongoing attempts at obfuscation by ODOT, will clearly induce further demand for that section of freeway, ultimately resulting in even worse congestion and air pollution. The people who will suffer from this increase in pollution are primarily area residents who have already felt the devastating effects of wholesale displacement due to the original construction of the freeway and what we now call the "Rose Quarter". The students at Harriet Tubman Middle School are

particularly vulnerable. The proposal goes against priorities outlined in Portland's Climate Action Plan and seriously undermines the vision outlined in the Albina Vision Plan.



I'd like to join the Street Trust, Albina Vision Trust, Metro, PBOT's pedestrian and bicycling advisory committees, the Portland Public Schools Board and many others in calling for for a full environmental impact statement and for full transparency on the part of ODOT and other participating agencies. The use of data from the unbuilt CRC to create traffic estimates (while the effects of planned decongestion tolling remain un-mentioned) is especially galling and makes ODOT appear to be an untrustworthy partner with nefarious motives. The agency's long legacy of autocrism and unresponsive bureaucracy must be reformed immediately.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and I look forward to this project either being abandoned or radically re-imagined.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Andrew P Leyva

Comment: We should not be unnecessarily expanding highways. We should be increasing green public transit. Climate Change must be addressed and enlarging highways doesn't help congestion (as many studies have show) and will only add to pollution and greenhouse gasses.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0322 Andrew Pomeroy

Comment: No more freeway expansions please. These transportation projects IN NO WAY solve the problems they're supposed to. Pretending the data on the matter doesn't exist is a slap in the face to each and every one of us taxpayers.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Andrew Schwartz

Comment: Traffic in Portland is terrible. No one can deny that. Rush hour seems to last from 730a-730p most every day. It's exhausting which is why my wife and I favor our bikes to our car now.

Given the known science on climate change and the need to move away from gas-burning vehicles - and that Portland is expected to grow dramatically over the next 30 years - it figures that the best use of our resources is not to invest in outdated infrastructure technology but instead to invest in the transportation we will need in the future. I would love that \$500m go towards mixed use walking and bike paths, increased and improved lite-rail, and expanded public transportation options than towards outmoded, climate change inducing roadways.

More roads does not equal less traffic. More roads will mean more cars and more pollution and more future gridlock. Please do not invest in more roads. It's a bad idea.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0401 Andrew Singelakis

Washington County, Oregon

Comment: On behalf of Washington County Land Use & Transportation, I am writing to express support for the Rose Quarter project. This project will improve access and mobility for Washington County residents, businesses and the region as a whole.

Interstate 5 (I-5) is the key route through the region and the state, the region's major freight route and the key connection between Washington County and the airport for transport of high value goods. The bottlenecks on I-5 in the Rose Quarter are well documented as are the associated costs associated with congestion. Construction of the improvements at the Rose Quarter along with the improvements in other bottlenecks at Hwy 217 and I-205 are priorities for our region.

I encourage you to continue efforts to complete the environmental process and secure funding for these improvements.

Attachments: [2019 0401 Andrew Singelakis ATT](#)

2019 0327 Andrew Winterman

Comment: This freeway expansion is a terrible idea. Nobody needs it except for Washington suburbanites upset that the whole world isn't made for their convenience. Choosing to live in the boonies and work in the city is a choice with consequences. Development in the city should be for the people in the city; which this emphatically is not. It will also not actually help traffic, since it will simply induce greater demand from communities even further out. No no no no no can I say no any more emphatically no.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Andrey Bratchikov

Comment: No comment provided

Attachments: N/A

2019 0225 Andy McMillan

Comment: I am a resident of Portland, Oregon writing to state my opposition to the proposed expansion of I-5.

It has been well documented for decades that expanding capacity for traffic only leads to induced demand. The idea that adding a lane would lead to decreased congestion and travel times is incorrect—something I'm glad ODOT's own consultation concluded.

We need to be taking immediate action against climate change and reducing our carbon emissions. Not only can we not accommodate more cars in our city, we have to start passing



likely unpopular legislation to limit the use of cars, especially for able-bodied folks making unnecessary single passenger journeys.

Tolls, decongestion pricing, and increasing the cost of owning and parking cars will have to be countered with bold, progressive legislation that prioritizes affordable, equitable transit and vastly improved infrastructure for cyclists and pedestrians.

Expanding I-5 would be an expensive, critical mistake that generations ahead of us will be paying for with their health. I urge you to move forward with the plans for improving the Rose Quarter without expanding I-5.

Thank you for reading my comments, and taking them into consideration.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Andy Palmquist

Comment: I am a Northeast Portland resident who deeply opposes the I-5 Rose Quarter project as currently presented. This plan comes across as the state trying to jam a square solution into a round hole. ODOT's complete obfuscation of facts about the project also established deep skepticism among many locals concerning this project.

There is very little about this project that makes sense. The concept that adding 1 merging lane will significantly lower carbon emissions is patently ridiculous. Moving freeway lanes nearer to Tubman Middle School makes absolutely zero sense and continues to emphasize the fact that children from lower-income families suffer more under plans like this.

I am a daily bike commuter that uses North Flint Ave regularly and find both the elimination of that bridge as well as the new arrangement of North Vancouver/Williams and Weidler to be extremely underwhelming and not properly servicing anyone.

There is also a significant amount of doubt about ODOT's intentions and the open-ended possibility of adding traffic lanes in the near future. If that is the case ODOT is doing the public a severe disservice. This project should not see the light of day and should go back to the drawing board.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Angela Dicianno

Comment: This highway expansion project is in direct contradiction to the city resolution to Decrease our carbon output by 2035. The science proves that building new lanes of traffic does Not lessen traffic flow - it only instantly fills up with more cars. Encouraging more cars to drive through the city is the opposite of the direction that we need to be moving. We need people to be taking transit and riding bikes as much as possible. Large highways and overpasses are also not conducive to a good quality of life for the urban residents and pedestrians that frequent this area of town. The Environmental Assessment should take into account climate change and the damage this project will do into the future - building for the past is a waste of money and a



huge risk. This project should be minimized to existing roadway maintenance and safety, not for highway expansion.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Angela Zehava

Comment: I am beyond shocked that anyone would think it is a good idea to increase pollution levels at Harriet Tubman. This is environmental racism! This historic school needs to be cleaned up, supported and preserved, not poisoned.

Secondly, we could spend this money on a light rail expansion in the I5 corridor. When I am sitting in traffic on a blessedly infrequent trip to Vancouver, I have often wished that light rail went past the airport to Vancouver.

Congestion is not the problem we need to solve- climate change is. I actually think that traffic congestion is a great deterrent that prevents people from making poor environmental choices. We should be requiring solar on new buildings, subsidizing residential solar retrofits, and rolling out biking infrastructure and light rail.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Anika Ghirnikar

Comment: Please do not widen I-5 in Portland. Please do not spend \$500M on roads that will significantly degrade public transit and public spaces. We need to invest in public transportation, widening this freeway will not help congestion and will just make our air dirtier. We do not need this freeway expansion.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Anissa Pemberton

350PDX

Comment: My name is Anissa Pemberton (they/them/theirs), and I am the Just-Transition and Equity Organizer at 350PDX. Today, it is unfortunate that I have to write ODOT to voice my opposition to Freeway Expansion that is being considered. As a climate justice advocate who is also a low-income person of color who takes public transit, it has been my experience that public transit in the city is not accessible or easy to navigate. When 40% of Oregon's carbon emissions come from transportation-- as a recent Oregonian article pointed out, Oregon simply cannot decarbonize our transportation sector without driving a lot less.

If we are going to spend \$500,000,000 on a transportation project that addresses the urgent existential threat that climate change represents, this money should be spent on improving and prioritizing public transportation and building walkable communities. \$500M could be spent on a litany of other projects and needs across the region - including building a lot of sidewalks in East Portland, bus rapid transit lines across town, or be a solid down payment towards the proposed



underground light rail tunnel. And unlike a freeway widening, all of those investments would be better for air quality, carbon emissions, public health, and congestion relief. Freeway expansion has never solved traffic congestion, in any North American city, anywhere. ODOT's own hired consultants admit that this project won't address recurring traffic congestion on this corridor. The way to reduce congestion is to invest in public transit infrastructure.

Related to these issues, there are numerous concerns about the surface-level bicycle and pedestrian facilities currently proposed. ODOT intends to remove the Flint Avenue crossing (one of the city's most popular bike commuting routes), the proposed "lids" over the freeway won't be strong enough to support buildings like the Albina Vision is proposing, and is opposed by all major bike/ped groups and local neighborhood organizations (we wrote a letter to Portland City Hall last year articulating the ways the surface-level street changes are not an improvement to the community). This is deeply concerning as biking is one of the meaningful ways individuals can reduce their carbon footprint.

It will also increase in air pollution in communities that are already sacrifice zones to pollution. This project proposes to expand a freeway into the backyard of Harriet Tubman Middle School, where air pollution is already so bad that PSU's researchers recommended that students forgo outdoor recess. This is an environmental justice issue - 40% of Tubman's students are Black.

Decongestion Pricing should be implemented before expansion. Road pricing is the only policy actually proven to reduce traffic congestion; it's also proven to improve air quality and reduce carbon emissions as well. Why is ODOT moving forward with a \$500 million boondoggle investment without first instituting congestion pricing to see if that mechanism wouldn't solve the traffic problems on the corridor *without* sinking half a billion dollars into the expansion? ODOT's studies of traffic patterns of the proposed freeway expansion *completely* ignore the reality that the state is mandated with moving forward with decongestion pricing, which will enormously impact how many people choose to drive on the corridor and greatly reduce congestion. There are meaningful, valid concerns about how to implement decongestion pricing fairly â€“ we've explored that in letters to the Oregon Transportation Committee last year.

Thank you for taking into account these concerns from a lived experience and the scientific reality of how to reduce air pollution, carbon emissions, and congestion in Oregon. I encourage you to follow up with me via email or phone to talk about how 350PDX can be involved in conversations about freeway expansion. I encourage you to listen to frontline communities who will bear the brunt of freeway expansion, both in the near term of air pollution and in the long-term in the impacts of the climate crisis.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Anita Bigelow

Comment: I think tolling or congestion pricing would do more for lessening traffic jams than adding space could do. Likely for less money.

Expansion just gives more room for pollution. Plus while construction is going on, which could be a very long time, Portland traffic would be a mess.



ODOT, if it is interested in transportation without pollution, should invest in more frequent diesel truck emission testing and give support grants to public transportation.

Part of our congestion problem in Portland is huge construction projects, both on busy arterials and smaller residential streets. Permitting happens without apparent regard as to how the pattern of closed or narrowed thoroughfares is going to adversely effect traffic flow. Given that this seems destined to last for, well, forever, adding a huge I5 project any time soon is a terrible idea.

Thank you for your consideration.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Anita Lindsay

Comment: I believe that this moment of time is asking our community to look to the future and makes choices that will enhance our environment and community with less traffic and pollution .

Reflecting on the theory of Induced Demand, that an increased infrastructure results overtime the same or more congestion that it was trying to mitigate, I strongly recommend that you commission an Environmental Impact Statement.

I am afraid that the positive results achieved,after the proposed project will ultimately make the neighborhood and environment less healthy.

I know that Oregon can be a beacon for the country, leading us to a future of sustainablen living.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0218 Ann Triebwasser

Comment: Thank you! I am so happy to hear about this project! It sounds great and beneficial to so many people. For me, the impact would mean an easier (and hopefully shorter) commute from the Montgomery Park building in Northwest Portland to my home in Gresham. In my commutes, I take the Fremont Bridge to I-5, and in the evening I connect from I-5 to I-84 and the Rose Quarter are is in need of a new design.

Thumbs up from this Multnomah County resident!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0317 Anna

Comment: Portland is a unique place and if highway expansions solve nothing, then people need evolve and seek new commuting solutions. With all the cool new motorized decives it would be more cost effective to ride/bike/skate into work. It is healthier for the individual and the environment. We also live in the PNW and have the gear available to be comfortable in bad weather. What will it take for people to want to make this change?

Attachments: N/A



2019 0401 Anna Belais

Comment: Investing in fossil fuel infrastructure is climate denialism. We have less than 12 years to mitigate warming and should absolutely NOT be prioritizing any additional infrastructure for personal motor vehicles. ODOT should muster the courage and integrity of those who opposed the Mt. Hood Freeway 50 years ago to make the right decision now for our future.

Freeway expansion will only induce demand, increase pollution, make other modes of transportation less safe and available, and solidify Oregon's regressive environmental policy. We should be leading by example in urban sustainability and livability. Please do not waste half a billion dollars of taxpayer money on this awful project.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0319 Anna Bell-Hibbs

Comment: Expanding freeways no longer makes sense. Traffic solutions need to focus on drawing people out of their cars, not encouraging more drivers on the road. Freeway expansion is not supported by evidence (traffic will eventually increase to the same congestion levels we struggle with now). Local residences and schools are already exposed to toxic exhaust levels. This is simply backwards thinking that should embarrass Portland planners.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Anna Cowen

Comment: If this passes, please include provision to provide lifetime respiratory healthcare for all students at Harriet Tubman Middle School.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Anna Cowen

Comment: Please look into other transportation methods to mitigate traffic congestion. Incentives not to drive; incentives to use public transportation; options for high speed trains; incentives for carpooling; incentives for those that can to work from home or at designated remote work locations.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0313 Anna Fritz

Comment: I am a 19 year resident of Portland, Oregon, a small business owner and one of the creative professionals whose work has helped make this city such a vibrant, desirable place to live. Portland is in a unique position to be a leader in stopping climate change and we tout ourselves as such internationally. Now is the moment to invest in infrastructure that *decreases* our carbon emissions, not *increases* them! We are on a collision course with climate chaos. If



we do not take BOLD action to change the way we meet our basic needs, we are facing the end of human life on earth and we're already taking many other species out with us.

What an exciting opportunity this could be to re-imagine our city as a public transportation paradise! Building and expanding freeways is the WRONG direction for Portland and for life on earth. Please kill this project and put our tax dollars toward transportation solutions that rely on human power, wind power, solar power and other creative solutions to the dire situation we are currently in.

Thank you for your work in service of this city. May you consider the well being of our children's children and the thriving of all life when you make decisions on our behalf.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Anna Kelly

Comment: I have many concerns about this project as it stands today. Based on what I have read and people I have spoken with, this project will lead to more driving, fail to address congestion, increase air pollution, create disjointed and largely useless lids, and offer little to any benefit for people walking, biking, and using transit. The traffic safety benefits appear limited to reducing fender benders rather than saving lives or reducing serious injuries.

It also pains me to see us spend half a billion dollars on a transportation project that does nothing to mitigate climate change, given that transportation is the largest single source of climate change emissions.

Please consider reallocating the funding from this project to support projects that meaningfully support walking, biking, and transit. If we want to address congestion, we should move forward first with congestion pricing, and spend the resulting revenue on projects that support walking, biking, and transit.

Given all the issues associated with this project, I support completing a full Environmental Impact Statement.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Anna Longfield

Comment: Hey I am commenting in support of this project. It will make the area safer and help employ multiple trades.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0225 Anne Bryant

Comment: I agree that congestion on the proposed area is increasingly awful I live in SW and I travel this route to the East side several times a week. However, 40% of OR's climate emissions come from transportation. There is plenty of evidence from other cities that freeway expansion = more vehicles, the exact opposite of what we need due to the fast acceleration of climate



disruption. Invest in more accessible public transportation and safe walking and biking routes by putting a fair toll on the freeways around Portland. I would pay for this vs, freeway sprawl. Don't turn Portland into LA.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Anne Elizabeth Hawley

Comment: As a NE Portland resident, I am opposed to this freeway expansion, which will worsen air quality and noise pollution in my neighborhood and through most of the areas in Portland that I visit most frequently.

This project is from the mid-20th century. Putting freeways through Portland was a dumb idea back then. Adding to them in 2019 is unacceptably backward and damaging. Please don't do it.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 Anonymous

Comment: This EA report is highly disingenuous! Its factual basis is suspect. Do not include effects from induced demand from a faster-moving freeway. This must be studied because it will have broad impacts on the air quality, congestion, and safety in the project area and beyond. There is no way to confirm the data used because the source is not made available, raising concerns about its legitimacy. Also, why is congestion pricing not considered as an alternative? It is a reasonably foreseeable possibility – probability – that tolling will be implemented and will be more effective than this project at reducing congestion and improving safety. It must be considered as a separate alternative and combined with the proposed.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 Anonymous 2

Comment: Looks good. I'm very excited about all of the new bike path options.

[arrow to Megan Channell's name] She's pretty rad!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 Anonymous 3

Comment: The assumption that adding lanes to the highway will not add capacity is faulty and misleading. It certainly adds capacity—there are more lanes for more cars!—which will make driving more attractive, induced demand and compounding the negative effects of congestion, pollution, and greenhouse gas emissions.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0307 Anonymous 4

Comment: Congestion pricing please.

What are the results of the travel modeling?

I am opposed to this expansion!!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Anonymous

Comment: * Purpose statement. EA incorrectly indicates improved connectivity. The loss of an existing bridge and out of direction travel for bikes/peds does not improve connectivity. * Need statement. Safety claim is not justified. This location has not had a comparatively high rate of serious and fatal accidents. \$500M could be much better spent on sections of highway where serious/fatal crashes occur. * Need statement. Operations is not justified. Adding lanes at any location anywhere could be an 'operations' project with such general language. * Project goals. Project does not integrate land use. The 'lids' create useless spaces. The Albina Vision would be an example of actually integrating land uses. * Project alternatives. EA fails to include congest pricing/tolling as an alternative. Adding lanes induces demand, tolling reduces demand. Explanation for not including tolling inadequate. * Project alternatives. EA includes the Columbia River Crossing assumption but no assumption for tolling. The CRC is a dead project, tolling is a planned project that should be incorporated. * Auxiliary lanes vs additional lanes. This is a freeway widening. Creating pseudo-terms like auxiliary lanes is misleading. Cross-sections clearly show additional lanes and a much wider footprint. * Impacts on the Eastbank Esplanade from a wider superstructure have not been fully analyzed. The encroachment on the EE degrades this sliver of park. * Impacts of closing Flint are an example of degraded connectivity. * Clackamas Bridge does not create a direct connectivity to the Broadway Bridge. * Lids do not contribute meaningfully as mitigation. Lids must include more usable space to be considered mitigation. * 3.14.2.2. No Build. Sections says that the no build alternative results in additional protected bike lanes, etc. Clarify how no build results in new facilities. * Protected bike lanes. Not clear that the protected' nature of the bike lanes has been demonstrated. Some figures look like buffered bike lanes. Demonstrate that physical protection will be used. Otherwise, these bike lanes should not be considered physically protected. Also inadequate amount of protected bike lanes/multi-use paths in the project area. Insufficiently mitigating impact of freeway widening. * Climate change/air quality impacts. Inducing additional demand for driving does not benefit GHG or air quality. * Hancock-Dixon St. 10% grade (and no protected bike lanes) is not an improvement for people walking and biking. This project is very car-oriented and mitigation has not improved connectivity for people walking and biking. * Hancock-Dixon St. Creating street this steep may have adverse impacts for disabled pedestrians (ADA). * Provide more substantial mitigation for the adverse effect of slower transit times. * Inadequate time public review given that I've heard additional documents have also been recently posted. Need more time. * EA conclusion of no significant impact is flawed. An EIS should be completed to address how the significant impacts to people walking, biking, and



living/working/schooling near this location will be more fully mitigated. EIS should also address congestion pricing and incorporate the Albina Vision as mitigation.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Antonella Mancini

Comment: I will keep my anti-expansion sentiment short and sweet by quoting an ODOT/City of Portland [N/NE Quadrant and I-5 Broadway/Weidler Plans] I-5 Broadway/Weidler Interchange Improvements Report from October 2012 (<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/415776>):

"The profound changes that construction of the Veterans Memorial Coliseum and I-5 freeway brought to the surrounding neighborhoods in the early 1960s understandably remain a sensitive issue. While the coliseum and freeway construction benefitted the desire for regional civic facilities and improved regional and state mobility, these improvements came with the displacement of residents and a commercial district that were the heart of Portland's African-American community. The impacts of these displacements continue to resonate with members of the community to this day and set an important context for any future improvements within the North/Northeast Quadrant."

It is still a sensitive issue. Where is your today, ODOT? Has this community not gone through enough?

Do not expand I-5. There are better solutions and better uses for the \$500M.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Antonella Pagani

Comment: I'm writing in opposition to the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion. I believe this is the wrong approach to alleviating traffic congestion in our city. I don't believe the city should be investing resources into car transportation, but rather put those resources toward programs to reduce carbon emissions. For example, the money for this highway expansion could be put toward a pilot program to make all public transit free, expand bus routes, etc. I'm also concerned about the lack of transparency surrounding this project, as ODOT has not made the supporting data available to community groups.

It is evident that this project is the wrong move for Portland and is being done in the wrong way. I urge ODOT to fully analyze alternatives to this expansion and provide a full Environmental Impact Statement to the public.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0000 April Robbins

Comment: The switch to putting bikes on the sidewalk at weidler and up Williams will be disastrous. That's a commuting route-not a jaunt along and see the sights route. The cyclists ride fast and pedestrians are more dangerous than cars here. The bikers need to be allowed to



use the street. They're just too fast (and should be fast..they're commuting and reducing vehicle traffic) to be in this close of proximity to pedestrians. Or the path must be bikes only and given a barrier from peds and their dogs and kids.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0315 April Streeter

Comment: Freeway expansion ruins Portland neighborhoods and thus the quality of life.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0324 Aquiles Montas

Comment: We need more freeways, semi freeways specially when city has cut lanes to give space to bicycles or max creating more backup specially on interstate corridor, Williams.

Many areas on I 5 needs one more lane for exits and move slow vehicles to next left lanes so in and out is more free. I have many locations where this would help. Feel free to contact me for more details

Attachments: N/A

2019 0215 Art Lewellan

Comment: This professional transit planner sees the project as worthy, congratulations are in order, will be awarded after a careful, generous, problem solving rebuild nears completion. (^: Please consider writing Willamette Week to dispel the notion a published article claimed worsened air quality would result. People still believe that article. Do it. Hello. Also, any sound wall should be minimal, landscaped with a minimal block of views. I am unhappy with all three ZGF Post Office site designs, poor road and ped access, insufficient treescape and daylight.

I am unhappy with Barbur MAX. Scenic beloved treescape clearcut to widen from 4 to 8 lanes beside an ugly noisy 30' buttress wall rising from a mile of sidewalk? Longer crosswalks with 35-45mph traffic? Converting WES to MAX Red Line from AORTA is the no brainer alternative. BRT has an 'opportunity' to serve Barbur way better. I'm absolutely ashamed of Metro/TriMet and City Hall for this horrible error in judgment. Lawsuits are pending you can bet on it.

PS: Request my list of 7 comprehensive concerns and I'll email them over. Thanks ODOT for RQ and Marine Dr @ I-5. Don't do 217 without MAX alongside.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Art Lewellan

Comment: Hi, I am Art Lewellan. I've been an advocate for mass transit in Portland for over 20 years. I've made a study, a constant study. I live in the area of the west side close to the Broadway Bridge. I walk across it. I bicycle. I take the streetcar and buses across it. Very



familiar with the streets around the Rose Quarter and I am -- it is my opinion that the result outcome of the project will reduce air pollution, not increase it. I also believe the safety improvements will hone to achieve it -- that as well will occur. Mostly on the streets, from my way of thinking, rather than on the I-5, but I think that's possible there too. And so I'm taking the position in the supportive. And I believe the investment will be worth it. Great to see the area of this map with this great view over the river, and I think it could very well become a very busy district. All those crosswalks, all those intersections, all this rebuild will improve safety. The pedestrian-only bridge that goes into the Rose Quarter in this area, that's a real improvement. The conversion of the Flint Bridge over I-5 Dixon crossing, that's an improvement for pedestrians and vehicle traffic wherever they can avoid getting on Broadway/Weidler. One improvement that I see -- I just wanted to add to the conversation. But exiting traffic off of I-5 southbound that has to merge with the traffic getting onto I-5 southbound is one huge bottleneck that I sense improving it will improve the traffic, will make it easier for motorists to go through there and may induce some -- induced demand. We've really got to work towards reducing emissions that come out of cars. And implementing mass transit. Those are my comments.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0000 Art Lewellan

The Loti Project

Comment: As a transit advocate in Portland for 20-some years, I've learned enough about transportation planning to present a fair assessment of big projects like I-5 Rose Quarter "Auxillary Lanes" and surface street upgrades-ped crossings, traffic bottlenecks, air pollution. This project is worth the cost and a fine investment!

I believe it will reduce air pollution, contrary to popular but IMO misled opinion that it won't live up to its promised improvement. The development potential is extra-ordinary, thus the cost is justified. Surface street traffic should improve as should pedestrian crosswalks and safety.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0227 Art Lewellen

The LOTi Project

Comment: Hello. I'm a neighbor near the project. I walk and ride the streetcar over the Broadway Bridge often. I look forward to the new pedestrian and Dixon crossings, better crosswalks, and the new I-5 on-ramp southbound that should reduce that horrible traffic bottleneck. I believe air pollution will be significantly reduced. But, there's a campaign organized by 350PDX saying just the opposite, that it will make air pollution worse. I believe 350PDX is perhaps unintentionally misleading other organizations to oppose the project.

I suggest you contact that organization. I've tried to myself but they didn't want to hear it. I got dirty looks from several 350PDX members for even showing up at public events. They have sized me up as some kind of obstructionist, which is far from the truth. I am opposed to MAX on



Barbur Blvd, oppose its horrific impacts, oppose widening from 4-lanes to 8-lanes which makes ped crossing more discouraging for transit users, etc. BRT (bus rapid transit) seems clearly more suitable for Barbur Blvd. MAX isn't really a separate issue because the better MAX route is from Beaverton to Tigard, Tualatin and Wilsonville alongside Hwy 217 which ODOT plans to actually widen. Anyway. Best of luck and please don't dismiss people's genuine concerns even when they may be entirely mistaken.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Arwen Myers

Comment: It astounds me that ODOT would try to fund a \$500,000,000 project that, by its own admission, would have no long-term effect on traffic levels in the area. In this era of impending climate crisis, investing this amount of capital in a short term project (ODOT states that traffic would return to current levels in *less than a decade*) is irresponsible and foolish. Please kill this project and invest that capital in far greener projects, such as transit, sidewalks, and bike paths.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Ashley Haight

Comment: Freeway Expansion is Climate Denialism. 40% of Oregon's carbon emissions come from transportation -- as a recent Oregonian article pointed out, Oregon simply cannot decarbonize our transportation sector without driving a lot less. If we are going to spend \$500,000,000 on a transportation project that addresses the urgent existential threat that climate change represents, this money should be spent on improving and prioritizing public transportation and building walkable communities.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Ashley Henry

Business for a Better Portland

Comment: BBPDX advocates for a transportation system that is a liberating force for everyone in the community. In collaboration with community organizations and government agencies, we are working to support a spectrum of sustainable transportation options that will aid in creating the thriving, equitable community we collectively strive for. We believe we need a transportation system that mobilizes its citizens, makes streets safer for all, and gets our community closer to its climate change mitigation goals. We want our leaders to make brave transportation decisions that benefit the entirety of the Portland region, serving

business and commerce in addition to everyone who lives here. Given the legacy of institutional racism in Portland and how it has manifested in the location of this project, it is imperative that our leaders act with respect, courage and integrity. Today, our leaders have the opportunity to stand for sane, compassionate policy and prove that Portland will lead the nation in our



commitment to a sustainable and equitable future. We support the detailed comments and issues raised by our colleagues at Albina Vision Trust, The Street Trust, and Oregon Environmental Council regarding the I-5 Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion.

We must act with conviction: Portland, and the next generation of Portlanders who will have to live with the consequences of today's actions, deserve better. We are calling on leaders to tap the brakes on this project and ensure \$500 million in taxpayer funds are thoughtfully invested in projects that deliver community benefit while paying more than lip service to equity. Proceeding without further analysis regarding the project's community and environmental impacts ignores irrefutable facts that question many faulty assumptions made by the Environmental Assessment. A more prudent approach would be to conduct a full Environmental Impact Statement while also giving congestion pricing an opportunity to ameliorate congestion problems and provide data that can better inform our policy and infrastructure decisions.

Attachments: [2019 0401 Ashley Henry ATT \(BBPDX\)](#)

2019 0401 Aubrey Jessen

Comment: With everything we know about our current and impending climate crisis, I can't believe that Oregon would be looking at any solutions that prioritize driving. It is shocking climate denialism. Putting resources toward making public transportation not just viable, but superior for commuters would send the message that we're invested in long-term change. We know that expanding the freeway will only result in more cars on the road, not decreased congestion. How can ODOT be so willfully in opposition to solutions that minimize harm and maximize community connection?

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Audrey

Comment: Please reconsider this investment. Widening the freeway will only increase capacity for more cars and trucks, resulting in more pollution. This adversely affects already-sensitive and marginalized communities within the area, as well as Harriet Tubman school. No child should have to refrain from participating in recess because the air is too polluted, yet this is already occurring. My little sister lives 2 blocks from Harriet Tubman, and she's not allowed to play outside. That's no way to grow up.

The money proposed for this project could do a lot of help elsewhere -- infrastructure for mass transit, sidewalks, safe crossings. I live off 82nd Avenue, and I've stopped counting the times I've seen people nearly hit by vehicles due to a lack of safe crossings.

Please look to other thoughtful solutions to reduce traffic that don't involve harming the marginalized communities already affected by the exponential growth in this city.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0401 Audrey Groce

Comment: I oppose the I-5 freeway expansion. As a Portland native, it is undeniable that the traffic in our city has increased notably over the last decade, and I understand that it is a problem we need to address, but I do not feel that this highway expansion is a long term solution. Portland was once a leader in sustainable transit, and choosing to expand this section of I-5 is not the type of progressive solution we need for our city. Highway expansions, while having the potential to decrease traffic in the short term, have not reduced congestion in the long term in other US cities. Instead, it creates space for more drivers and leads to greater congestion issues. Portland should focus these funds on making transit, biking, and walking more appealing and accessible options for Portlanders. As we face the consequences of climate change, we need to take serious strides towards making our city greener, not providing opportunities to put more cars on the road. Additionally, the project will largely benefit commuters from Washington state, rather than the communities of North Portland, who have already experienced major displacement at the hands of I-5. While there are aspects of this project that aim to make the Rose Quarter area safer for pedestrians and cyclists, this plan needs to shift it's focus to sustainable solutions to traffic issues that are more considerate of climate issues, local communities, and are more on par with the Portland I know and love.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 August Kroll

Comment: Please do not widen I-5 in Portland. Please do not spend \$500M on roads that will significantly degrade public transit and public spaces.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Austin Magleby

Comment: The marginal economic benefit is not worth the drastic damage to the environment this project will cause. Do not go through with this project, the need is not there and taxpayer dollars can be spent elsewhere to improve our quality of life without destroying our environment.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Aven Handley-Merk

Comment: Please do not widen I-5 in Portland. Please do not spend \$500M on roads that will significantly degrade public transit and public spaces. Expanding a freeway in 2019 is climate denialism.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0425 Avian Ciganko-Ford

Comment: For <<...>> sake this is not going to solve traffic congestion.

Environmental Assessment Comments
First Name Begins with A



Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Avril Carrillo

Comment: No comment provided

Attachments: N/A