



Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with C

Ordered by first name

Contents

2019 0401 Cait McCusker	6
2019 0331 Caitlin Smigelski.....	6
2019 0327 Caleb Smith	6
2019 0220 Cameron Adamez.....	6
2019 0401 Cameron Dieter.....	6
2019 0329 Cameron Evans	7
2019 0323 Cameron Jones.....	7
2019 0327 Cameron Schnur.....	7
2019 0328 Camilla Dartnell.....	7
2019 0329 Camilla Dartnell.....	8
2019 0412 Camille Bales	8
2019 0307 Cara Wessel	8
2019 0307 Caroline.....	8
2019 0312 Caroline.....	8
2019 0401 Carolyn Hogg	9
2019 0329 Carolyn Stuart.....	9
2019 0316 Carrie Kyser	9
2019 0306 Carrie Leonard	10
2019 0306 Carrie Leonard	10
2019 0402 Carrie Leonard	10
2019 0401 Carrie Milligan.....	11
2019 0327 Case Kauzer	11
2019 0325 Casey Brazeal.....	12
2019 0228 Casey Sundermann	12
2019 0313 Cassie Cohen	12



2019 0401 Cat Farris	12
2019 0331 Catherine B	12
2019 0330 Catherine Murphy	13
2019 0303 Catherine Wasilewski.....	13
2019 0311 Cathey Briggs	14
2019 0401 Cathy Jacoby	14
2019 0227 Cathy Zheutlin.....	14
2019 0329 Cathy Lamb-Mullin	15
2019 0325 CBM.....	15
2019 0327 Cecelia Bockenstedt	15
2019 0219 Cedric Cicognani.....	16
2019 0402 Celeste Pepitone-Nahas	16
2019 0303 Celine Fitzmaurice	16
2019 0401 Chadwick Ferguson	17
2019 0402 Charles Finks	17
2019 0328 Charles Heying	17
2019 0330 Charles Reneau	18
2019 0318 Charles Seaton	19
2019 0401 Charles Townsend	19
2019 0329 Charlie Bow.....	20
2019 0328 Charlie Fisher.....	20
2019 0328 Charlie Graham.....	22
2019 0401 Charlotte VanCleve.....	23
2019 0330 Chase Yurga-Bell.....	23
2019 0224 Chauncey Anderson	23
2019 0225 Chelsea Penning.....	24
2019 0331 Chelsea Riedy.....	24
2019 0322 Cheri Stuber.....	24
2019 0304 Cheryl Curry.....	25
2019 0312 Cheryl McDowell	25

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with C



2019 0305 Chet	25
2019 0401 Chris.....	26
2019 0312 Chris Anderson	26
2019 0329 Chris Baker	26
2019 0328 Chris Carvalho	27
2019 0331 Chris Chaplin	27
2019 0325 Chris Coiner	28
2019 0226 Chris Davies.....	28
2019 0401 Chris Eykamp.....	29
2019 0401 Chris Farrington	29
2019 0327 Chris Fuller.....	29
2019 0328 Chris Hagerbaumer.....	30
2019 0329 Chris Jensen	31
2019 0401 Chris Jones	31
2019 0327 Chris McCraw	31
2019 0401 Chris McGowan and Tom Rinehart.....	32
2019 0312 Chris Muhs.....	34
2019 0311 Chris Palmer	35
2019 0401 Chris Palmer	35
2019 0327 Chris Riefstahl.....	37
2019 0307 Chris Smith	37
2019 0312 Chris Smith	38
2019 0329 Chris Smith	39
2019 0401 Chris Smith	43
2019 0327 Chris Thomas.....	45
2019 0401 Chris Warner.....	45
2019 0331 Chris Whalen	45
2019 0308 Christian Grand.....	46
2019 0401 Christianne Gillenardo-Goudreau	47
2019 0224 Christina DeArment.....	47



2019 0301 Christina M Gullion.....	47
2019 0321 Christine Hoerner.....	48
2019 0401 Christine Manning.....	48
2019 0316 Christine Nelson.....	48
2019 0315 Christine Utz.....	49
2019 0326 Christopher Davies.....	49
2019 0401 Christopher Schiel.....	49
2019 0305 Christopher Hebbeler.....	49
2019 0331 Christopher Hebbeler.....	50
2019 0327 Christopher Yuen.....	50
2019 0312 Cindy.....	50
2019 0312 Claire Hansen.....	51
2019 0326 Claire Swearingen.....	51
2019 0326 Claire Swearingen 2.....	52
2019 0401 Claire Stein-Ross.....	53
2019 0329 Claire Vlach.....	54
2019 0304 Clare Burovac.....	54
2019 0329 Clare Burovac.....	55
2019 0402 Clarissa Littler.....	55
2019 0402 Clarity Flowers.....	55
2019 0401 Claud Gilbert.....	56
2019 0327 Clay Robbins.....	56
2019 0217 Clay Thompson.....	57
2019 0402 Clayton Sodergren.....	57
2019 0305 Cliff Heaberlin.....	57
2019 0305 Clint Culpepper.....	57
2019 0306 Clint Culpepper.....	57
2019 0312 Clint Culpepper.....	58
2019 0315 Clint Culpepper.....	58
2019 0325 Clint Rhea.....	58

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with C



2019 0401 Clint Rhea58

2019 0326 Clinton Myers58

2019 0313 Clive Munz59

2019 0331 Cloe Ashton59

2019 0319 Cole Lalomia59

2019 0308 Cole Merkel60

2019 0330 Cole Trusty60

2019 0305 Coleen Holden61

2019 0328 Colin Dabritz61

2019 0308 Colin Gibson62

2019 0329 Colin Jones62

2019 0331 Connor Daliposon62

2019 0331 Connor Robetorye63

2019 0327 Connor Toth63

2019 0402 Conor Eifler63

2019 0401 Coral Walker63

2019 0225 CoralSage Walker-Dale63

2019 0402 Corbin Smith65

2019 0327 Courtney Brown65

2019 0327 Craig Harlow66

2019 0322 Cresten St. Clair67

2019 0315 Cullen Carter67

2019 0401 Curtis Bieker67

2019 0327 Cyrus Joiner68



2019 0401 Cait McCusker

Comment: I know it's hard for transportation planners to accept that what they've been doing for years hasn't been working that making freeways wider only brings, at most, temporary relief from congestion. But it's time to look at the hard, numerous, overwhelming bodies of research and case study evidence that proves the opposite. You are treating the symptoms, not the cause, of congestion. Your first stab at an environmental assessment study hasn't turned out so well, it's time to do a congestion pricing study.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Caitlin Smigelski

Comment: Expansion does not improve congestion but is bad for our climate and air quality. Release a full Environmental Impact Statement and consider decongestion pricing

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Caleb Smith

Comment: Please move forward to expand interchange. I drive through that interchange 5 days a week and it's dangerous.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0220 Cameron Adamez

Comment: I am a former Albina resident. (I lived in Minnesota and on Albina before that.) I love my old neighborhood and am irate that anyone is even considering widening the freeway. It's already difficult enough to cross the freeway daily, and people drive a bit more recklessly on the feeder roads. Kids go back and forth quite a bit. The soil and air is already polluted from the glass factory that didn't have air scrubbers. More car and truck exhaust will just exacerbate the poor air quality. This neighborhood has already been damaged by gentrification, violence, and pollution. The residents of Albina, past and present, deserve more than this.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Cameron Dieter

Comment: This seems like too much money and too much work for a band-aid. I don't understand why the solution to traffic is create more traffic, instead of investing in better ways to get through the Metro area. Wouldn't light rail from downtown Vancouver to the Rose Quarter be a better solution to this problem than freeway expansion? I don't see what the value is in adding two lanes over such a short stretch when there will still be major congestion in 2027.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0329 Cameron Evans

Comment: Please consider running an economic model that compares funding a MAX extension to Vancouver rather than a freeway expansion.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0323 Cameron Jones

Comment: As a 19 year resident of Portland, I'm opposed to the Rose Quarter freeway expansion project. Data shows that freeway expansions have never reduced congestion, and I see no reason to think this one will be any different. Please consider a less expensive and more effective solution: congestion pricing.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Cameron Schnur

Comment: Please don't expand the freeways in Portland. The freeway already makes the surrounding area unpleasant with noise and pollution, and what you're proposing will only make it worse.

This project is also super expensive. I do drive on the freeways but I also bike and walk a lot. Every single day I am almost killed on the streets of Portland because of unsafe infrastructure that lets bad or distracted drivers have too much latitude. Please spend my tax dollars fixing THAT issue instead.

Furthermore, it has been shown time and again that widening freeways only leads to an increase in cars, not a decrease in traffic. Why would you not be listening to the evidence?

Furthermore, the planet is dying. In 100 years, when they look back on this time and how we addressed the rapidly changing climate, the side lobbying for freeway expansion will be seen as the villain. Do you want that to be you? Do you want your picture in a 2119 Urban Planning textbook talking about how badly humanity screwed up the planet?

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Camilla Dartnell

Comment: Hello,

The design for the Vancouver bikeway is a very important piece of this project, especially with the removal of Flint. Can you please send me the designs proposed for this area?

Thank you,

Camilla

Attachments: N/A



2019 0329 Camilla Dartnell

Comment: Thank you for your reply, Douglas. Do you have an idea of whether or how this would affect the Harriet Tubman Middle School? It looks like the design inches pretty close.

Thanks!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0412 Camille Bales

Comment: I do not agree with this plan. As a member of the neighborhood which will be directly affected I urge you to not move on with this plan .

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 Cara Wessel

Comment: Excited to see this neighborhood transform. As a pedestrian and cyclist, I'm eager to have safer routes through the Rose Quarter. It's great to see more space in a car dominated area given back to the public realm. Project team is doing an awesome job!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 Caroline

Comment: Why put all this thought into helping the environment when if you were actually concerned you wouldn't build the freeway in the first place. Many people claim they "love" helping the environment, where there actions show the opposite thing they say. Don't pretend to be a good person. Be a good person!

Helping the environment is a beautiful thing. It is only beautiful however when you are telling the truth about helping the environment. Do not lie or the world will know, do not tell the truth and you will regret it. Living isn't a game, it's everyone's daily lives.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Caroline

Comment: Hello. My name is Caroline. I'm a Portland resident and recent University of Oregon student. So my question involves more of logistics and the effects of this expansion on Oregon's youth. So knowing that adding two lanes of traffic won't actually reduce the traffic, but by 2027 there will actually be significant congestion once again. Obviously, we know about induced demand and that the freeways, when they are expanded, people drive more. If you build it, they will come. Knowing that's 500 million for two lanes, 1.5 miles is the equivalent to 150 miles of sidewalks, 6003 electric buses or 6,427 miles of protected bike lanes. And knowing that in 2018 there have been 467 deaths on Oregon roads. Knowing that 40 percent of Oregon pollution comes from carbon emissions. And keeping that number in mind, building this freeway is a



pretty obvious sign of climate change denial and a sign that ODOT doesn't necessarily care about the 467 deaths in 2018. Knowing that Oregon's youth will have to deal with the effects of ODOT decision, how can you register a decision to expand this freeway and this detrimental effect on Oregon's youth, and particularly those at Tubman Middle School. I am here to ask you to stop the freeway expansion and implement congestion pricing. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Carolyn Hogg

Comment: The environmental assessment does not convince me that pedestrians and bikers traveling in the Broadway/Weidler area will be safer with this expansion. I also feel concerns about health impacts to students at Harriet Tubman and residents of the Lower Albina neighborhood are not adequately addressed by the assessment. Additionally, the time allotted for public comment did not feel sufficient when official drawings of the project were not released for scrutiny until less than a week before it ended. I support the comments submitted by Rukaiyah Adams and Elissa Gertler, and I hope that the project team will conduct a full environmental impact statement before moving forward. Thank you very much.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Carolyn Stuart

Comment: NO NO NO

more room for cars = more cars that will clog everywhere more
got to be better solutions

Attachments: N/A

2019 0316 Carrie Kyser

Comment: I am a community college math teacher. I help (math anxious) students explore how we use numbers to understand the world. We talk a lot about climate change, compute our carbon footprints, and look at the costs of automobile travel. My students are generally appalled once they understand what's going on.

We must do what we can to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels, this is no longer debatable. Why are we even talking about widening a freeway? Providing more space for cars LEADS TO MORE CARS. Students in my elementary math class know this doesn't add up--what is wrong with ODOT?

Attachments: N/A



2019 0306 Carrie Leonard

Comment: The travel time analysis shows that there will be up to a 5 minute travel time decrease for car drivers through the project zone after build. This assumes that there is NO increase in the number of vehicles using the road, which based on data collected on all freeway widening projects in the US, is a wrong data input parameter. Regardless, the analysis also shows an INCREASE of the bicycle transit time of one minute for multiple routes through the region. This analysis only takes into account the signal timing and neglects other significant impacts to bicycle travel time such as the 10% grade on the new bridge, which will reduce travel speed dramatically for most riders. In addition, the analysis does not factor in the longer travel distance between points if one is to take the new Clackamas bridge -- while the route is car free it is significantly longer than using existing surface streets. This analysis neglects the significant impact to non-car users of the region for inaccurate projects of benefits to car drivers.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0306 Carrie Leonard

Comment: One of the stated justifications for this project is to reduce the number of crashes on I-5. One of the other stated justifications is to reduce congestion. However, the data presented in Figure 13 of the Transportation Safety Technical Report, coupled with the travel time modeling in Tables 2-3 & 2-4 of the EA shows that the highest number of crashes currently occurs during time periods with the least amount of congestion on the freeway (during the middle of the day). These findings are actually consistent with the body of knowledge that has shown that the frequency and severity of car crashes increases exponentially with an increase in speed of the vehicle. On page 20 of the EA, one goal of the surface street changes is to "reduce driver speed" for safety of all users. The conclusion supported by the data is that decreasing the travel times through the Rose Quarter will increase the likelihood of crashes occurring, not decrease that likelihood. This is in direct contrast to the stated goals of the project.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Carrie Leonard

Comment: I would like to have my dissatisfaction recorded regarding the data sources and analysis behind the EA for the Rose Quarter Expansion.

An EA is supposed to compare an 'as is' future scenario (aka no-build) with conditions with a future scenario as built. In this case, the 'as is' scenario includes a non-existent and unfunded \$3 billion additional bridge over the Columbia River, which is out of the scope of the project area. This is the antithesis of a no build condition, in that something major is indeed built that will affect all of the environmental parameters of both scenarios. This bridge was never called out in the EA documents when presenting the baseline conditions for both sets of analysis.



As such, I believe this EA is misleading at best and duplicitous at worst and, at a minimum, must be redone using a true no build baseline condition.

There is also a key piece of data analysis missing from the EA. If the goal of the project is to truly reduce trip times for ALL USERS of the project reason, then the traffic data analysis transit times must include the effect of the project on the travel times of people not in personal vehicles as well as those using personal vehicles. Unfortunately the EA currently only includes modeling data for personal vehicle travel only in both the build and no-build scenarios. I would like to see the impact of the project on other users of the transportation network, specifically pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users.

Thank you,

Carrie Leonard

Portland, OR

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Carrie Milligan

Comment: Hi, I am a northwest Portland resident and am dismayed that in this day and age that Portland is considering highway expansion. I am aware that in large cities like Los Angeles that freeway expansion has done nothing to reduce congestion, and as someone who has to breathe the air from the freeway as I travel or bike through town I am thoroughly worried about this backward approach Portland is considering. I am fervently against it.

Thank you for considering this comment

Sincerely,

Carrie Milligan MD

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Case Kauzer

Comment: Hello. My name is Case Kauzer and I am a resident of NE Portland. Please do not move forward with the proposed highway expansion project. Highway expansion has never once relieved traffic congestion long term. Even if it would relieve congestion, making it easier to drive is the opposite of what we should be doing if Portland is at all serious about combating climate change. I have 2 young kids. How am I supposed to explain to them that we sacrificed their future because we were so addicted to our cars? That they have to grow up in a world in climate crisis because we were too lazy and afraid to try something new?

I live in NE and work in Beaverton. I got frustrated fighting traffic every day right through the Rose Quarter. So I got an ebike and commute by bike most days of the week. I love cycling so this was easy for me. I know for many it would not be. How about spending half a billion on



active transport? Protected bike lanes, rapid transit. Imagine the city we could create. Portland needs to be a leader when it comes to climate change.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Casey Brazeal

Comment: I'm writing to voice my concerns about the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion. We do not need more lanes of highway. They will simply pull people further from the city center exacerbating problems with sprawl and traffic in the future.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0228 Casey Sundermann

Comment: Enough! No matter how many lanes are added, congestion just gets worse and worse. Let's begin offering pedestrian routes, bike routes, efficient public transportation. We do not need more traffic, more emissions, more lanes and more lanes of paved roadway.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0313 Cassie Cohen

Comment: I am concerned that the Environmental Assessment made the assumption that air emissions policies will change in 2045. Especially after the Oregonian investigation revealed the disproportionately impact the trucking industry lobbying and campaign finance contributions have on Oregon policies. ODOT should use this project as a pilot to step up and say all equipment and trucks for the duration of the project will not increase diesel or other emissions. Include those standards in rfp terms for contractors. Offer incentives for MSEWBs to purchase diesel filter upgrades. This small percentage of extra money upfront will offset medical expenses from health problems for families affected by the air pollution. This is the responsible, equitable thing for ODOT to do. Anything short of this is complacency with low health and environmental standards of trucking industry and business as usual.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Cat Farris

Comment: The last thing we need to do is expand our freeway system. Traffic will just increase to fill the extra space, and we'll be worse off than we already are. Studies have shown this to be true. Portland's abysmal traffic is something that can't be solved by more lanes on the freeway.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Catherine B

Comment: I would like to add my submission to the public comments.



I bike to work in the Pearl from NE Portland by crossing the Flint Avenue bridge to access the Broadway bridge. I oppose the removal of the bridge as the current plan stands, I do not consider the current proposal to be an improvement from a bike-commuter perspective.

I request that ODOT conduct another environmental assessment, this time without the expanded version of the Columbia River Crossing in it, to determine what the actual improvements are to safety. I read this article from OPB and I feel like it points out why the current EIS for this project needs to be redone with better condition assumptions.

<https://www.opb.org/news/article/odot-used-long-dead-i-5-bridge-replacement-to-plan-rose-quarter-upgrade/>

I also request that ODOT implement decongestion pricing on I-5 before any further study or work to expand the Rose Quarter Freeway is conducted.

Thank you for your attention to these requests.

Sincerely,

Catherine B.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Catherine Murphy

Comment: As a 26-year resident/homeowner and small business owner in the NE Eliot neighbor, I am STRONGLY OPPOSED to the freeway expansion/widening of I-5 through the Rose Quarter, including the reworking of streets that cross above I-5 in the area. My concerns are as follows:

Environmental concerns: Carbon emissions in this area are already too high. Do not make the problem worse. Spend some of the proposed budget on legislating to eliminate the filthy diesel emissions that are currently unregulated. Along with that, let's propose to re-open the Port of Portland and re-establish a more comprehensive use of sea transport instead of trucks that pollute and congest our highways. Lack of transparency in process: More access to studies and other alternatives to congestion have to be made easily accessible. We in Eliot lived through the terribly opaque and rushed process of designing and constructing the Rose Quarter in the '90s. This did nothing to benefit our neighborhood, and, in fact, was a wasted opportunity to do something really good for the city. Costs far outweigh the benefits. A \$500 million project should BENEFIT the general population, not just make it easier for people to continue driving more than they should. Public transportation and pedestrian options should be front and center. Our city needs these things more than more freeway lanes.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0303 Catherine Wasilewski

Comment: I am writing in order to voice my strong opposition to the proposed Rose Quarter Freeway expansion project. Spending \$500,000.00 in order to increase the number of cars



going through this part of town is absurd. It would be much wiser to initially implement Decongestion pricing in order to decrease traffic congestion. We need to work towards lowering the number of cars on the road.....not increasing the number! As a regular bike rider, I use the Flint Street Bridge frequently to get from my house in NE Portland to downtown. It breaks my heart to think of the added air pollution that will be caused by this freeway expansion, especially since it will adversely affect the health of students at Harriet Tubman Middle School. As a longtime resident of Portland, I urge you to use these ODOT funds to work towards improving walking and biking safety in the neighborhood.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Cathey Briggs

Comment: This freeway expansion makes no sense. The benefits, if there are benefits, are negligible. But the negative consequences in increased pollution and toxic impacts to Tubman students are real. And the cost of this expansion are prohibitively expensive.

Why aren't you considering congestion pricing?

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Cathy Jacoby

WA Dept of Land Use and Transportation

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: N/A

2019 0227 Cathy Zheutlin

Comment: I'm against the proposed freeway expansion project. When I was a child, I could not tolerate smog. It would be harmful to all the students at Harriet Tubman School. That is simply cruel.

All studies show that more freeway lanes does not solve the congestion problem.

Adding to the infrastructure for fossil fueled vehicles is backwards. Now is the time for a green vision that will provide a better infrastructure for a world that can actually last.



The only policy initiative that has ever had a demonstrable impact on peak congestion is road pricing. We hope to see the City of Portland lead and work with regional partners towards adopting a deliberate, community-minded approach to road pricing before spending hundreds of millions of dollars on a twentieth century solution for a twentieth century problem. Road pricing policy, if drafted appropriately, can be equitable, cost-effective, and sustainability-minded; expanding an urban freeway at a time in which 40% of Portland's carbon emissions come from transportation can be none of these things.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Cathy Lamb-Mullin

Comment: Hello,

Please do NOT expand the Rose Quarter freeway!! It is an irresponsible plan in the fact it does not take into consideration that, "if you build it, they will come". While the project may initially decrease travel times through the corridor, in the mid- and long-term it will not relieve congestion. We need to take a serious look at ways to get people out of single occupied motorized vehicles (congestion pricing, carpool incentives, dedicated bus lanes, for example). We need a long term solution to the congestion and climate change. Building more freeway lanes is NOT a part of the solution.

Please do NOT expand the freeway!

Cathy Lamb-Mullin

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 CBM

Comment: This isn't just bad for Portland, it's bad for the whole region! We can do better.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Cecelia Bockenstedt

Comment: Half a billion dollars to expand a freeway? Goodness, how much would it cost just to make public transit free?

I truly like to see us invest an alternative transportation to cars. I'm not sure that I understand what decongestion pricing is, but could we not somehow subsidize the people who do live within a short distance of where they work? Can we pay people to stay out of their cars? So many possibilities.

My understanding is that expanding the freeways will not reduce congestion . . .please don't do it

Attachments: N/A



2019 0219 Cedric Cicognani

Comment: I just wanted to express my full support for this project, especially with regards to moving the I-5 southbound ramp from Wheeler to Weidler Street. I use this ramp everyday around 5 PM and it is an absolute nightmare trying to merge onto I-5 while traffic from I-5 is trying to merge onto the I-84 ramp. Not only does this create incredible congestion, but it is also very unsafe - you have traffic moving at highway speeds on the far left lane of I-5 while the right lane is at a standstill since people are trying to merge on I-84. You end up having to force your way into traffic and having to speed up immediately so that cars don't crash into you. I honestly fear for my life every time I use this ramp and I can't believe it is 2019 and this issue still hasn't been addressed. All of the other improvements as part of this project are great, but I think that this particular issue should be a priority. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Celeste Pepitone-Nahas

Comment: I grew up between SW Portland and Beaverton and I have been commuting in this city since I got my drivers license in 2012. Over the past 6 years, I have experienced firsthand the increased traffic in this city. We all have. Nowadays people who have lived in Portland for a while are the first to talk about the 'traffic problem,' and how troubling it is that our commutes take twice as long, our streets are congested, and our air quality is getting worse. There is proof that expanding freeways will NOT solve Portland's traffic problems. Worse still, the expansion will put more cars on the road close to Harriet Tubman Middle School. As the daughter of a PPS teacher and a future teacher myself, I care deeply about the future of Portland Public Schools, and I believe it is our duty as citizens to protect and provide for our children. A recent study found that levels of arsenic and other toxins that come from car exhaust were already in "well in excess" of local safety guidelines. This project will make it near impossible to meet climate emissions reduction goals. More critically, it will limit the fundamental right for kids to play, live, study, and grow in their own neighborhood. To prevent congestion we need to invest in our public transportation systems and keep conditions safe for bicyclists--which means keeping the Flint Avenue bridge in place and invest in improving roads in East Portland.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0303 Celine Fitzmaurice

Comment: To whom it may concern,

I am a 20+ year Portland resident, a bike commuter and a university professor who teaches on the topic of climate change. I am writing to strongly encourage you to abandon plans to expand the I-5 freeway to address increasing congestion. Decades ago, we could be forgiven for



supporting the expansion of freeways. Today, we have all of the data and experience to know better. Expanding freeway lanes only leads to increased congestion over time at a huge expense and hassle to taxpayers. In the face of overwhelming evidence that we need to end our reliance on fossil fuels in order to save ourselves and the planet, expanding freeway lanes is a huge step backwards. Portland, given its rich history of sustainability-oriented urban planning, has the potential to set a great example for the rest of the country as we address increasing congestion. Please use the funding we have available to build infrastructure that supports fossil-fuel free/reduced transportation options such as improved bike and pedestrian ways, increased max and bus lanes, and an efficient rail system.

Sincerely,

Celine Fitzmaurice

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Chadwick Ferguson

Comment: Hi, I wanted to add my voice in opposition to the current design of the expansion of i-5 through the Rose Quarter in Portland.

I concur that something needs to be done at this location, yet feel that the current project won't really do much to mitigate congestion.

I also oppose it because the current design seems to do more harm for the people of Portland in greenhouse emissions, and congestion in the city.

Respectfully,

Chadwick Ferguson

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Charles Finks

Comment: Please don't widen I-5. Research has shown over and over that widening freeways does not work. Be smart, listen to the research, do the right thing, and cancel these widening plans. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Charles Heying

Comment: With our city streets simply collapsing under the weight of increased traffic, it seems a very poor use of funds to waste \$500 million on this Rose Quarter project. Please put the money where its needed.

Charles Heying

Portland, OR



Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Charles Reneau

Comment: To Whom it May Concern,

I've been watching, with dismay, as ODOT plans to spend \$500 million on a freeway expansion in inner Northeast Portland. The planning for this expansion has been secretive at best and dishonest at worst. For example, the public only found out in the last week, thanks to strong investigative reporting, that all the traffic forecasts depend on models that include a Columbia River Crossing replacement, which has not even been planned or funded! That's dishonest.

-

For another example, consider the question of "adding capacity." ODOT is claiming that the Rose Quarter project is not a freeway expansion, yet also claiming that this will ease a "bottleneck." What is the mechanism by which both statements are true? How does one increase volume of traffic (easing the bottleneck), without adding volume of traffic ("not an expansion"). That's speaking out of both sides of the mouth. ODOT is either lying to its constituents, or so obtuse that it does not realize the statements are logically opposed. ODOT would have us believe that we can, for the first time in the nation's history, expand a highway and expect not to see traffic fill that new void. ODOT should be ashamed at this dishonesty.

-

The citizens who pay taxes in this state, and the citizens who daily breath in the pollution from this highway, deserve a government that they can trust. We deserve a policy and infrastructure making bureaucracy that does not seek to hide inconvenient facts or make decisions in the interest of the bureaucracy's short term gain.

-

Since I can no longer trust ODOT to make good choices, I demand that the the Rose Quarter expansion planning be justified by a full Environmental Impact Statement. How on earth could the agency justify not performing one, given the increase in vehicle miles traveled that this highway expansion would incentivize? What are the environmental and health effects of increased pollution on bike commuting on the Eastbank Esplanade? What are the environmental effects on the community that the highway travels through? A project of this magnitude, with its climate effects, local pollution effects and urban growth effects, necessitates a full Environmental Impact Statement. Without it, I and many other Portlanders will continue to distrust the statements and even the motives of ODOT.

-

Thank you for your time,

Charles Reneau

Attachments: N/A



2019 0318 Charles Seaton

Comment: The EA for this project ignores the existence of induced demand. Currently, I live in South East Portland (in Lents). If there is a meeting or an event in North Portland in the late afternoon or early evening on a weekday that I might want to go to, I have to plan to take 45 minutes to an hour going by city streets because the I-5/I-84 interchange is too slow and unreliable during rush hour. To the extent that this project would actually cause the I-5/I-84 interchange to be less slow and more reliable, then it would make it more inviting for me to use I-84/I-5 to go from Lents to North Portland during rush hour. Any time that I would decide to do that, that would be induced demand. Induced demand just gets us right back to the same level of slow traffic as we have now, but with more cars producing more exhaust. The traffic modeling in this EA is based on false assumptions and so produces inaccurate and dishonest results.

I have read that the funding for this project can only be spent on highway projects, but I have also read that we have many ODOT maintained highways that could be transferred to local control, if only they could first be repaired to a condition where the local entities would be willing to take them over. \$500 million would do a lot to make highway OR213 (82ns Avenue) into a more livable and usable road, one that PDOT would be willing to take over. It would do a lot to make highway 30 into less of a bike and pedestrian killer in both North and North East Portland and extending west of Portland. There are road improvements for a safer and healthier Portland that we could support, but Portland is overwhelmingly opposed to this senseless boondoggle.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Charles Townsend

Comment: I am an Eliot neighborhood resident and bicycle and pedestrian commuter that travels through the proposed I5 Rose Quarter project area daily. There are so many things wrong with this project it is hard to even begin. Below are the reasons I do not support this project.

Studies have shown that any capacity or increase in ease of use of a roadway will not address the capacity issues in this transportation corridor. There are also many examples where freeway expansion did nothing to reduce congestion and travel time. If the capacity is there auto users will fill it. This is a no win for everyone.

With increased capacity comes an increase in the number of vehicles that are on the road. That equates to more air pollution in an area that already has some of the worst air quality in Portland. I do not live right by the freeway but I am close enough to hear I5 traffic from my home and ride and walk through the pollution it creates almost daily. This is bad for the environment and bad for residents and visitors of the Eliot neighborhood. We need a full Environmental Impact Statement completed for this project. That is a must!

I do not feel that ODOT has been transparent in providing details and data on the project in order for the public to adequately comment on it. These are actions of an agency that either has something to hide and/or needs to manipulate data in order to make the project look appealing.



For example the traffic data in documents provided by ODOT show a larger estimated traffic volume in 2015 versus 2016. Why would you need to use estimates or modeled data for 2015 when real traffic data exists? The \$500 million dollar estimate attached to this project is a lot of money. We need to know exactly what we are going to get for our money and why we actually need this project completed.

As primarily a bike and pedestrian commuter I feel the design is flawed and does not address the needs of non-automobile forms of transportation. The design essentially rebuilds the existing infrastructure we have making no improvements and in some cases making it worse. For example the Hancock-Dixon crossing has a 9-10% grade, which is steeper than a lot of hills professional cyclists use for training. That is completely unacceptable and introduces a physical barrier to entry for people taking up cycling for the first time. Also where are the safety improvements for cyclists like protected bike lanes and wider corners?

Finally you have multiple community and city organizations that have come out against the current design: PDOTs Bicycle Advisory Committee, PDOTs Pedestrian Advisory Committee, and Portland Public School Board.

All in all the negatives highly outweigh the positives. It only benefits auto users and is in direct conflict of city and state planning goals including Vision Zero and the Transportation System Plan. This \$500 million dollar project is a mistake and ODOT needs to concentrate on projects to increase pedestrian and cyclist safety on streets like 82nd and 122nd where we have already had multiple car related injuries and fatalities this year.

In its current state this project is a No Build for me.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Charlie Bow

Comment: Please conduct an EIS. There is no chance that widening the freeway will improve travel times or reduce traffic. I recognize that scientific research has never prevented politicians from grossly overspending on ineffective solutions, but please at least conduct an EIS before ruining the Rose Quarter. I have no issue with most of the other plans to improve the area. The freeway caps and improved access are quality reforms. But Los Angeles, San Francisco and many other cities have been widening freeways for years and I do not believe it has ever lead to the desired outcome. I would have thought Portland capable of the required foresight to avoid such mistakes, but I see that this project will likely be forced through despite that mounting opposition. I travel through that section of the city daily and strongly encourage you to sit for a few minutes and think.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Charlie Fisher

OSPIRG



Comment: OSPIRG Comments on the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project Environmental Assessment

Portland is living proof that cities that invest in a broad range of transportation options can produce a vibrant economy, improved public health, and enhanced quality of life for their residents. Portland's success in creating a vibrant, growing community less dependent on cars is also partly the result of something that Portland didn't invest in: wider highways. Today, however, the state is considering several projects that would add new highway capacity to the region. Among those projects is the proposed widening of a section of Interstate 5.

Widening I-5 would be an expensive step backwards for transportation in Portland. The project runs counter to the goals of Portland's Climate Action Plan, which aims to reduce carbon pollution from transportation by 78 percent by 2050 and daily passenger-miles of travel in vehicles by 64 percent by 2050. Highway widening projects generally incentivize additional driving.<<Footnote 1>> We can build a sustainable and efficient transportation system in Portland without spending hundreds of millions of dollars widening I-5. The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) should not move the widening project forward.

At the very least, there are problems with the recently completed Environmental Assessment that should cause ODOT to slow down and complete a full Environmental Impact Statement before making any further decisions about the future of the project. Because the process used in and substance of the Environmental Assessment leave critical questions unanswered, a Finding of No Significant Impact would be inappropriate at this stage.

The Environmental Assessment claims that, compared to the no-build alternative, the highway expansion will lower emissions in the long term. This is a surprising finding, given what we know about expanding highways. New road capacity draws in more drivers, meaning more vehicle miles traveled and more emissions.

A deeper dive into the traffic projections used to support that finding in the Environmental Assessment, reveals an apparent assumption that the no-build alternative would include the future construction of a new 12-lane Columbia River crossing. Clearly, this new bridge and highway expansion would bring a flood of new traffic into the Rose Quarter neighborhood, but it is unclear how that additional traffic factored into the projections in the no-build alternative. And if it did factor into the projections, it is unclear why.

In other words, there is a very real unanswered question of how many vehicles per day it was assumed would be coming across the Columbia River in 2045 under the no-build alternative. To answer this question, and ultimately, to answer the question of whether the build alternative actually would result in lower emissions than the no-build alternative, a full Environmental Impact Statement should be completed. And importantly, in the Environmental Impact Statement there needs to be a clearer explanation of the methodology of the traffic modeling and a transparent reporting of the assumed traffic projections under both the build and no-build alternatives.



The Environmental Assessment also fails to analyze road pricing options as an alternative to the highway widening. But the Oregon legislature has already directed ODOT to begin work to implement congestion

pricing on Interstate 5 and Interstate 205 in the Portland metropolitan area. ODOT's <<Footnote 2>> own studies have even concluded that congestion pricing could measurably reduce traffic congestion on I-5.<<Footnote 3>> The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires a robust analysis of alternatives.<<Footnote 4>> Failing to consider a viable, and arguably better and more effective, alternative seemingly runs afoul of NEPA. Widening I-5 is the wrong choice for Portland. It is a 20th century solution to a 21st century problem. For Portland to continue to grow its vibrant economy, to continue to improve public health and quality of life, and to meet its climate goals, the city should continue to improve its walking and biking infrastructure and expand its public transit network. But even putting all of that aside, the Environmental Assessment is insufficient and ODOT is unable to credibly conclude the process with a Finding of No Significant Impact. If ODOT moves forward at all, it should be with a full Environmental Impact Statement.

<<FOOTNOTES>>

1 <https://ospirg.org/reports/orf/highway-boondoggles-4>.

2 <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2017R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/HB2017/Enrolled>.

3 https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Value%20Pricing%20PAC/VP_TM3-Final-InitialConceptEvaluation.pdf.

4 https://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/nepa/trans_decisionmaking.aspx.

Attachments: [2019 0328 Charlie Fisher ATT](#)

2019 0328 Charlie Graham

Comment: We are at a crucial time in history and we must make decisions that reflect the seriousness of our environmental situation. I oppose freeway expansion for the following reasons.

It won't improve Congestion

It will Increase in air pollution

Freeway Expansion is a form of Climate Denialism

I am fearful that ODOT is hiding the data. They must be more transparent. We should be implementing decongestion pricing before expansion is looked at.

We must demand a full Environmental Impact Statement before proceeding.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0401 Charlotte VanCleve

Comment: My name is Charlotte VanCleve. I'm a born and raised Portlander. I grew up in Sellwood, and my mom still lives in the house I was born in. I love that I've been able to travel all over

Portland by different modes of transport. I have always relied on public transportation and my bike to get around the city.

The I5 Rose Quarter Expansion project troubles me deeply. The expansion project is just one more example of the city prioritizing cars of people. We should be doing everything we can to make it easier to get around Portland that don't involve a car, not making it easier for the cars. As someone who is deeply concerned by climate change, this seems like the wrong direction for us to go.

Not to mention the safety of our children and our schools at Harriet Tubman Middle School. I remember visiting that school when I was a Rose Festival Princess for the first time. I am a graduate from St. Mary's Academy, in downtown Portland, and I was so excited that PPS was offering an all girls middle school option! We must do everything we can to protect our future generations.

Thank you for your time,

Charlotte VanCleve

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Chase Yurga-Bell

Comment: I think expanding the I-5 is a terrible idea. Every single time a freeway expansion in a major city is undertaken, induced demand makes congestion worse. It's been seen in Denver, Houston, Los Angeles, and others. If our goal is to make Portland a less congested and more environmentally friendly city, what we should really do is streamline public transit, first by designating Express routes on buses and light rail that would have fewer stops but faster service from outlying areas, secondly by putting tolls on all major freeways, and then by negotiating with Vancouver to finally expand the Max line into downtown Vancouver. Don't ruin an already congested quarter of the city by doing something that will make traffic even worse, JUST to please a WA city that doesn't pay any infrastructure taxes to Portland.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0224 Chauncey Anderson

Comment: This is a note to say I support the I5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project. It's obvious that section of I5 is a bottleneck that often affects the entire city, and causes additional problems with the way it was originally developed. I do also support other measures to reduce traffic



overall, including tolls on area freeways (both coming into Portland via the I-5 and I-205 bridges, and within the Portland area), an interstate light rail line and other mass transit improvements, and increased bicycle and pedestrian options. But in the end, those alone won't solve the problems on I5 at the Rose Quarter, and I think we need to do what we can to alleviate the existing bottlenecks there.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0225 Chelsea Penning

Comment: Spending half a billion dollars on highway expansion in 2019 is just about the silliest thing I've ever heard of. We have what, eleven years to completely stop all fossil fuel emissions if we want to save human civilization from catastrophe? And this plan supposedly "lowers" emissions by 2045? THAT'S WAY TOO LITTLE TOO LATE.

AND it's not even true. All the evidence says that expanding roads just makes more people choose those newly-expanded roads, meaning it has NO impact on congestion and *increases* emissions.

I cannot imagine how we will face future generations if one of the most progressive states in the country wastes this much money on expanding fossil fuel infrastructure instead of expanding public transit, making communities more walkable, adding high-speed trains across the state to reduce flights, etc.

NOT TO MENTION the impact on Harriet Tubman Middle School, where the air is already so bad that it's recommended that the students skip recess and stay inside.

Stop twisting facts and lying to the public. The BEST thing we could do for I-5, for the students, for the neighborhood, AND for the climate is to expand the light rail system to cross the Columbia, with or without financial help from Vancouver, and actually get cars OFF THE ROAD before it's too late.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Chelsea Riedy

Comment: We need better public transit and more sustainable climate-friendly solutions. This opaque project isn't it.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0322 Cheri Stuber

Comment: My name is Cheri Stuber. I'm looking at map of Rose Quarter Improvement Project online, as we're looking to buy a building tomorrow, a commercial building on n flint avenue. Looks like its at the end of the Dixon crossing. There's blue x's right on the street where this building is. Want to know what's happening there before we consider buying. My number is 503 307 7589.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0304 Cheryl Curry

Comment: As a close-in NE Portland resident, I'm against the proposed Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion. I have had the privilege of living in Portland without a car for 6 years. I want our budget and planning to go towards making that possible for more people, whether that means an increase in Vancouver-PDX public transit, improving bus service, or more bike lanes. In addition, adding lanes for cars as proposed is a deeply irresponsible choice considering the dire situation of climate change. Lastly, when I bike past Harriet Tubman school, I can tell the air quality is very poor, and research backs it up. Please don't make the air quality even worse for these innocent learners by adding more car smog.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Cheryl McDowell

Comment: I am strongly opposed to ODOT's plan to expand Interstate 5 at the Rose Quarter for the following reasons:

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'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.

Please reject this plan and spend your money on solutions to pollution and on repairing our existing roads, bridges, and highways.

Sincerely,

Cheryl J. McDowell

Attachments: N/A

2019 0305 Chet

Comment: This city has been growing rapidly for years, and our current roadway infrastructure is woefully inadequate to support the current, let alone future demand. Expanding freeways, reversing ill-conceived lane elimination "road diet" projects such as on SE Foster, and permitting



motorcyclists to safely filter between lanes of cars at low/moderate speeds are the most effective and practical solutions to our city's traffic congestion crisis.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Chris

Comment: I am writing to express my concerns about the widening of I-5 through the rose quater. I strongly oppose it. The only way to address traffic congestion, is to provide efficient and safe public transit, walking and biking options. This project does nothing to improve those, and studies have shown they are negatively impacted. With induced demand, there is also the likelihood that it will increase traffic in the area, further worsening air pollution, and immediate traffic on nearby surface streets.

I would also like to see a full environmental impact statement. We should plan for the future, and build cities that prioritize the movement of people, and not automobiles, in safe, low environmental impacting ways.

Thank you,

Chris

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Chris Anderson

Comment: I've been in Portland since 1998. Thank you Commissioner Eudaly and ODOT for being here. It's 2109 and the question I have is, like, in what does more cars make sense? It seems like every time we move in the other direction, we see prosperity. And highway widening is just going to invite more cars. It's going to invite more parking problems and it's going to invite more congestion in the central city. So it doesn't make sense to me. The project doesn't pencil out. Losing Flint makes biking worse. What does make sense is freight and transit priority and tolling and congestion pricing makes sense, but building doesn't make sense. Use the money on I-5 corridors like 82nd Avenue where people are getting killed. My kids don't want more cars, like, just in general. That's a generational thing I think. But their school is also in the project area, the Ivy School on Williams and it's going to be subject to all the debris for the next few years while people build. So don't do that, instead it makes sense to use congestion pricing, prioritize, you know, freight so that -- and transit so we can actually use the infrastructure for what we need it to be used for. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Chris Baker

Comment: I oppose freeway expansion in Portland. There is not data to support this will solve traffic problems and it run contrary to our climate change goals as a city.



Please use the money that would be spent on this project for priorities that enhance sustainable transportation options.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Chris Carvalho

Comment: I am in favor of the project. I know a vocal minority of people are in opposition and cite the concept of "induced demand" as a justification. However, our traffic problems are not the result of building freeways. We haven't built new ones in many years, yet traffic is worsening due to new housing construction approved by a pro-growth local government who is irresponsibly causing a traffic nightmare. I recommend that ODOT work closely with Metro, city, and county governments to set goals for traffic levels and adjust new housing construction to stay within those goals. That's a common-sense approach that will keep traffic manageable. Those who are anti-car often live a lifestyle where they don't have a car, and/or can live close to work. That's not possible for everyone. In my job, I must drive to locations in many different areas, ones not served by transit. There is no way for me to do what the opponents to this project are asking. As the EA noted, reduced congestion will improve emissions because cars won't be idling in stuck traffic. If our goal is to reduce emissions, as it should be, then the right solution isn't to toll solely based on congestion levels, it should be to toll based on how much a vehicle pollutes. I made the decision to buy a hybrid car because it rarely idles in traffic. Tolling based on emissions could also have the effect of taking large trucks off the road during commute hours, if congestion pricing includes a vehicle emissions component. If traffic continues to worsen, our economy and quality of life will suffer along with a cost everyone will pay in terms of wasted time on the highways. Please look at the needs of our entire community, not just the people who think no one should own a car in Portland. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Chris Chaplin

Comment: Hello,

I am writing as a concerned citizen, a parent, a Portland homeowner, and a user of I-5. I appreciate the opportunity to submit a comment in response to the plan to expand I-5, and I will keep this as short as I can. First, in a time of rapid climate and environmental destabilization, the absolute *last* thing we need to be doing is encouraging more driving. If every country in the world were to outlaw driving tomorrow, arctic ice would continue to melt, and global temperatures would still be on track to rise at least 1.5 C by the end of the century, the consequences of which would be nothing short of disastrous for millions of people. We need to be doing everything in our power to discourage driving, not to encourage it.

Second, I am confident ODOT is aware of the numerous examples showing that freeway expansion does *not* improve traffic congestion; if not, I would point you to this link: <https://www.wired.com/2014/06/wuwt-traffic-induced-demand/>. Essentially, creating more room



to move on the highway makes driving more appealing and serves to create more drivers. We urgently need fewer drivers.

Third, in the nearer term, building more lanes onto our freeways will lead to increased air pollution throughout much of the city, but particularly in the areas closest to the proposed expansion. I'm sure you are aware of the PSU study recommending children at Harriet Tubman Middle School not spend recess outside. Is this the kind of city any of us want to live in, where kids are directed to stay inside because the air is too dirty to breathe? Were this happening in another country, we would likely scoff and condemn their governmental leadership for failing their citizens. In truth, it is happening here. We cannot allow it.

For so many reasons, this kind of project simply cannot happen. At an absolute minimum, I would ask that a full Environmental Impact Statement be completed to study other, more socially and environmentally beneficial ways to use the funds currently earmarked for this project. I appreciate your time in considering this and other comments. I acknowledge that the tone of my comment may convey impatience and frustration - please know that this is only because of the seriousness and urgency of the problems we are facing, and the critical import of putting all of our resources toward alleviating these problems, rather than exacerbating them.

Many thanks,

Chris Chaplin

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Chris Coiner

Comment: Let it be know that I am in strong opposition to the I5 freeway expansion. First it has been proven over and over again that expansions don't work. We should be leading on this issue and implementing decongestuon prices to combat this issue. Second, Portland should also be leading on all environmental issues and giving more money and infrastructure to cars which make up much of our co2 emissions, is a terrible idea. I ask all of to thing about your kids and grandchildren and let's to the right thing here. Not to mention the fact that this will directly impact those children who attend middle school right next to the freeway. My third point is that this money is needed elsewhere. Let's improve upon the infrastructure that doesn't contribute to climate change. Let's invest that money in transit, bus lanes and protected bike lanes. Expanding a freeway is backward thinking, it time to boldly move forward for a brighter future Portland.

Chris Coiner

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Chris Davies

Comment: I strongly oppose any expansion or addition to any aspect of the I5 corridor through my neighborhood.



We need to eliminate the Portland portion of I5 altogether, and stop the noise and air pollution it causes. It cuts through the heart of North Portland, and ruins the entire east bank of the river. Get rid of it, and make 205 a toll road.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Chris Eykamp

Comment: Hello,

Please conduct a full EIS for the Rose Quarter Project. Enough new information has come to light to shed doubt on the adequacy of the Environmental Assessment conducted. For example, traffic volume assumptions that assumed a large (and as of yet unplanned and unapproved) Columbia River Crossing would be built; the noise and light impacts on the Eastside Esplanade bicycle path were not considered; and the effects of extended construction impacts on Rose Quarter bicycle traffic was not adequately considered.

Also, please delay this project until after the effects of congestion pricing can be measured. Demand reduction may prove to be a more efficient mechanism for improving traffic flow. It would certainly be cheaper, and since it would be fully and easily reversed if it has negative side-effects, we should try it before turning to a much more expensive construction program.

Thank you,

Chris Eykamp

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Chris Farrington

Comment: Larger freeways don't relieve congestion. Alternative transportation does. I support other options.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Chris Fuller

Comment: Please do not move forward with the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project as currently proposed. ODOT is unpersuasive in demonstrating how this project markedly improves anything, be it traffic congestion, safety, or environmental impact. It is well established that moving to accommodate more traffic merely leads to more vehicles on the road, greater congestion, greater reliance on automobiles, and more of a negative environmental impact. Why would this project be any different? In terms of safety, it doesn't compute that more vehicles moving more swiftly (while that lasts) is somehow safer than the current situation, especially when you take into the account the relative severity of the accidents likely to occur. Setting aside the general negative environmental impact associated with more vehicles and more emissions (see the Portland State congestion and emissions mitigation study), the specific impact on the Harriett Tubman Middle School and the surrounding area is particularly appalling,



especially in the historical context of other such projects and the neighborhood involved. I'm also disappointed to see the removal of the Flint Ave bridge, with no coinciding solution for bike commuters - I am proud to live in a city that typically encourages and facilitates alternative modes of transit, rather than undermining them. The immense cost is another issue, especially considering the negligible gains in question. It seems to me there are more imaginative ways this money could be spent on improving existing infrastructure while exploring alternative and more proven solutions to the congestion issue. At the very least, ODOT should release the data they've used to inform this project so that it can be independently evaluated before the project moves forward - they can't expect to be taken at their word, especially when it's difficult to find corresponding precedents in terms of other such projects that were successful in achieving their stated aims. Frankly, this is the kind of project I can imagine reading about happening elsewhere while being thankful I live in Portland. Please don't let it happen here.

Respectfully,

Chris Fuller

NE Portland

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Chris Hagerbaumer

Comment: Oregon Environmental Council (OEC) appreciates that traffic congestion has a serious impact on quality of life, productivity, public health, and the environment in the Portland metropolitan region. We question, however, whether the Rose Quarter project, as designed, will lead to the congestion reduction and environmental co-benefits described in the Environmental Assessment. Real-world evidence demonstrates again and again that adding lane capacity will help improve traffic flow, but only in the short-term. Likewise, although active traffic management techniques (e.g., coordinated signal timing and ramp metering) are certainly worthwhile and can help reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by improving traffic flow, they also result in induced demand, albeit on a smaller scale. The only truly effective solution to traffic congestion (and the GHGs that result from stop-and-go traffic) is to use prices to balance the supply of and demand for travel (i.e., congestion pricing). ODOT states that analyzing congestion pricing will be done separately, but there is no law prohibiting the agency from including a congestion pricing analysis in an environmental assessment of a road project. In fact, NEPA requires the analysis of reasonable alternatives and also requires the assessment of “reasonably foreseeable circumstances.” Given that the Oregon Legislature has required ODOT to pursue pricing for I-5 (and other freeways), leaving congestion pricing out of the analysis will lead to an incorrect interpretation of impacts. OEC therefore urges ODOT to conduct a full Environmental Impact Statement for the Rose Quarter and to include congestion pricing both as part of the base case and as an alternative to widening the freeway. OEC is also concerned about the limited vision for the neighborhood improvements. It’s high time to redress the harm inflicted when I-5 was built through the heart of Portland’s African American community back in the 1960s. We agree with the champions of the Albina Vision who are concerned that:

- The freeway caps are not big enough or strong enough to hold the needs of the Albina Vision



project. The project must be designed to allow for parks, affordable housing and small businesses, essentially the ability to recreate true neighborhoods. • The current bicycle lanes, pedestrian walkways and bridges for biking and walking are not congruent with promoting vibrant and vital areas for community to thrive. The current design is too complicated, hilly and with too many zigzags to invite people into the community spaces. • The project does not address the long-term wealth creation needs of the communities most affected (communities of color and the most marginalized communities). ODOT must work closely with Albina Vision to determine how the project can result in longer-term benefits. To summarize, given the complexity of the issue and the many concerns that have been raised regarding the draft Environmental Assessment, OEC requests that ODOT (1) conduct a full Environmental Impact Statement, including analysis of congestion pricing, and (2) engage authentically with the champions of the Albina Vision. Thank you for considering these requests.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Chris Jensen

Comment: Given the urgency of the climate change problem facing the world I think it unconscionable that we are considering expanding our freeway network. We should be implementing

decongestion pricing first.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Chris Jones

Comment: I am opposed to this project. Expanding freeway lanes will do nothing to improve the sustainable transportation future for the region. This project will increase automobile traffic and CO2 emissions, encouraging more car trips on our already overused freeway. ODOT has, furthermore, not been transparent about their data and process. ODOT has misrepresented the effectiveness of the urban design component of the project. We should not be spending public money on transportation projects that increase vehicle trips and CO2 emissions.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Chris McCraw

Comment: Hi folks!

I'm a homeowner in NE portland, about 2/3 of a mile from the interstate @ Rosa Parks, and I see the congestion that happens daily on the freeway. I hate sitting in traffic so much that I stopped driving, but my partner who lives with me commutes daily to Salem, and so I have some of her insights into how bad traffic is during rush hour: I know, it's real bad!

But I don't think that widening a small section of the freeway (or even a large one) is the answer. Congestion is not cured by widening; it's temporarily postponed. Also, the planet is dying, let's



focus on modes of transport that are less likely to accelerate it please? With that much money we could do some world class bike, ped, and transit update.

At the very least, I'm extremely disappointed in a lack of environmental impact study and some cheap experiments like congestion pricing. Seems like putting the container ship before the horse to me.

Thanks for your time.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Chris McGowan and Tom Rinehart

Portland Trailblazers; City of Portland

Comment: Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Final Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed 1-5 Rose Quarter project. In general, the City, Office of Management and Finance and the Portland Trail Blazers are supportive of the project. The Rose Quarter is Oregon's premiere large arena event destination and is a major regional economic driver and cultural asset. The City and the Portland Trail Blazers have a long-standing relationship at the Rose Quarter event campus which includes two arenas, accessory buildings, and several parking garages. The City and the Portland Trail Blazers both own land, have invested significant capital in our facilities, and have an ongoing financial stake in the continued success of the Rose Quarter.

We have been following the progress of this project for many years and support it because of its benefits to the local area and the regional transportation system. However, we are concerned about the negative impact the proposed local street configuration would have to the operations on the Rose Quarter campus, especially the ability of guests to efficiently access our venues with a minimum of effort and impact on our surrounding area. One specific failing of the design proposed in the EA comes in the removal of any direct route for guests leaving Rose Quarter garages to access the new freeway ramp at Weidler and 1-5. If the current plan for those surface streets isn't revised, this change will create enormous delays for our customers' post event departure and will result in increased traffic and gridlock on the surrounding surface streets of the neighborhood on a regular basis. However, we are confident this can be fixed during the design phase of the project.

Our concern is focused on how the street configuration impacts the access to and egress from the parking garages that provide spaces for events in the Mada Center and the Veterans Memorial Coliseum (VMC). We can't support the current street configuration as described in the Traffic Analysis Technical Report (Pg. 80 - Section 6.2.3) as it won't meet the needs of the Rose Quarter campus. The elimination of N Williams and the relocation of the SB 1-5 onramp would require significant out-of-direction travel from the garages to exit the area, funnel essentially all event traffic through several constrained intersections - creating increased pedestrian/vehicle conflicts, and greatly increasing the amount of time it takes to empty the garages. Furthermore, the EA's proposed mitigation of rerouting traffic northbound on N Wheeler by way of cones and flaggers after all events is financially unsustainable and potentially unsafe.



The City is a major landowner in the Rose Quarter and partners with Portland Trail Blazers' sister company, Rip City Management (RCM), who manages the Moda Center, VMC, garages, and entertainment complex. The Rose Quarter is a major economic driver in the region, and events there generate significant revenues through ticket taxes and parking fees for the City. These revenues support the ongoing maintenance, repair and improvement of the venues as well as covering bonded debt payments associated with spectator venues in Portland. An acceptable street configuration in the Rose Quarter needs to work all the time, not just for big events. Between the Moda Center and the VMC there are over 30,000 seats, but the three garages have only a total of 2,600 spaces so they regularly fill for even mid-sized events.

In the twelve months ended June 30, 2018, the VMC hosted over 130 events with a total of 450,000 attendees while the Moda Center and surrounding commons held over 170 events with a total of 1,500,000 attendees. Current street configurations allow mid-sized events to empty with a minimum of traffic control flags, and even major events do not require the level of manual traffic control that would be required by the configuration as shown in the EA. Having flaggers switch traffic operations hundreds of times a year is horribly inefficient and not an economically viable option. Modifications to the street system required after large events should be minimized. A more permanent solution is necessary.

There are some alternative solutions that are supported by RCM and the City as outlined in the 2016 report: Moda Center - Post Event Traffic Analysis. This study was conducted by ODOT consultant AECOM and puts forth two options which would work better for the Rose Quarter, both of which call for N Wheeler to be permanently configured as a two-way street. Option 4 (Attachment 4) in that study is the preferred option. This configures N Wheeler as a four-lane road with two lanes in each direction. It also realigns N Wheeler with the Garden Garage exit. Option 1 (Attachment 1) configures N Wheeler as a three-lane road with either one southbound lane and two northbound lanes or an easily convertible center lane that is only used during events.

RCM and the City understand that garage egress times may increase slightly due to needed active transportation improvements and other development, but ideally, we would like the time it takes to empty the garages after events to stay the same or decrease with the project. Unfortunately, the configuration shown in the current EA configuration significantly increases egress time beyond what's tolerable for event goers. According to the 2016 study, it takes 25 minutes for the Garden Garage to empty after a Trail Blazers game. This study found that the proposed configuration changes in the EA could more than double the time for the garage to empty. This would have the negative effect of discouraging parking in the public parking facilities at the Rose Quarter, or worse, reducing attendance at events due to parking challenges. Prior to selecting a final street circulation design, we request that an analysis, similar to the 2016 AECOM report be undertaken to ensure that the impacts on post-event traffic controls will not significantly increase the time it takes to empty the garages.

The alternative solutions studied in 2016 provide better access and egress to garages on a day to day basis as well as during major event times than the option shown in the EA documents. They don't require as frequent or extensive traffic operation changes, so it is both easier to navigate and safer for both drivers, traffic management staff, and pedestrians. Finally, these



alternatives are less financially burdensome for RCM and minimize the financial risk to the City and RCM associated with event and parking revenues.

It is also important to remember that the ultimate solution to the local street network must work for the Rose Quarter of today, but also work for the Rose Quarter of the future. City policies from the recently adopted Central City 2035 plan suggest a much busier urban district - not an episodic event center. The street network needs to work at all times for all modes, even with a broader mix of uses and new development in and around Rose Quarter.

The shortcomings of the current proposed local circulation design for event ingress have been a known issue since the 2012 Oregon Transportation Commission adoption of the 1-5 Broadway/Weidler Interchange Improvements Facility Plan. That document calls out the need to further refine local circulation alternatives within the Rose Quarter to enhance circulation for all modes and develop a system that accommodates event ingress and egress. See the Facility Plan, Implementation Actions, Specific Design Coordination, (5)(c). It is disappointing that little has been accomplished in this regard since 2012.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this EA. As noted above, we believe the impacts of this project to be generally positive, and we are confident that our concerns can be addressed during the design phase. We believe this solution will not only help Rose Quarter operations but go toward improving the functionality of the entire district.

Attachments: [2019 0401 Chris McGowan and Tom Rinehart ATT](#)

2019 0312 Chris Muhs

Comment: This project appears to be a disaster. It will not do its stated job of relieving congestion in the long term. ODOT's own document from the Value Pricing Project says so: Section 3.2 paragraph 1 in http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Value%20Pricing%20PAC/VP_TM3-Final-InitialConceptEvaluation.pdf

On that premise alone the project should be ended. If it is not, then I have these additional comments:

- The project needs to directly improve public transit. Dedicated transit lanes on I-5 would facilitate north to south express bus service. The EA finds slight delays to bus service due to new bike/ped traffic signals & signal phases
- Parks atop a freeway are not useful. This seems like a waste of money that looks pretty in the project renderings. No one wants to go to a park that is near a bunch of cars, pollutants, and loud noise. If you are capping the freeway then the cap needs to be buildable, i.e., possible to build commercial and residential buildings. This would help reconnect the neighborhood and would make marginal contributions to businesses and the housing shortage.
- The estimated marginal reduction in GHG with the project compared to without in the EA (801M vs. 799M VMT) appears insignificant. If the difference is significant this needs to be reported in the EA. It doesn't seem appropriate to provide statements in the open house like this project reduces emissions when the reduction is driven by changes to fuel standards. This



project is a small sliver of a reduction, and that is entirely an estimate! In our climate change situation on this earth, this is unacceptable.

- I am upset that ODOT is disguising this widening project with language like aux lanes that the layperson does not understand

We need to change the way we think about congestion. You cannot expect a freeway in the central area of largest city in the state to have uninterrupted traffic flow at one of its highest-volume interchanges. There is a demand to get to these places by vehicle that historically has always exceeded the freeway's capacity. The money for this project would be better spent by not touching the freeway or its ramps and instead enhancing safety and operations for other modes of travel through the Rose Quarter area.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Chris Palmer

No More Freeways

Comment: Freeways are fossil fuel infrastructure, and expanding them in a time of climate crisis is denialism, and goes totally against the spirit of the City of Portland Fossil Fuel Infrastructure ban. Congestion is a problem, but the solution is less cars and car infrastructure, not more! Public transit, active travel and congestion pricing are where we need to be headed. Stop this project and redirect the money somewhere useful.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Chris Palmer

350PDX

Comment: 350PDX would like to thank the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) for the opportunity to provide public comment on the I-5 Rose Quarter freeway widening project.

350PDX works to build a diverse grassroots movement to address the causes of climate disruption through justice-based solutions. We understand that the climate crisis is upon us and that climate change is a threat to every Oregonian. Its effects are being felt immediately and severely by the most vulnerable Oregonians -- children, people of color, people with low-incomes, and people with disabilities. Immediate impacts in Oregon range from extended and intensified wildfire seasons to diminishing and uncertain water supplies to inhospitable marine ecosystems and rising sea levels. Changes in weather patterns and increases in extreme weather events are a costly threat to essential infrastructure and are forecasted to cost Oregon businesses billions of dollars in lost revenue.

The source of this climate damage is not some faraway event -- climate change is the sum result of every-day actions and our responsibility is to immediately and collectively cease contributing actions. We must make immediate and significant steps to eliminate existing



sources of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, including eliminating the use of fossil-fuel vehicles.

“If we ended GHG emissions tomorrow, climate change effects would persist and worsen for decades to come. ... Our children, and theirs, will be living for decades with the worsening consequences of our failure to take timely action when we knew we should. Bad as that is, further delay only makes it worse.”

--2018 Biennial Report to the Legislature for the 2019 Legislative Session, Oregon Global Warming Commission

Transportation emissions already comprise 40% of Oregon’s greenhouse gas emissions. Despite increasingly rigorous GHG emissions requirements for cars and light trucks, the transportation-related GHGs contribution to the State’s GHG emissions rose from 35% in 2014 due to increased vehicle-miles travelled. The region’s population is forecasted to increase by 390,000 people by 2050, and it is imperative that we develop a transportation network that accommodates these new residents without any additional vehicle miles traveled and any increase in associated emissions. Incredibly, the environmental assessment (EA) of the project claims that the project will not increase vehicle miles traveled and will result in decreased GHG emissions! Such bold claims require exceptional evidence and ODOT’s description of methods, results, and data in the EA to justify these findings is inadequate. To decarbonize our transportation sector, we must fully redirect our resources towards investments in walkable communities connected by frequent, reliable public transportation. As many local transportation advocacy organizations have pointed out, this project actually worsens commute times for the transit lines that pass through the neighborhood. It’s simply disingenuous to invest half a billion dollars in a transportation project in the center of Oregon’s densest city and claim that this project has any benefits to carbon reduction.

When the I-5 corridor was constructed six decades ago, the Lower Albina neighborhood was destroyed and the predominantly African-American neighborhoods centered in North Portland were savagely split. The opening of I-5 initiated a cycle of decreased air quality, suburban sprawl, increased traffic and emissions, and demand for additional vehicles lanes, in turn inducing additional demand and restarting the cycle. This proposed I-5 Rose Quarter freeway widening project amplifies the same core cycle of destroying the fabric of the city for the convenience of suburban motorists travelling through the city. But now, the project cynically uses the co-opted language of environmental sustainability, active transportation, and environmental justice to describe a freeway expansion project as a boon to pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, and motorists while “repairing” the historical neighborhood with construction leftovers.

Given the large and growing role of transportation in the State’s GHG emissions, the mandate to decrease emissions to 10% below 1990 levels by 2020 and at least 80% below 1990 levels by 2050, the inadequacy of the EA, and the history of damage to the adjacent communities inflicted by the freeway, it is the position of 350PDX that:



1. ODOT should not move forward with the I-5 Rose Quarter freeway widening project based on the Environmental Assessment and should instead complete a full Environmental Impact Statement to evaluate the effects of the project.
2. ODOT must include analysis of congestion pricing as both an alternative to reduce congestion and as a complicating factor to the build/no-build analysis. As of January 2019, ODOT has funding and permission from the Federal Highway Administration to study congestion pricing along the I-5 corridor as mandated by Section 120 of Oregon House Bill 2017. ODOT should also conduct the build/no-build analysis with the underlying assumption that a twelve-lane Columbia River Crossing is not built.
3. ODOT should partner with the City of Portland, Metro, and TriMet to facilitate the development of a network of dedicated and priority transit and biking facilities on all facilities under its jurisdiction.

350PDX appreciates this opportunity to provide public comment on the I-5 Rose Quarter freeway widening project. We urge you to recognize that the community is urging you to stop prioritizing the allocation of space and right-of-way to automobiles to the detriment of people walking, biking, or taking public transportation. Take this opportunity to build a positive legacy that contributes to the health, safety, and welfare of the Portland Metro Region, the State of Oregon, and the whole of the I-5 Corridor.

Sincerely,

Katy Kolker, 350PDX Interim Executive Director

Chris Palmer, 350PDX Volunteer & Communications Coordinator

Jessie Maran, 350PDX Volunteer

Jesse Lopez, 350PDX Volunteer

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Chris Riefstahl

Comment: Good evening,

My names is Chris Riefstahl and I leave in east Portland and make the commute every day to Hillsboro. Please continue with the project. The freeway need to be fixed.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 Chris Smith

Comment: I oppose this project. It does not align with the City of Portland TSP priorities for safety ([illegible] on fatalities and serious injuries) or modal hierarchy (peds, bikes, and transit over SOVs).

Attachments: N/A



2019 0312 Chris Smith

Comment: Good evening. I'm Chris Smith, a resident of Portland and I'm vice chair of the Portland Planning Sustainability Commission. I am, however, testifying as an individual tonight. Occupational hazard as a planning commissioner, I tend to review proposals against Portland's plans and policies. So, for example, I know that our Vision Zero policy asked us to prioritize safety on the basis of fatalities and serious injuries, not the fender-benders and side-swipe collisions that happen in this area. I know that the TSP that you administer Commissioner Eudaly, asked is to prioritize pedestrians, cyclists, transit, shared vehicles, single-occupant automobiles, all the way to the bottom. Yet this proposal claims that it will speed automobiles -- I have some doubts about that -- it claims it will speed autos while admitting that it will slow transit. So there's a direct contradiction between this project and the goals of our TSP. I'd also note that our north/northeast quadrant plan and our central city plan that integrated and called for a multi-level connection into the Blanchard (ph) area to support future development. What this project delivers is a street with 10 percent grade for more than 100 feet that will really only be useful to automobiles. There will be no easy pedestrian, bicycle, or transit connections because of that grade. For example, we can't run a streetcar on anything over 7 percent grade, so it will never have streetcar service across that connection. We need a project that fulfills Portland's policies and rules. Thank you.

References: Norm Marshall. 2017. "Why Urban Freeway Expansion is Futile". PSQ (/publicsquare). Aug 2017.

"Traffic Congestion and Greenhouse Gases". Access.

Video From "No More Freeways". Hosted at: nomorefreewayspx.com

Bigazzi, A., Rouleau, M. 2017. "Can Traffic Management Strategies Improve Urban Air Quality? A Review of the Evidence. Journal of Transport Health.

Bigazzi, A. Figliozzi, M. 2012. "Congestion and Emissions Mitigation: A Comparison of Capacity, Demand, and Vehicle Based Strategies. Transportation Research Part D.

Evaluation of Build v No Build Conditions for Bicycling with the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project. PBOT.

Bertelsen A. 2018. Enhanced Transit Corridors Plan. Portland Bureau of Transportation. June 2018.

Windsheimer R. "I-205 Project Funding Scenarios". ODOT Region 1. Presentation.

Phillip Ditzler. Personal letter from Phillip Ditzler to Ms. Tammy Baney and Mr. Matthew Garrett responding to questions about tolling sections of I-5. U.S. Dept. of Transportation; Oregon Division. January 8, 2019.

City of Portland. 2018. Portland 2035 Transportation System Plan. Portland Bureau of Transportation. May 2018.

Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability. "Central City 2035 N/NE Quadrant Plan; Adopted by City Council Oct. 25 2012".



City of Portland. "Vision Zero Action Plan; Saving Lives With Safe Streets". December 2016.

ODOT. 2016. Oregon Transportation Safety Plan. Oregon Dept. of Transportation.

-Table V: "2016 Fatal and Serious Injury Crash Rates and Casualty Rates.

Oregon Dept. of Transportation. 2018. "2016 State Highway Crash Rate Tables". Transportation Data Section Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit. August 2018.

Oregon Metro. 2018. "2018 Regional Transportation Plan. Regional Transportation Safety Strategy; A strategy to achieve Vision Zero in the greater Portland region". December 6 2018.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Chris Smith

Comment: These comments are associated with a number of attached digital files that will be delivered on a flash drive to your office.

1. Improper safety filter

The Project Need (EA 1.3) states that I-5 between I-405 and I-84 has the highest crash rate on urban interstates in the State of Oregon. While this may be true, it is not the relevant factor. The City of Portland Vision Zero policy, Metro RTP Safety Policy and ODOT's own Transportation Safety Action Plan (TSAP, 2016) specify that the priority is not all crashes, but rather fatal and serious injury crashes. From the TSAP section on Infrastructure:

Develop and improve infrastructure to eliminate fatalities and serious injuries for users of all modes.

Other interstate segments have higher fatality and serious injury rates than this segment. Indeed, the ODOT facilities in the region with the highest fatality and serious injury rates are orphan highways rather than interstate segments.

This plan misallocates resources for safety based on all relevant policy.

Please see attachments in folder 1 Safety on flash drive:

2018 RTP Safety Chapter

City of Portland Vision Zero Policy

ODOT TSAP

Crash Rate Tables

2. Does not support City of Portland land use plans

The Projects Goals (EA 1.4) include Provide multimodal transportation facilities to support planned development in the Rose Quarter, Lower Albina, and Lloyd.

During the development of the N/NE Quadrant plan (precursor to Central City Plan) in 2012, a major outcome discussed was opening an East/West connection to the Blanchard site north of Broadway. This plan delivers that connection in the form of the new Hancock/Dixon crossing.



This crossing has a significant section of 10% grade, meaning that it fails to meet the multi-modal need since it will be largely inaccessible to pedestrians, bicycles and transit (the Portland Streetcar for example has a maximum grade of 7%), modes that are all prioritized higher than single occupancy vehicles in the Portland Transportation System Plan.

Please see attachments in folder 2 City Plans on flash drive:

Portland TSP

N/NE Quadrant Plan

Central City Plan

3. Failure to Consider Decongestion Pricing as alternative and as impact on traffic modeling

The EA dismisses what it calls value pricing as an alternative:

The analysis of value pricing (or tolling) in the I5 corridor will be considered in the future. The potential termini for value pricing in the I5 corridor is not determined and is not currently included on any adopted transportation fiscally constrained list. Therefore, value pricing is also not considered a reasonable and foreseeable action. Potential impacts associated with value pricing are not evaluated within this NEPA document. If value pricing seems feasible following the analysis and if the State of Oregon decides to pursue value pricing, a separate NEPA process to consider the potential impacts of value pricing in the corridor would be conducted at that time.

What the EA obscures is that the future is now. The same legislative package that provides a significant funding stream for this project also directed ODOT to pursue tolling in the corridor and in fact an application for tolling authority has been submitted to FHWA which defines the potential termini of the tolled segment. It is clear that the project area is within the termini.

Presentation materials from the Dec 6, 2018 Oregon Transportation Commission meeting make it clear that ODOT anticipates the possibility of congestion pricing being implemented at the same time or even before the completion of this project.

<<Figure 1 contained in letter attachment>>

Furthermore, action item TR120 from the City of Portland Central City Plan specifies:

As part of the implementation of the Broadway/Weidler I-5 Interchange Plan (TSP Projects #20119, #20120, #20121), the following conditions are placed on the City's participation. City of Portland support for the project is:

4. ODOT, in partnership with PBOT, will implement congestion pricing and TDM options to mitigate for climate impacts as soon as feasible and prior to the opening of the project.

Decongestion pricing/value pricing/tolling is absolutely reasonably foreseeable and must be evaluated both as an alternative to this project and as a scenario in modeling traffic for this project.



ODOT has a strong motivation to exclude this analysis because their own consultants indicate the futility of addressing congestion in the corridor by any means other than pricing. ODOT is actively working to exclude this critical information from the project analysis.

Please see attachments in folder 3 Decongestion Pricing on flash drive:

OTC Presentation Materials

FHWA Response to ODOT on Congestion Pricing

Record of Portland Value Pricing Committee

Also please see Portland Central City Plan in folder 2 City Plans

4. Failure to Consider Ramp Closure Alternatives

The EA (2.1) identifies the close interchange spacing in the project area as a root cause of the issues the project seeks to address:

Within the approximately 1.5 miles that I-5 runs through the Project Area, I-5 NB connects with five on- and off-ramps, and I-5 SB connects with six on- and off-ramps. Drivers entering and exiting I-5 at these closely spaced intervals, coupled with high traffic volumes, slow traffic and increase the potential for crashes.

It seems odd then that no ramp closure solutions were evaluated. Since more than 70% of the crashes are in the southbound direction, would it not make sense to run a low-cost trial of closing the southbound exit/entrance ramps to/from Broadway/Weidler, either completely, or at specific times of day (the afternoon/evening period had a much larger portion of collisions), or perhaps opening them only for major spectator facility events? Such an operational trial is much more fiscally responsible than the build alternative and should be attempted before committing to a major capital project.

5. Negative Impact on Transit and Cyclist Travel Times

In Portland and the Region, bus speeds have been slowing due to increasing traffic congestion on arterial and collector streets. The Enhanced Transit Corridor project has been created to address this by developing exclusive transit lanes, queue jump lanes and other transit priority tools.

While the project area is not part of the plan, several major transit lines do traverse the project area and a significant capital project like this should be making a contribution to improve transit travel times. Instead this plan creates new signalization where it forces bikeways to cross transit lines, slowing both modes. The Environmental Assessment purports that it will save auto travel time while acknowledging that it delays bicycles and transit. This is contrary to the Portland TSP which prioritizes walking, biking and transit over single-occupancy vehicles.

Please see attachments in folder 5 Transit and Cycling and TSP in folder 2 City Plans on flash drive:

Enhanced Transit Corridors Program

PBOT assessment of bicycle delay



City of Portland TSP

6. Unlikely claims of reductions in emissions

The Environmental Assessment claims a reduction in the build scenario because of faster vehicle speeds. While stop-and-go traffic may have higher emissions than slow traffic, additional speed is offset by higher emissions at higher speeds (<https://www.accessmagazine.org/fall-2009/traffic-congestion-greenhouse-gases/>). And over time emissions generally correlate with total traffic, so induced demand is likely to increase emissions in the project area very quickly (<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1361920912000727>)

The project claims on no or minimal induced demand are simply not credible based experience with urban freeway projects in the United States as summarized in the attached article.

The likely increase in emissions will significantly affect the outdoor play areas at the Harriet Tubman middle school in the heart of the project area. In any emissions scenario, the freeway and its emissions will be significantly closer to the school due the project.

Please see attachments in folder 6 emissions on flash drive.

7. Opaque information and inadequate opportunity for comment

A significant group of individuals and organizations requested a 90-day public comment period, but ODOT limited comments to 45 days.

In response to complaints about significant omissions in the traffic data in the EA, ODOT provided an additional 623 pages of data on March 13, with less than 3 weeks left in the comment period.

After denying that engineering diagrams of the project existed, ODOT released 33GB of drawings on March 23 in response to a public records request.

Significant information on traffic modeling assumptions was only provided on March 25.

Nonetheless ODOT has provided no extension to the April 1st deadline for comments.

Urban freeways by their nature have significant impacts on the cities they exist in. No expansion, even a minor one as ODOT would like to characterize this project, can avoid significant impacts.

This project should be subject to a full Environmental Impact Statement process, which should acknowledge and include the existing Decongestion Pricing Project that is happening in parallel both as an alternative and as a factor in modeling traffic.

References:

Norm Marshall. 2017. "Why Urban Freeway Expansion is Futile". PSQ (/publicsquare). Aug 2017.

"Traffic Congestion and Greenhouse Gases". Access.

Video From "No More Freeways". Hosted at: nomorefreewayspx.com



Bigazzi, A., Rouleau, M. 2017. "Can Traffic Management Strategies Improve Urban Air Quality? A Review of the Evidence. *Journal of Transport Health*.

Bigazzi, A. Figliozzi, M. 2012. "Congestion and Emissions Mitigation: A Comparison of Capacity, Demand, and Vehicle Based Strategies. *Transportation Research Part D*.

Evaluation of Build v No Build Conditions for Bicycling with the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project. PBOT.

Bertelsen A. 2018. Enhanced Transit Corridors Plan. Portland Bureau of Transportation. June 2018.

Windsheimer R. "I-205 Project Funding Scenarios". ODOT Region 1. Presentation.

Phillip Ditzler. Personal letter from Phillip Ditzler to Ms. Tammy Baney and Mr. Matthew Garrett responding to questions about tolling sections of I-5. U.S. Dept. of Transportation; Oregon Division. January 8, 2019.

City of Portland. 2018. Portland 2035 Transportation System Plan. Portland Bureau of Transportation. May 2018.

Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability. "Central City 2035 N/NE Quadrant Plan; Adopted by City Council Oct. 25 2012".

City of Portland. "Vision Zero Action Plan; Saving Lives With Safe Streets". December 2016.

ODOT. 2016. Oregon Transportation Safety Plan. Oregon Dept. of Transportation.

-Table V: "2016 Fatal and Serious Injury Crash Rates and Casualty Rates.

Oregon Dept. of Transportation. 2018. "2016 State Highway Crash Rate Tables". Transportation Data Section Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit. August 2018.

Oregon Metro. 2018. "2018 Regional Transportation Plan. Regional Transportation Safety Strategy; A strategy to achieve Vision Zero in the greater Portland region". December 6 2018.

Attachments: [2019 0329 Chris Smith ATT](#); [2019 0329 Chris Smith additional attachments](#)

2019 0401 Chris Smith

CoP Planning and Sustainability Commission

Comment: These comments are supplemental to my March 29 comments.

A flash drive (labeled "CPS2") with the video of the March 26th, 2019 Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission meeting is attached to this comment and will be delivered to your offices on April 1.

At this meeting you made two significant statements:

1) You acknowledged that the traffic modeling in the EA assumes the construction of the Columbia River Crossing project, imply that the CRC is reasonably foreseeable. If so the project has the obligation to analyze the cumulative impact of the I-5 Rose Quarter project and the



CRC. the EA clearly does not do so, and the cumulative impacts would be beyond the scope of the EA, as demonstrated by the very complex EIS for the last attempt at the CRC project.

2) You indicated that the freeway lids contemplated by the project are potentially able to support one- to two-story buildings. While many in the community might see this as a desirable feature, nonetheless the EA does not undertake analysis of the environmental impacts of such structures.

Both of the above are strong additional indicators that a full EIS is necessary.

References: Norm Marshall. 2017. "Why Urban Freeway Expansion is Futile". PSQ (/publicsquare). Aug 2017.

"Traffic Congestion and Greenhouse Gases". Access.

Video From "No More Freeways". Hosted at: nomorefreewayspx.com

Bigazzi, A., Rouleau, M. 2017. "Can Traffic Management Strategies Improve Urban Air Quality? A Review of the Evidence. Journal of Transport Health.

Bigazzi, A. Figliozzi, M. 2012. "Congestion and Emissions Mitigation: A Comparison of Capacity, Demand, and Vehicle Based Strategies. Transportation Research Part D.

Evaluation of Build v No Build Conditions for Bicycling with the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project. PBOT.

Bertelsen A. 2018. Enhanced Transit Corridors Plan. Portland Bureau of Transportation. June 2018.

Windsheimer R. "I-205 Project Funding Scenarios". ODOT Region 1. Presentation.

Phillip Ditzler. Personal letter from Phillip Ditzler to Ms. Tammy Baney and Mr. Matthew Garrett responding to questions about tolling sections of I-5. U.S. Dept. of Transportation; Oregon Division. January 8, 2019.

City of Portland. 2018. Portland 2035 Transportation System Plan. Portland Bureau of Transportation. May 2018.

Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability. "Central City 2035 N/NE Quadrant Plan; Adopted by City Council Oct. 25 2012".

City of Portland. "Vision Zero Action Plan; Saving Lives With Safe Streets". December 2016.

ODOT. 2016. Oregon Transportation Safety Plan. Oregon Dept. of Transportation.

-Table V: "2016 Fatal and Serious Injury Crash Rates and Casualty Rates.

Oregon Dept. of Transportation. 2018. "2016 State Highway Crash Rate Tables". Transportation Data Section Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit. August 2018.

Oregon Metro. 2018. "2018 Regional Transportation Plan. Regional Transportation Safety Strategy; A strategy to achieve Vision Zero in the greater Portland region". December 6 2018.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0327 Chris Thomas

Comment: I write to voice my opposition to the I-5 rose quarter project. At a time when we should be doing everything within our power to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, this project eliminates a bottleneck, thereby making driving easier and encouraging more of it. As demonstrated in cities across the country, expanding freeways makes driving more convenient, which induces additional driving when people elect to live farther from work, drive farther for shopping, choose between driving and alternative modes of transportation, and so on. If congestion relief, as opposed to encouraging more driving, is in fact the desired outcome, I ask that you first implement congestion pricing to require roadway users to pay for the privilege of freeway use and thereby suppress demand. If equity is a concern, low income users could receive a credit for any congestion fees paid. I understand this is something ODOT is considering in addition to the I-5 widening project, but it should really be the first step as an alternative to the proposed project.

Thank you for your consideration.

Chris Thomas

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Chris Warner

Portland Bureau of Transportation

Comment: Please find the attached document, Exhibit A, which provides comments from the City of Portland on the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project Environmental Assessment (EA) and supporting documents.

The comments were assembled from various bureaus with subject matter expertise and responsibility for the appropriate EA topic areas.

Portland Streetcar will be responding separately through Portland Streetcar, Inc. although as the systems manager, the PBOT Streetcar Division has also provided comment as part of this submission.

As a Participating Agency we appreciate the opportunity to comment and look forward to continued participation as the EA is completed and design work begins. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Attachments: [2019 0401 Chris Warner ATT](#); [2019 0401 Chris Warner ATT 2](#)

2019 0331 Chris Whalen

Comment: Hi, I am Chris, I am 14 years old and I care about my future. Please, this isn't going to help at all. Expanding the freeways and adding more lanes only worsens the problem of congestion on the roads because it encourages more people to drive, this makes it even worse for the environment than it is now and is not an okay thing to do. We care, my generation cares



and I do not want to be living in a Portland where the freeways look like Los Angeles and the air pollution is as bad as Dheli, India. Please make your decision for the future generations not the comfort of yourselves.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0308 Christian Grand

Rowe Middle School

Comment: Many thanks for your consistent desire to make Oregon a better place to live. I admire ODOT's efficiency and dedication.

I appreciate the work you have put into the Rose Quarter project, but my request is that you do not continue the project.

The idea of saving 2.5 million hours of delay each year is surely tempting, but that number is based on the assumption that current traffic projections stay relatively static. This is not the case. Once folks notice the increased efficiency and speed, more people will travel on that freeway, thereby decreasing the intended efficiency. I urge you to take a look at Houston and Los Angeles if you would like an example of how more freeways do not lead to decreased traffic.

I also do not believe that the freeway will be helpful for the community that lives in the area. The benefits will go to people traveling through that part of town, not to those who live there. As an educator, I am disappointed that the students of Harriet Tubman Elementary may have to deal with increased pollution and noise for the benefit of people who do not live in the community. I do not believe that having Portland Public Schools pay to have a ventilation systems put into its high traffic neighborhood schools mitigates the risk of breathing the pollution that they do.

The people who live there will suffer from increased pollution, while the people who drive through the town will benefit with a temporarily faster commute. The short term benefits of the freeway would certainly be outlasted by a rail line.

My wife and I moved to Portland from Southern California because we wanted the ease of travel usually reserved for a small town, and the amenities of a city. We moved here specifically because of the 20 minute neighborhood program.

I urge you to lean on Portland's culture of community, urban infill, and forward-thinking mass transit plan. Please do not try to solve a 21st century problem with a 20th century solution.

Many thanks for your time; please feel free to contact me with any questions.

--

Christian Grand, M.Ed.

Rowe Middle School

NCEA Treasurer



Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Christianne Gillenardo-Goudreau

Comment: Expanding the freeways will not help with traffic. This is an incredibly bad idea that will affect the city for decades. It's lazy thinking.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0224 Christina DeArment

Comment: I moved to Portland because it is forward thinking and progressive. Please spend your proposed time and money on expanding alternative transportation options including more regularly running busses and trains with larger routes and more safe/well lit bikeways. What about a tax break for employers who allows their employees to commute into work at different times instead of 9-5. Also, let's increase the cost of parking downtown. There are many ways to look at this problem. Let's get creative and find a long-term solution. -christina

Attachments: N/A

2019 0301 Christina M Gullion

Comment: No city has ever solved traffic congestion by adding more capacity. The expansion will make it easier & more convenient for cars to travel the I5 corridor, so more cars will choose that route and it will be at capacity almost immediately.

I particularly object to a plan that increases carbon emissions in the PDX area. \$500 million is an enormous amount of money. It could be used for numerous alternatives to auto transport and reduce demand for I5. These projects include sidewalks and crosswalks in East Portland, rapid transit between Portland and Vancouver, better coverage of the city with bus lines & more frequent service, electric buses. Unlike a freeway widening, all of those investments would be better for air quality, carbon emissions, public health, and congestion relief.

Finally, demand-sensitive pricing should be applied to the I5 & I84 corridors a great example is the city of Singapore, in which every local vehicle has a transponder with a value-added card, tolls are automatically deducted & priced according to time of day and area; they are even used to pay parking fees in public parking garages. I used the tollway in Dallas, TX for many years traffic moved fast and a toll-tag permitted traffic speed through toll gates.

Don't do it! There are smarter ways to spend that money, and the need for reducing carbon emissions is reaching emergency levels.

Christina M Gullion

326 SE 53rd Ave

Portland, OR 97215

Attachments: N/A



2019 0321 Christine Hoerner

Comment: I oppose the expansion of the freeway through the Rose Quarter for several common sense reasons.

1) It will not solve or even make a dent in traffic congestion through that area, period. Other safety measures should be taken to reduce crashes and fatalities. Start with severely limiting speed because drivers in the left lane go too fast and many cars in the right lane are jockeying to change lanes either left to get around the slowdown of cars merging onto I-84, or right to merge onto the I-84 on ramp which is ALWAYS backed up. Install cameras to detect speeders and ticket them. Enforce a LOW speed limit of 25 or 30 MPH through that short area--it will save time and lives with fewer crashes and delays due to those crashes.

2) Pollution--those children and teachers at Harriet Tubman School should not be destined to likely be predisposed to ill future health. Nor should nearby residents.

3) The Flint street overpass is a godsend of a bike route connection to the west side of town and is heavily used by bike commuters. It is wide, has little car traffic and feels relatively safe. By eliminating it and creating a possibly less favorable route you risk getting people off their bikes and back into their cars.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Christine Manning

Comment: I support and agree PPS perspective. Please do not expand I-5. I am concerned about air quality decreasing, traffic impact (increased SOVs), soil stability and health and lastly noise for the students and the surrounding neighborhoods. Please spend the money on 82nd or Powell improvements. (Both ODOT).

Thank you,

Christine Manning

Attachments: N/A

2019 0316 Christine Nelson

Comment: Expanding freeways is not the answer to urban automobile congestion. It simply adds to the carbon-dioxide in our environment which is a major cause of catastrophic climate disruption. For the sake of future generations and our earth, please do not be part of this.

Building easily accessible urban transportation systems for all sectors of our society is a much more responsible option. By focusing on that you would be creating a better Oregon and setting a new benchmark for those who follow you.

Thank you for considering my opinion.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0315 Christine Utz

Comment: Our beautiful city does not need more lanes for traffic and no more freeways. We do need bus only lanes and free transit. Either of those would reduce more traffic than any expansion and in less time than any expansion would take to build.

Listen to the children, teachers, parents and even older folks like me who would rather take a few minutes longer to get to our destination when walking, biking or taking public transportation. Yes, I have a vehicle but have CHOSEN to drive only a day or two a month. We have only one EARTH.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Christopher Davies

Comment: I am absolutely opposed to any expenditure towards "improving", widening, or fixing the freeway

The freeway cuts through the heart of my neighborhood, and is a source of noise and toxic air.

Get rid if it.

Make 205 the only north-south road,heavily tolled to reduce congestion.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Christopher Schiel

Comment: Hello,

The EA fails to reconcile induced demand and is likely to make congestion worse. If we have 12 years to do something about climate change, it is absolutely critical to faithfully assess all environmental impacts.

Please proceed with a full EIS before moving forward to the design phase.

Regards,

Christopher F Schiel

Attachments: N/A

2019 0305 Christopher Hebbeler

Comment: Hello, I have lived in Portland for 46 years, born here. Been driving on our portland freeways for 29 years.

Although this expansion wont solve our commuter hour congestion, It will ease traffic overall . Back in and around 1985 people complained the MAX train was too expensive, and the train would never be fully utilized. This freeway expansion needs to move forward.

My 2 cents.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Christopher Hebbeler

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 0327 Christopher Yuen

Comment: I am strongly opposed to this rose quarter project. It compromises all our future sustainable transportation goals, doesn't materially improve safety, exacerbates climate change, and repeats the racial injustice that we are supposed to leave behind.

At age 28, I am among a generation of peers that will experience the consequences of our policies and actions nowadays. Sure, we can take a reactionary approach to transportation planning, where we "predict and provide" road capacity where we expect congestion will become unbearable, but our long term mode share and sustainability goals require that we do otherwise. We can either miss all these goals, and carry on a path of automobile dependence, where everyone continues to live further away from school and work, where inner-city racially diverse schools get fed more pollution, where only the poor ride transit; or we take visionary approach- implementing road pricing first and evaluating its impacts before building any more capacity. We could even spend that money towards improving transit or cycling, or for building more affordable housing that would allow people to live closer and need to drive less.

Portland would not be the only city that has taken a visionary approach- Vancouver BC abandoned an entire highway network in the 60's and things are working out wonderfully. Traffic cordon counts indicate that car traffic has declined back to levels last seen in the 1970's while downtown has only added more jobs and residents. Transit ridership is soaring. Cycling and walking are becoming practical and safe choices. We can do it too. It takes leadership to do, but we can do it too.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Cindy

Comment: Hi, I'm Cindy. I'm a student at Harriet Tubman Middle School. The air quality is very bad at our school. To add more trucks and automobiles would increase toxic particulates in the air. The emissions standards are low here in Oregon, and adding more diesel trucks on the highway, yards away from our school, would affect us greatly. Also, if you choose to expand the highway, during construction, surface streets will see a huge increase in drivers. Even now we already have had two students hit by cars near our school. I respect your choice but note that this will affect the students of today and in the future.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0312 Claire Hansen

Comment: Hi, my name is Claire Hansen. I'm a parent of a student at Martin Luther King Junior Elementary School and a student at Harriet Tubman Middle School. I'm a proud member of the Albina community. After 20 years in Portland I was honored to be able to move into the Albina community almost eight years ago. I would like to say that you probably know the history of the Albina community. I hope so as our representatives in government. But I'm not going to assume it because many people, myself included, didn't truly know the history until they moved to the area. Since you probably do, you know that they community has not been listened to again and again. I want to point out that while we have some really amazing middle school students and parents here tonight, we didn't have anyone else out of 500 students because they don't even know. They don't know that this project is expanding into the school grounds. They do not know that there is testimony that can be given. And most of them when I brought it up said "Nobody is going to listen." Please make sure that that is not what happens again. We know the data. We know the science behind the expansion in terms of what amount of capacity will be alleviated, and then further congestion will just be returned. We know about the amount of particulates. But we also know that this is an act upon communities of color, upon poor communities, among people that can't speak out for themselves, or who have spoken out and have been silenced. So this becomes the intersection of how we want to build our society in terms of our air, in terms of our traffic flow, and who we want to listen to. And I feel this project is a wonderful opportunity to say we have a better way to do this. We know what we've done in the past and we have a better way to think about where we can use our money and who it can be used for. We can advocate to use ODOT money somewhere besides expanding the freeway into a school, and into a community that's been disserved again and again with these projects. Thank you for your time.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Claire Swearingen

Comment: It's astounding to me that ODOT and Portland city officials have been able to lie to themselves about the realities of this project so thoroughly. The proposed changes will do nothing but waste crucial city funds and increase emissions in the backyard of a middle school, all while failing to improve traffic congestion, just as every freeway widen project in the past has.

Why was no other strategy employed before jumping to this destructive, expensive conclusion? Where were congestion pricing, transit infrastructure investments, gas taxes, active commuting programs? Where were all of the solutions that actually have the ability to relieve congestion while moving toward goals of sustainability? This is not the 50's, we are well out of the freeway era. It's time to be more inventive with our solutions because if we aren't, all we get is little kids with asthma in the short term and an uninhabitable planet in the long term.

Not only will this project be ineffective and damaging, but it is also a massive waste of city funding. Is ODOT even aware that there are entire swaths of Portland proper that have no bus service, no sidewalks, and roads that are impossible to drive on? A massive percent of the



roads in far southwest Portland are unpaved and many of them are in such poor condition that they can barely be considered roads. There are long stretches of road with no sidewalk at all where cars drive upwards of 40 miles an hour. There is an astounding lack of bus service which is especially horrific given that the high schools do not provide school buses. You are forcing families to own multiple cars and doing nothing to help those who can't. There are people all over the city DYING at unsafe intersections in car accidents. I saw a 15-year-old girl having tea with her mother just minutes before she died crossing the street on Hawthorne Blvd. People in this city are dependent on you to use city funding to help them, and you are blowing half a billion dollars on this project. It's insulting.

All you are doing by going forward with this project is wasting money and encouraging car use. You are completely stuck in the past. The era of freeways must come to an end if we as a country and as a human race are going to act like we are taking climate change seriously at all. Portland can be an example to other cities of what a smart, green, equitable future looks like, but not if this project goes through. Show those living in this city that you really do have their best interests at heart. Give them safe roads, transit, and clean air. This is a turning point in the fight against climate change, and you're choosing to lose the battle.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Claire Swearingen 2

Comment: To whom it may concern,

It's astounding to me that ODOT and Portland city officials have been able to lie to themselves about the realities of this project so thoroughly. The proposed changes will do

nothing but waste crucial city funds and increase emissions in the backyard of a middle school, all while failing to improve traffic congestion, just as every freeway widen project in

the past has.

Why was no other strategy employed before jumping to this destructive, expensive conclusion? Where were congestion pricing, transit infrastructure investments, gas taxes, active commuting programs? Where were all of the solutions that actually have the ability to relieve congestion while moving toward goals of sustainability? This is not the 50's, we are

well out of the freeway era. It's time to be more inventive with our solutions because if we aren't, all we get is little kids with asthma in the short term and an uninhabitable planet in

the long term.

Not only will this project be ineffective and damaging, but it is also a massive waste of city funding. Is ODOT even aware that there are entire swaths of Portland proper that have no bus service, no sidewalks, and roads that are impossible to drive on? A massive percent of the roads in far southwest Portland are unpaved and many of them are in such poor condition that they can barely be considered roads. There are long stretches of road with no sidewalk at all where cars drive upwards of 40 miles an hour. There is an astounding lack of bus service which is especially horrific given that the high schools do not provide school buses. You are forcing



families to own multiple cars and doing nothing to help those who can't. There are people all over the city DYING at unsafe intersections in car accidents. I saw a 15-year-old girl having tea with her mother just minutes before she died crossing the street on Hawthorne Blvd. People in this city are dependent on you to use city funding to help them, and you are blowing half a billion dollars on this project. It's insulting.

All you are doing by going forward with this project is wasting money and encouraging car use. You are completely stuck in the past. The era of freeways must come to an end if we as a country and as a human race are going to act like we are taking climate change seriously at all. Portland can be an example to other cities of what a smart, green, equitable future looks like, but not if this project goes through. Show those living in this city that you really do have their best interests at heart. Give them safe roads, transit, and clean air. This is a turning point in the fight against climate change, and you're choosing to lose the battle.

Sincerely,

Claire Swearingen, Urban Planning student, and long-time Portland resident

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Claire Stein-Ross

Comment: I write to oppose the I-5 freeway expansion, for the following reasons:

Portland has long been a leader in urban planning and transportation, as well as public policies that consider the critical issue of climate change. The funds for freeway expansion can have a more lasting effect on the future of Portland and the region if used to further pioneer public transit and other more environmentally-friendly and efficient transportation options.

My understanding is that the modeling of traffic improvements due to the expansion assumes construction of the Columbia River Crossing. Because the CRC project is not a reality, these projections are also unrealistic and should be reevaluated.

The potential impact to Harriet Tubman Middle School warrants further study, ensuring that any future plans have the support of the school's administration, teachers, and parents. While I appreciate your acknowledgement of the history of displacement in the proposal materials, this project does not fully address concerns of people who live, work, and attend school near the site - a displacement of their perspectives if not their bodies.

As many others have already requested, I urge you to conduct a full environmental impact study and to reconsider the long-term ramifications of investing in freeways instead of public transportation.

Thank you,

Claire Stein-Ross

Attachments: N/A



2019 0329 Claire Vlach

Comment: I am writing to express my opposition to the Rose Quarter I-5 Expansion Project.

The negative effects of climate change are already being felt, and I'm worried about the state of the planet my two young children will inherit. 40% of carbon emissions in Oregon are from transportation. Building a freeway will only serve to increase carbon emissions, when we need to be working to drastically curb emissions in order to avoid severe weather, flooding, and other climate-related issues.

I also spend a lot of time walking and biking (also with my kids!) and am concerned that ODOT thinks that the best way to improve safety on our streets is via this freeway project. This project is mostly meant to prevent minor collisions such as fender-benders, but other ODOT-owned streets such as 82nd Ave and Powell Blvd regularly see major collisions, including people getting seriously injured or even killed.

These are only two of the many reasons why I oppose this project. I would like ODOT to do the following:

- 1) Implement congestion pricing. This might be enough to solve traffic problems in this area without spending half a billion dollars, and would have a positive rather than negative impact on climate change.
- 2) Do a full Environmental Impact Statement. This project will have significant impacts on air pollution (including for some of our most vulnerable populations, such as at Harriet Tubman Middle School), on climate change, on transportation in the Rose Quarter area, etc, and should be more fully studied. A no-build alternative that doesn't include a new CRC should be studied, as well as an alternative involving congestion pricing rather than expansion.
- 3) Spend money on fixing our existing problematic streets to make them safer for people walking and biking and to make them more efficient for transit. This would be a much more responsible use of funds.

Sincerely,

Claire Vlach

Attachments: N/A

2019 0304 Clare Burovac

Comment: Hello,

I am STRONGLY OPPOSED to the expansion of I-5. 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. I live and



work within a mile of this area, and I would MUCH prefer that this money be spent on bike lanes and public transit.

Thank you for your attention to this.

Clare Burovac

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Clare Burovac

Comment: I am very concerned about the newly released information regarding the affect the highway expansion will have on the Eastbank esplanade. That is a major bike arterial, as well a recreational path for runners and walkers. As someone who travels it frequently (at least a few times per week when it's open), I am very concerned about the new construction that will affect it, as well as the increased air and noise pollution from the vehicular traffic that will use it. As an asthmatic who does not own a car and commutes by bike and public transportation, this will directly affect my health and well being. Please kill this project.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Clarissa Littler

Comment: Hello,

I wanted to register my opposition to the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion.

I think it's a bad move to try and improve the efficiency of using freeways instead of making them less necessary by investing in transit and road improvements for pedestrians and cyclists.

As an educator who works across the Portland area---and frequently in east county---I can say that what would help people like me is to have more transit options at a higher frequency.

I've read about the proposal for this expansion and I don't think it'll be worth the cost, fiscal or environmental, when we could instead invest in any number of improvements across Portland.

Thanks for your time,

Clarissa

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Clarity Flowers

Comment: I am deeply disappointed by the continuation of this project, because I need to have hope for the future, and every dollar we spend towards helping cars is a step away from our priorities. I am frustrated that every day I learn about new fact about the project that I wish had been clear up front. I am angry that people are dying on my city's streets and money that could've gone towards that is instead going towards a freeway, a freeway that is another step in a long legacy of neighborhood destruction in the Rose Quarter. We failed our black communities



in the Rose Quarter when we demolished their neighborhoods to build the I-5. It saddens me that we're prepared to fail them further.

Please reconsider this project, and instead look into safety improvements for the most vulnerable people on the streets, as well as congestion pricing as a sustainable and proven model for scaling back our dependence on auto-traffic.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Claud Gilbert

Comment: There are myriad reasons to reconsider the auxiliary lane additions to I-5 at the Rose Quarter. Here are a few.

The caps as proposed are poorly planned and considered. They will be inadequate, hard to reach, loud, have polluted air and therefore be underutilized as park space. They can be re-engineered to support larger buildings. Larger buildings will tie-in to the Albina Vision Trust plans to reconnect the neighborhood severed in two by the freeway and house the historically impacted and marginalized minority community that was centered in this area .

The planned bikeways and street access are poorly planned. Heavily used Flint crossing will be eliminated. Access ramps will have a grade as steep as 10%! Broadway will carry five lanes of vehicle traffic. All of these factors will make non-vehicle use more difficult.

The added access lanes will add capacity which, in turn, will lead to induced demand with higher vehicle counts and a return to gridlock. This is just kicking the can down the road and not a long term solution. Congestion tolling as a response to gridlock should be considered.

A further investment in expanding freeway capacity (which is what this truly is) runs counter to the pressing need to immediately start reducing our use of fossil fuels. Portland's existing high level of diesel particulate matter air pollution, the immediate presence of Harriet Tubman Middle School, the overwhelming dependence on the single occupancy vehicle and, lastly, the global climate catastrophe all demand a reduction of freeway and internal combustion engine vehicle use, not an expansion.

Thank you, Claud Gilbert

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Clay Robbins

Comment: This is dumb as hell! The expansion won't fix anything while doing immeasurable damage to the area. Where did they come up with this ridiculous plan? It makes me embarrassed to live here.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0217 Clay Thompson

Comment: I love this idea. It would be a much needed boost to the walkability of the Lloyd District and better use of real estate. If you could cap a little more of I-5 that'd be great too.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Clayton Sodergren

Comment: I oppose the freeway expansion for a number of reasons. First, it will not help with traffic- LA tried the same thing and it made traffic even worse- which ODOT has even admitted to. Secondly and more importantly, more freeways means more pollution in nearby neighborhoods and overall, and higher CO2 emissions. Our world is already undergoing massive extinction, as has been documented by countless peer-reviewed scientific publications, and more carbon emissions will only speed this up. This proposal is irresponsible in the face of climate change and I oppose it wholeheartedly. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0305 Cliff Heaberlin

Comment: Just wanted to add my voice of opposition the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project: I'm well familiar with the area as a several decade long bicycle commuter and past resident of nearby Boise neighborhood. That sort of funding could be put to better uses supporting a wider range of transportation infrastructure, from sidewalks to rapid bus lines.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0305 Clint Culpepper

Comment: I am reviewing the Rose Quarter EA for the BAC and have a question about the LTS analysis. In the Active Transportation Technical Report, it mentions the "Local Street Multimodal Risk/Safety Assessment included in the Transportation Safety Technical Report (ODOT 2019c)" but I can't seem to locate this. Specifically, I'm looking for how this LTS analysis was conducted and the details about the analysis. With PBOT not having their own LTS analysis, I'm assuming that this was conducted as part of the EA and so we would like to know how this analysis may have completed. Would you have any details about where we could find this analysis?

Attachments: N/A

2019 0306 Clint Culpepper

Comment: I didn't find the details of the LTS analysis in the safety document or its appendices nor did I find ODOT's methodology in any of these documents. If you could let me know where both of these can be found in the document, I would appreciate it.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0312 Clint Culpepper

Comment: Clint Culpepper, a parent of two future Harriet Tubman students. ODOT is being disingenuous in calling this a safety project. This is a capacity project first and foremost. Barbur, Lombard, Powell, and 82nd are all on our list of high-crash corridors. All of them are also ODOT facilities, on which they have refused to make significant safety improvements. If ODOT was truly concerned about safety, they would spend this \$500 million on projects that would begin saving lives tomorrow. This project is also located in a neighborhood that has been destroyed repeatedly by projects that have been forced upon it. The Memorial Coliseum, the Rose Garden, the Convention Center that we're sitting in today, as well as the I-5 when it was originally constructed, all displaced the community that then neighborhood belonged to. The Albina Vision is a project that is attempting to stitch the lower Albina neighborhood back together. Moving this I-5 project forward will only further damage the neighborhood and make putting the Albina Vision in place even less likely. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0315 Clint Culpepper

Comment: Megan,

Which technical report contains this analysis, I still can't seem to find it mentioned.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Clint Rhea

Comment: I'm deeply concerned with the proposed spending of \$500 million on additional automobile infrastructure in the heart of Portland. We already own a legacy of destroying entire neighborhoods and inducing traffic around our waterways - please don't waste more time and money doing the same. Portland is lagging behind cities around the world that are already debating and/or implementing congestion pricing to win back cities for people. It's time for us to be bold and act on real data for the future of our people and planet, not silently watch ODOT crustify Portland with more car infrastructure. Do not squander this opportunity to reverse course!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Clint Rhea

Comment: No comment provided

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Clinton Myers

Comment: No comment provided



Attachments: N/A

2019 0313 Clive Munz

Comment: Please go through with this project, currently the interchange is an unsafe mess to drive through and causes significant waste of time and fuel. People and goods need to get to their destination and that isn't going to change in the future. This project will be a significant benefit to those that have to use it on a regular basis, and will be a benefit to the rose quarter area, including those that are able to bike to work downtown. Induced demand isn't a relevant argument in this situation.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Cloe Ashton

Comment: We're at a critical point in society where our leaders need to be forward thinking, but not about the impact generations from now, they need to think about the impact their decisions make within the next 10 years. If leaders make any choice antithetical to lessening carbon emissions they are acting against the people and the planet. This is no longer a fringe ecological concern, but an imminent threat facing every human.

Freeway expansions don't work. Mathematical models for traffic aren't effective. The fix can no longer come from throwing options at the wall to see what sticks. We know there need to be fewer personal vehicles on the road, start there.

We need universal solutions not just for fixes for those who can afford convenience. Public transit works for everyone. Commuters, locals, tourists, the disabled, the young, the old. If a young professional thinks traffic is inconvenient try being wheelchair bound in outer SE where sidewalks (if there are any) lack curb ramps.

Every dollar of the people's money should be spent on equitable solutions for all not stop-gaps prioritizing the few.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0319 Cole Lalomia

Comment: The idea that we can alleviate traffic by increasing the capacity of 1.8 miles of road is absolutely ridiculous. All freeway expanding projects lead to more cars using the freeway. I've heard the project pitched as a safety improvement-- the thinking being that more space to merge makes for safer merges. If we really wanted this 1.8 section of road to be safe, we would extremely lower the speed limit. Yes, there are some merges that feel unsafe and are prone to crashes in this area, but they would not if everyone was moving at 35mph instead of 50mph. Roads are not unsafe because there is traffic, roads are unsafe because of how we drive on them. I would like to see ODOT implement decongestion pricing before any sort of expansion. What compounds the absurdity of this project is the history of Albina and the safety of children at Harriet Tubman School. I love the idea of capping the highway to re-connect parts of a



neighborhood that were destroyed by the original I-5 construction, but only if the caps are actually capable of being built upon. In the current design, the caps will be isolated/disconnected greenspace above and next to the highway. They will be underused. Spending 500 million dollars on increasing traffic, increasing pollution next to a school in a historically under served community, and building a couple of benches next to the freeway is not okay.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0308 Cole Merkel

Comment: To whom it may concern,

I would like to lodge my strong disapproval toward the Rose Quarter I5 freeway expansion.

I believe this project is a waste of public resources and a tone deaf policy that imperils our future. With any large transportation infrastructure project we need to consider the reality that we have less than a decade to drastically curb greenhouse gas emissions to survive climate change. This project would, long term, increase motorists using the I-5 corridor, in turn increasing the amount of carbon burned in our city center.

In Oregon, we have a long, storied history of taking care of our natural resources and creating a stake in public ownership in our infrastructure projects. We made all beachfront public land, and tore freeways out of downtown Portland to create Waterfront Park. Previous generations also had the foresight to stop projects like the Mount Hood freeway and invest those infrastructure dollars in the nation's first ever light rail lines. The half a billion dollars that are set aside for this boondoggle that won't decrease congestion in the I-5 corridor while massively increasing pollution in our city center could be redirected. Instead we could use these monies toward creating large scale green infrastructure projects, or we could simply use them to bring streets in East Portland and throughout the Metro area up to code with paving, bike lanes, sidewalks and rapid bus corridors.

Building a freeway, the American infrastructure project of the 1950s, is regressive and menial when we need big, bold and fresh investment to set an example for the rest of the nation. We are required to do this in order to battle the realities of climate change that we are already beginning to suffer under without real, bold action.

Please do not spend my tax dollars on this regressive, pointless freeway.

Cole Merkel

Milwaukie, OR

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Cole Trusty

Comment: Freeway expansion through Portland is a bad idea! Is this a Donald Trump plan? I hope so, because I would like to think better of Oregon Transportation Professionals. Expansion



will not solve traffic problems, but will fill that area with more cars, at a time when we need to reduce the amount of cars on our road. You know, we all know, that the cost estimate is a lie. Just the costs of fighting all of us that are seriously opposed to such lunacy is going to be expensive.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0305 Coleen Holden

Comment: Apart from clear studies and statements that show this very expensive lane expansion will not help traffic, it seems like it will do a lot more bad than good. This very large monetary investment will result in increased emissions and a variety of climate concerns. Instead this money could be used to encourage zero emissions, like more zero-emission buses, more sidewalks, increased light rail coverage, etc. I'm very unsure of why money is being thrown to this project, and personally think it's the wrong direction we need to be going as a country. If decongestion is a reason, why not implement decongestion pricing? This is bad news for the environment, and predictions and expectations show little to no return - why are we spending [so much] money on this?!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Colin Dabritz

Comment: Good public policy is based on facts, and it's clear that the reasoning in the initial report was based on a flawed assumption. It would not be right to proceed with this project without a new analysis based on clear, transparent assumptions that match realistic possibilities.

Moving into a future where the climate change fight is becoming life or death, we need smarter public policy that improves our environment. It seems clear that this project, as it stands, is a net negative. We can't afford policy mistakes like this with our health, safety, and ecology of our world on the line.

I've worked with ODOT before, and there are many good people there who are trying to do right by their communities. It's time for the organization to recognize and respect the good work and research the community has done on this issue and listen.

Please, stop this project, and work toward better policy that works with communities and our environment. It's a win for everyone.

Colin Dabritz

1250 E Burnside St, Apt 229

(This is intended to be a public comment on the I5 Rose Quarter expansion project)

Attachments: N/A



2019 0308 Colin Gibson

Comment: Even if you assume that freeway expansion relieves congestion (it doesn't), any economic benefit would be vastly outweighed by the increased carbon emissions and their contribution to climate change. It does not pencil out in the long term. Expanding freeways is climate denialism. Instead of continuing the failed experiment of freeway construction, we should be doing everything we can to incentivize low-emission transit options and disincentivize personal automobile use.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Colin Jones

Comment: Six of the eight years I've lived in Portland were in the Lloyd District and, after changing jobs three years ago, I've commuted to or from work most days by car. Most weekend, you find me taking I5, I84, or the 26 to get to hiking spots around the state. I appreciate that car mobility is critically important to many Oregonians and that freeways in Portland aren't just about Portlanders. But the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion is the wrong way to improve mobility and opportunity for Oregonians. We've built our identity as a state that innovates, that puts community vitality first, and that leads the fight against climate change this project moves us in the wrong direction on all three fronts. Rather than developing a creative solution, as we did when we extended the Red Line to the airport rather than building new parking, RQFE doubles down on a freeway strategy that has failed across the country. Rather than supporting community vitality, as we did with the development of McCall Park, this project damages community assets like the Vera Katz Esplanade and divides the Albion's neighborhood once again. And rather than addressing climate change and pollution, this freeway expansion will lead to greater emissions and pollutants for Harriet Tubman students. I would urge ODOT and the City of Portland to go back to the drawing board and find a way forward that lives up to Oregon's values.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Connor Daliposon

Comment: Freeway expansion has never solved a traffic congestion problem. This project is expensive and disruptive and, worst of all, it won't even work.

Please, before moving forward, provide the public with a full Environmental Impact Assessment. People are owed that much at least.

\$500,000,000 can fix hundreds of sidewalks, build bus only lanes and protected multi-modal paths.

Freeways aren't good. Get creative. Please.

I, along with many neighbors, strongly oppose the I5 Rose Quarter freeway expansion project.

Thank you,



Connor Daliposon

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Connor Robetorye

Comment: A freeway expansion would be moving this city in the wrong direction! Building bigger and bigger roads for more and more cars is environmentally unsustainable. We need to invest in public transit options and improve existing infrastructure much more than we need more lanes on our freeways!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Connor Toth

Comment: I believe that any project to increase automotive capacity in urban areas is misguided. All these funds should be redirected to furthering modes of transportation which are sustainable and equitable (biking, public transit, walking)

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Conor Eifler

Comment: This is a shameful and lazy move. As our city grows we need to stay true to the values that have made Portland such an amazing place.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Coral Walker

Comment: More Freeways are not going to help our city, it is going to make things worse. More Traffic, more accidents, more pollution. Let us invest in public transportation and a more walkable and bikeable city. We do not want to become another Los Angeles with impossible traffic and non-stop freeways. We want a friendlier, healthier lifestyle. Stop the freeways.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0225 CoralSage Walker-Dale

Comment: Dear all,

For a cost of half a billion dollars we could start making the necessary developments on greener light rail and carbonless public transit options. If we have \$450,000,000 to spend on transit, then add more public transit options and do not implement a toll.

Given Portland's growing metropolitan area, we should have the kind of regular, circular transit options so common in European cities that bring people in and out of the city at a frequency that makes public transport the best option. As more residential buildings are built



downtown without any parking, and as the city tries to move away from being car-centric, it is a painful irony that it is also seeking to swell the freeway.

NO expansion project has EVER reduced congestion! PSU, all other states, and anyone with experience will tell you that, if anything, initially freeing up lanes just makes more people drive by 'induced demand'. This is a catastrophic step backward in efforts to limit climate change, a huge waste of taxpayer money, and a source of great disgust for me.

I'd like to think you've come across all the following already--but then that would mean you're in denial about it by not following it. Still, I remind you that it is an issue of pollution, social justice, climate denial, unrealistic goals, and costs.

Increase in air 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.

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. Not a single urban freeway expansion in North America has ever solved the problem of congestion, due to a concept that urban planners call induced demand. Why are city leaders willing to spend \$450 million betting that somehow, the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion will be any different?

Opportunity Costs: Even *if* ODOT can manage to keep this project under \$500,000,000 (pretty unlikely, given the agency's track record), it's an enormously expensive undertaking whereas the revenues could be spent on a litany of other projects and needs across the region. \$500 million could build 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.

Community Opposition: Despite ODOT's claims that this project reconnects the community, 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

I urge you in the strongest terms possible to end this project and explore other public transport infrastructure that has long been needed and that is a far more sustainable use of funds for our goals.



Attachments: [2019 0225 CoralSage Walker-Dale ATT](#)

2019 0402 Corbin Smith

Comment: I feel a little strange writing to you, seeing as I am a Clark county resident, but I figure this is my metro area, as well. I have sat by, frustrated by my own city and state's deadlocked and half informed response to bringing accessible multiuse transit to Vancouver, and it pains me to see Portland, supposedly more progressive than Vancouver, fumble around with the same asinine solutions to congestion that gave left the I5 Crossing such a mess. Expanding Freeways does not work. It just invites traffic and pollution to our city centers. Portland should be seeking to expand other methods of transit expansion instead of feeding the old paradigm of car-first road construction. I oppose the Rose Quarter expansion.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Courtney Brown

Comment: I am resident of the Eliot neighborhood and a mother of two girls who will attend Tubman middle school.

At first I was hopeful that with its freeway caps and "improved" pedestrian and bicycle access that the expansion project would be good for our neighborhood and all the kids getting themselves to and from Tubman everyday. I was hopeful that freeway caps could be used to mitigate the impacts to the airshed around the school from I-5 and that the caps could be used to provide connected and dedicated spaces for bike and pedestrian traffic and re-connect the pieces of what once was the thriving Albina area. But I am saddened to see that the project falls short of providing dedicated lanes for bike and pedestrian traffic and the caps will not be big enough or near enough to Tubman to make any difference. And the project planners missed an opportunity to give back to the community in providing for meaningful connected public spaces. I do not think this project will make it safer for kids travelling to and from Tubman from automobile traffic. And, the Environmental Assessment also does a terrible job of evaluating the impacts to the health of our kids from an expansion of freeway lanes.

I heard on OPB that the Environmental Assessment is based on the assumption that the Columbia River Crossing had been built - which we know it hasn't. Are the project planners really that incompetent? If that news is true you must go back to the drawing board and plan for this project under real circumstances. At the very least please do a full Environmental Impact Statement on this project. And please put the health and safety of the most vulnerable users of this area: middle schoolers, bicyclists and pedestrians at the forefront of the project. I would support this project if I believed it contributed to the betterment of our neighborhood and the environment. In its current form, it does not. The focus is clearly on moving as much traffic through the Rose Quarter as possible. This single-minded focus is a missed opportunity.

Thank you,

Courtney Brown



Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Craig Harlow

Comment: I oppose the proposed project to widen Interstate 5 through the Rose Quarter, on many serious grounds.

I have read that data used by ODOT has not all been released to outside parties that need it for independently evaluating the project. If that is true, then (1) all data should be made available without restriction or delay, and (2) the period for outside parties to analyze data and address concerns with the public and with ODOT should be extended to allow for robust, and thoroughly inclusive public discussion process.

I have now come to understand that the project's projections for traffic volume include the non-existent widening of the Columbia River crossing, and that the same theoretical increase was *not* included in air-quality projections by this project. Is that, in fact, the case?

I have also read that the project's Environmental Assessment document doesn't adequately attend on the impacts to health and safety. If it hasn't been done already, then a full and complete environmental impact statement should be ordered.

I have also read that advocacy organizations for active transportation -- biking, walking, transit, etc. -- dispute the projects claims that it will improve conditions for active transportation, and that the same is true of affected neighborhood organizations, and groups representing the community's various minority and elderly members. If this project isn't taking those expert groups' input seriously, then the motivations driving the project.

Increasing lane capacity through this section will only temporarily alleviate congestion problems, and according to the rule of induced demand, that temporary relief will increase incentive for people to choose auto travel along this route and in a short time the same level of congestion will be resumed, but with a greater number of vehicles in slow-motion storage. There is no precedent to demonstrate the notion that increasing lane capacity will have long-term benefit to traffic congestion.

Increasing the number of autos participating in this section's congestion will increase auto emissions, in opposition to our state's and city's climate action goals.

Long-term traffic and pollution here and in adjacent neighborhoods will worsen, not improve if this project goes forward.

The increased pollution is doubly insidious, because those most affected will be the historically abused african-american Albina neighborhood, and the children in attendance at Harriet Tubman Middle School, where my fifth-grader is tracked to attend during the next three years, and which already fails air quality testing under its current conditions, immediately adjacent to this section of I-5.

On the whole, I view the project as a wasteful use of public funds, which could be better used toward achieving our city's, state's, region's, and nation's climate action goals, or toward greatly reducing traffic violence that brings injury and death to vulnerable roadway users. Indeed, it



could be spent on addressing this section's congestion by implementing other measures that reduce driving through there -- such as decongestion pricing, improved transit service, etc. -- rather than increasing driving.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0322 Cresten St. Clair

Comment: I am emailing you to assert my opposition of the I5 Rose Quarter expansion.

Bigger roads will simply induce demand, intensify pollution, and make Portland a less livable city for the people who actually live and pay taxes here.

Congestion pricing is the answer. Make the drivers from out of state pay their own way.

--

Thanks a bunch,

Cresten St. Clair

Attachments: N/A

2019 0315 Cullen Carter

Comment: It's upsetting to see how permanent concrete structures, like roads and highways, are being built for temporary means transportation.

(These will eventually become humongous bike trails, no doubt.)

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Curtis Bieker

Comment: I would like to voice a full endorsement of the I-5 Rose Quarter project. As a life long resident of Portland and some one who has been using this interchange to commute to work for the past 15 years, I believe that this project is well worth the trouble and judging from the volume of traffic that I see use this route daily, a large portion of commuters would feel the same way. Unfortunately it seems that once again in PDX there is a very organized and highly vocal group opposed to a much needed public infrastructure project....ignore them. We need this fix to keep traffic out of our neighborhoods (making it safer for bike/pedestrians), offer a safer route for vehicles, and reduce the amount of stopped traffic emissions that contribute to our poor air quality. Let's fix a problem and end the debate.

Thank you for your time

Attachments: N/A



2019 0327 Cyrus Joiner

Comment: Please don't expand I-5. It won't work to relieve congestion, it's a waste of money, and most importantly it will worsen climate change and local pollution in a time of crisis. Spend the money on mass transit options. Thanks.

Attachments: N/A