



Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with D

Ordered by first name

Contents

2019 0301 D A Wiley	6
2019 0331 D S Hoyt.....	6
2019 0303 Dale Hall	6
2019 0329 Damian Hinman	6
2019 0330 Damien Erlund	6
2019 0302 Dan	7
2019 0312 Dan Dias	8
2019 0302 Dan Frye	8
2019 0329 Dan Gold.....	9
2019 0405 Dan Hoeg.....	9
2019 0313 Dan Kneip	9
2019 0323 Dan Macleod.....	10
2019 0329 Dan McFarling.....	10
2019 0312 Dan McForling.....	11
2019 0401 Dan Pape	11
2019 0312 Dan Peterson	11
2019 0329 Dan Shaw	12
2019 0311 Dana Gehm.....	12
2019 0331 Dana Henderson.....	12
2019 0309 Dana Weintraub	13
2019 0401 Danahy Sharonrose	13
2019 0329 Dane Eastlake.....	14
2019 0312 Daniel Amoni.....	14
2019 0401 Daniel Amoni.....	15
2019 0311 Daniel Serge G Constantino	15

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with D



2019 0329 Daniel Derrick	17
2019 0329 Daniel Edward Bund	19
2019 0401 Daniel Frye.....	19
2019 0302 Daniel Frye.....	19
2019 0311 Daniel Frye.....	20
2019 0401 Daniel Gebhart.....	20
2019 0328 Daniel Jaffee	20
2019 0312 Daniel Peppenger	22
2019 0331 Daniel Sinderson.....	23
2019 0330 Daniel Sloan.....	23
2019 0226 Daniel Wilson	23
2019 0324 Danielle Dorman	24
2019 0327 Danny Dunn	24
2019 0330 Darla Truitt	24
2019 0316 Darsey Landhoe.....	24
2019 0326 Darshan Rajesh Chauhan.....	25
2019 0329 Dave Boggs	25
2019 0401 Dave Royer	25
2019 0325 Dave Shaut	26
2019 0324 Dave Smith Bass	26
2019 0401 Dave Stevens.....	26
2019 0325 Dave Whipple.....	26
2019 0327 David Andrew.....	27
2019 0401 David B McCoy	28
2019 0329 David Bellis-Squires	28
2019 0331 David Berge	29
2019 0329 David Binnig.....	29
2019 0312 David Binnig.....	31
2019 0308 David Bisers.....	32
2019 0315 David Brant Reza Farhoodi.....	32



2019 0225 David Celis.....	33
2019 0328 David Dalby.....	33
2019 0401 David Dysert	34
2019 0327 David F Hayes	34
2019 0330 David Hupp	34
2019 0305 David Kafrissen.....	36
2019 0329 David Jensen	36
2019 0328 David Keeler	36
2019 0312 David Kishpaugh.....	37
2019 0307 David Kunz.....	37
2019 0326 David LaPorte	37
2019 0304 David Levine	38
2019 0307 David Lewis.....	38
2019 0307 David Lewis 2.....	39
2019 0331 David Macbale	39
2019 0401 David Medford.....	40
2019 0402 David O'Dell	40
2019 0402 David Owen	40
2019 0330 David Pagano	40
2019 0303 David Powell	41
2019 0303 David Regan	41
2019 0326 David Regan	41
2019 0312 David Schafer	41
2019 0305 David Shafer	42
2019 0307 David Shafer	42
2019 0331 David Stein.....	42
2019 0303 David Worthington	45
2019 0304 Dawn Smallman.....	45
2019 0328 Dean Funk	46
2019 0226 Dean Sigler	47

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with D



2019 0327 Dean Sigler	47
2019 0304 Deanna Cintas	47
2019 0401 Debbie Gordon.....	48
2019 0329 Deborah Nass	48
2019 0330 Debra New Poscharscky.....	48
2019 0225 Deanna T Grossman.....	49
2019 0225 Deena T. Grossman.....	49
2019 0328 Deanna T Grossman.....	49
2019 0401 Deanna T Grossman.....	49
2019 0226 Dell Goldsmith.....	50
2019 0401 Dell Goldsmith.....	50
2019 0227 Dena Turner.....	50
2019 0331 Denis Heidtmann	51
2019 0320 Denise Query	51
2019 0302 Dennis Karas	51
2019 0314 Derek Hines	52
2019 0331 Derek Lund	52
2019 0401 Derek Ray.....	52
2019 0311 Derianna Mooney.....	52
2019 0312 Desi Wright	53
2019 0227 Desiree Tullos	53
2019 0401 Diana Glidden	54
2019 0227 Diana Oxley	54
2019 0306 Diana Richardson	55
2019 0401 Diana St Amour.....	55
2019 0327 Diane Jacobs	55
2019 0312 Diane Meisenhelter.....	56
2019 0401 Diane Waggoner	56
2019 0402 Dominic Belcastro	56
2019 0312 Donald Hsu	57

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with D



2019 0224 Donald Winn	57
2019 0330 Donna Martin	57
2019 0326 Dorothy Mitchell	58
2019 0326 Doug Clauder	58
2019 0225 Doug Hanke	58
2019 Doug Hecker	59
2019 0000 Doug Klotz	59
2019 0312 Doug Klotz	59
2019 0325 Doug Klotz	60
2019 0328 Doug Klotz	62
2019 0319 Doug Oneill	65
2019 0325 Doug Pratt	65
2019 0331 Douglas Kelso	65
2019 0331 Doug Allen	66
2019 0328 Doug Allen	70
2019 0312 Dr Jesse Lopez	72
2019 0327 Dr Virginia Feldman	73
2019 0312 Dr Carrie Leonard	73
2019 0311 Dr Marna Hauk	74
2019 0329 Drew Blount	74
2019 0330 Duane Fickeisen	75
2019 0401 Duffy Epstein	75
2019 0226 Duncan Baruch	76
2019 0326 Duncan Baruch	76



2019 0301 D A Wiley

Comment: Please consider an alternative to building this new freeway. I am vehemently against this project

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 D S Hoyt

Comment: Let's not invest in bigger freeways in Portland's core. That's not how Portland became a vibrant, popular place.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0303 Dale Hall

Truck Driver

Comment: Why don't you make it DOUBLE DECKER 8 LANES OF TRAFFIC EACH WAY This would solve a lot of problems

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Damian Hinman

Comment: I'm joining the thousands of other community members across the Portland Metro Area concerned about the traffic congestion, air pollution, and carbon emissions associated with the proposed \$500 million freeway expansion in the backyard of Harriet Tubman Middle School.

We ask ODOT to more fully study alternatives, including decongestion pricing, to this expansion with a full Environmental Impact Statement, released to the public.

Rather than spend \$500 million on irrational and irresponsible freeway expansion, motivated by special interests, ODOT could build a lot of sidewalks in East Portland, bus rapid transit lines across town, or be a solid down payment towards the proposed underground light rail tunnel. And unlike a freeway widening, all of those investments would be better for air quality, carbon emissions, public health, and congestion relief and not be in direct, extreme conflict with cutting local climate warming emissions.

Thank you for your full attention.

Damian Hinman

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Damien Erlund

Comment: When conservatives rail against big government, this project stands as a perfect example in their favor:



- * ODOT has misled the public by hiding or obfuscating data
- * ODOT is largely ignoring a far cheaper and environmentally friendly alternative, congestion pricing (in favor of...project build money? Justifying their own existence? Money to their friends in construction? It smacks of cronyism)
- * ODOT is ignoring induced demand, which is akin to ignoring basic economics or, say, gravity - it's disingenious and again, misleading. We all know the state's transportation agency is aware of this basic transportation phenomena
- * Despite dubious claims of improving active transportation, this project will negatively impact major active transportation corridors (the computer-generated images of the Eastbank Esplanade being covered by an extra freeway lane is tragic)

The right course of action is halting this project in its entirety, but at the very least a full environmental assessment needs to be done and done in a way the public can trust, unlike how ODOT has overseen the rest of this project.

Regards,

Damien Erlund

NW Portland

Attachments: N/A

2019 0302 Dan

Comment: I have a comment on the EA. On page 25 it states:

"This EA evaluates the potential for the Build Alternative to affect a wide variety of environmental resources. However, the following resource topics have not been included in the EA because they are not present in the Project Area or because the Projects potential effects would be so minor as to not warrant a full evaluation in this EA."

The list includes "Visual Resources." I disagree with this conclusion that visual resources impacts "would be so minor as to not warrant a full evaluation. " Impacts on visual resources is not limited to the natural environment, but also the built environment. Evidence of this are the simulations that were prepared by ODOT to show the Build Alternative, which show more than minor impacts on the built environment (new structures, sound walls, etc.). ODOT elected to prepare simulations of the Build Alternative because of the more than minor impacts to the built environment. The fact that ODOT prepared simulations, but did not evaluate Visual Resources in the EA at all, is an oversight. If the impacts "were so minor" then why did ODOT prepare simulations? The EA simply cannot dismiss visual resource impacts. I recommend the Final EA address impacts on visual resources.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0312 Dan Dias

Hillsboro Economic Community Development Department

Comment: Thank you. Good evening Commissioner Eudaly and Mr. Windsheimer, Dan Dias with the City of Hillsboro Economic and Community Development Department. I am here this evening on behalf of our mayor who is out of town and was not able to come and testify. We've also submitted a letter from the mayor into the record as well. I wanted to thank you for the opportunity to comment and express the appreciation of Hillsboro to the partnerships enjoyed with ODOT as well as PBOT on regional transportation matters such as this. This is a hub of a critical corridor that is important both locally as well as regionally, and that has an effect both environmentally and economically. The region's interstate freeway system is essential to our region's sustained economic competitiveness and vitality in this location as the hub of that freeway system. One major area of regional interest that we've experienced is a need for many of the manufacturers and industries that are in Washington County and Hillsboro as well as the agricultural users out in that part of the region as well, needing to get goods and products through the region out to external market. That's largely done through the I-5 corridor, the I-84 corridor, as well as PDX. Congestion points such as the I-5/8425 intersection and some of the target areas that this project seeks to resolve is critical in that those congestion delays spill over into other key corridors, such as Highway 26, 405, 217, and that adds uncertainty to many of these businesses needing to get things like cancer drugs or medical devices or high-technology products out to these broader markets. And the uncertainty of those travel times and shipping of those goods continue to be a threat and impact both to their business as well as future businesses. This also translates into additional congestion for those workers that also work within those employment centers, needing to go to those jobs and those locations. And if there's congestion on these critical corridors, it also spills over into other areas such as north Portland, St. Johns, the Germantown Road neighborhood, for example, as well. So with that, we support your efforts in this and we appreciate the opportunity to comment. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0302 Dan Frye

Comment: I am a Portland resident and I am opposed to the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion in it's entirety for the following reasons:

#1) It will not improve traffic. Congestion is wide-spread in our road system and this "expensive minor tweak" will not solve anyone's commute issues.

#2) It will disadvantage people living and working in the neighborhood. If any benefits accrue they will accrue to long-distance commuters who don't have to suffer the consequences.

#3) This proposal will increase the production of GHGs by encouraging more individual vehicles on the road. Climate change is the most significant economic and environmental issue we have and this is an expensive step backward.



#4) ODOT is not being forthcoming about its analysis and data. We need transparency in transportation planning.

Instead we need ODOT to invest for the future, not the past. We need

#1) Congestion pricing - see London, see Stockholm, see Milan, see NYC coming. It works.

#2) Investment in fossil-fuel free public transportation.

#3) Investment in improving walkability and biking infrastructure.

Thanks for listening.

Daniel Frye

Portland, Oregon

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Dan Gold

Comment: Please, please, please do not expand I-5 into my neighborhood. It is unbelievable that you would endeavor to spend 500 million dollars to expand I-5 without trying out other options first. The impacts to the esplanade would be awful. As a person who lives close to I-5 and uses the area by the MODA center and eastside esplanade frequently, I strongly oppose this proposed expansion.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0405 Dan Hoeg

Comment: There is a better solution: cheaper, quicker, and it will change the city's transportation forever. I work for a startup developing electric, clean self driving vehicles, including freight, and deliveries. We could give a report detailing how the I fradyructure 3xpenses.youre proposing could be reduced withbuilding any new or necessary roads. We cam scale our fleet for evacuations, emergency response, and they have 100% runtime efficiency. When can we speak on the phone to give you an idea of what we can offer? TUESDAY at 10 PST? Thanks. Dan Hoeg

Attachments: N/A

2019 0313 Dan Kneip

Comment: I read about the public hearing last evening and the fact that many in attendance from the public voiced opposition to this project so wanted to share my opinion.

After spending a considerable amount of time reading through the project materials, in addition to following along previously via the news media, I am in full support of moving forward with the project. I travel that section of I5 frequently and find it to be nerve wracking at best. Anything we



can do to make that section of roadway safer, with a reduction in accidents, is worthy of the expense and effort.

I do not believe it is a freeway expansion project as many of the critics contend. I do believe it brings additional enhancements to the local area that will improve people flow in the neighborhoods surrounding the project area, and will make it a safer area overall for bicyclists and pedestrians.

I think many critics hear the word spending money on highways and thus automatically make the leap to "we are expanding capacity." I don't see how they can come to that conclusion other than they have preconceived biases to spending money on anything other than new bike lanes.

Please do not listen to the critics and move forward with this solution. I commute to a job downtown down the I84 corridor and often end up taking that section of I5 when 84 is backed up.

Dan Kneip

Attachments: N/A

2019 0323 Dan Macleod

Comment: This will not solve congestion and ignores the clear and present danger that is climate change. I thought we were progressive not regressive, Portland?

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Dan McFarling

Comment: ODOT has failed to consider a sensible public transportation alternative to this expansion of pavement. In fact, ODOT has failed to offer or consider ANY alternative to more pavement.

ODOT's focus has incorrectly been on moving vehicles. The focus needs to be on how to move more people and more freight, NOT more rubber tires. Move more people and freight using LESS space, NOT more space!

ODOT claims they lack sufficient funds to adequately maintain EXISTING pavement. It makes NO sense to waste limited resources on EXPANDING that which we cannot maintain. Although ODOT has claimed "this is not a freeway widening project," it is in FACT a freeway widening project.

There is no way one can waste even more space and money on a mode of transportation (SOVs) in a congested area and expect to relieve congestion.

ODOT is LONG OVERDUE to change from being a DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS, and begin to become a Department of TRANSPORTATION.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0312 Dan McForling

Comment: Thank you for the opportunity. My name is Dan McForling. I got my start in this area back in 1947. In an area already strangled by congestion, it is foolish to pretend that one can devote even more space and waste even more dollars on a mode of transportation that is inherently inefficient in terms of land use. If we wish to increase mobility in the Rose Quarter area, we need to invest in public transportation. Saying a freeway widening project is not a freeway widening project does not change the fact that it is a freeway widening project. Quote, "The money can only be spent on highways." Today that is true. But when the only significant source of transportation funding is locked into the least effective response we can have to transportation needs, we have a serious problem and it needs to be changed. We need to change that reality. About 30 years ago, the Oregon Department of Energy issued its annual report. And in that annual report, the Department of Energy stated quite clearly that until we change the constitution, which currently restricts money from highway revenues into building more roadways, we can never hope to realize an effective transportation systems. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Dan Pape

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

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Dan Peterson

Comment: To whom it may concern,

I feel it necessary to comment on this project based on a lot of seemingly overblown comments I have seen on the issue.

Personally I use a bicycle for around half of my trips and my mileage driven is very low outside of road trips. I yearn for cities that are more bike-able, transit heavy, and dense. Days I commute by car are often my worst. That said, I think the backlash to "widening" the freeway in the Rose Quarter is undue.

The project primarily looks to link two sections of 3 lane freeway with a continuous 3 lanes alleviating a bottleneck that has flow issues even at the best of times. I am a proponent of many road diet projects in neighborhoods and commuting routes, however I-5 is a federal highway and an economic artery, and crippling it can and will lead toward economic detriment.



I still believe heading toward transit and density city planning is the best course of action over the long term, but pulling the rug out from under projects that will see us through until transit and density start paying off dividends is absurdly short sighted.

Thank you,

Dan Peterson

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Dan Shaw

Comment: The assumptions that justify the Rose Quarter freeway expansion are, at best, falsely based and, at worst, immoral. Evidence from cities around the US clearly demonstrates that increasing the capacity of a freeway does nothing to improve congestion, instead compounding the issue of idling emissions and a reliance on the single-occupant car. Moreover, using the excuse of enhancing the convenience of commuters to add to the dangerous levels of pollution at Harriet Tubman middle school smacks of eminent domain and is unconscionable. Portland deserves a robust approach to congestion that takes into account benefits to all road users and the community at large. Do better.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Dana Gehm

Comment: I support the expansion of I5. The Portland metropolitan area road system does not have enough capacity. That is why there is so much congestion. The proposed expansion is probably too little, too late and hence will not solve the problem. But whatever can be done, to improve the highways, should be, and as quickly as possible.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Dana Henderson

Comment: I am emailing to send my strongest opposition to the proposed Rose Quarter highway expansion. We already know based on decades of examples from other cities and badly designed freeway expansions within Portland itself that this kind of brute force motorist-favoring urban planning DOES NOT WORK. The science is in on projects like these, they are inefficient and will be detrimental to overall quality of life in what is supposed to be a progressive and forward thinking city. The environmental and design documents provided to the public are woefully inadequate and riddled with errors or outright misrepresentations. The project would have a massive impact on bike commuters and further worsen the noise and pollution problems along the eastbank esplanade, not to mention the dangerous and morally reprehensible health impact on the students of Harriet Tubman Middle School. There are better ways of spending this money to actually improve safety and decongestion within the city. I'd recommend looking at the numerous safety issues along 82nd Avenue and putting in some real protected bikelanes along ODOT roads east of 82nd, not the dangerous joke of a lane that passes now. Otherwise we'll



have a downtown like so many other cities I've visited and lived in : bumper to bumper traffic along economic deadzones filled with massive overpriced parking complexes.

As a Portland resident for 12 years now, I'm completely baffled by the constant backsliding that this city has made in livability and planning, completely abandoning any pretense of being 'the city that works' and simply acquiescing to the greed of developers and corporate entities that honestly don't give a f*** about the people that actually live here.

Show that Portland and Oregon can still make commonsense decisions that actually benefit people, and scrap this wrongheaded plan.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0309 Dana Weintraub

Comment: Hello:

Please reconsider the plan to add extra lanes to this particular stretch of I-5 near the Rose Quarter District.

I'm originally from a suburb of Los Angeles, and being stuck in an endless backup at all hours of the day and night while gagging on smog is not what I would consider worthwhile.

Surely, there are much better alternatives and use of limited funds that will achieve the same desired results.

Its way past time to wean ourselves out of the automobile and into mass (public) transit.

If other developed (and advanced) nations can exist with more efficient modes of travel, so can we.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Danahy Sharonrose

Comment: Dear Decisions Makers:

I am concerned about the following issues:

Expanding freeways is not an effective strategy for reducing congestion. ODOT has failed to make the case for why this project should move forward.

ODOT should fully evaluate proven strategies such as congestion pricing and investment in public transportation before spending a half billion dollars to expand a short stretch of highway.

The project is entirely at odds with the City's Climate Agenda. 40% of Oregon's emissions are from the transportation sector. We need to focus on strategies that reduce dependency on cars, not perpetuate 1950s style highway projects.

At the same time that ODOT is proposing to spend nearly half a billion dollars on expanding I-5, the region continues to neglect serious road safety problems in East Portland.



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

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

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Dane Eastlake

Comment: Please reconsider your plan to redevelop I-5 through the Rose Quarter. The negative impacts will far outweigh the benefits, if any.

In addition to a staggering price tag and years of delays and neighborhood disruptions, the project would hope to increase the amount of traffic in the core of our fair city and simply move the congestion down the road a mile or so. More noise, more pollution, more visual blight...

We shouldn't be wasting our time and money trying to encourage more people to drive. The only long-term solution to traffic jams and drive times is to get more people out of their cars. Otherwise, we're just pushing the problem down the road for the future generations to deal with. I would suggest system-wide free mass transit. Thanks.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Daniel Amoni

Comment: Daniel Amoni. I live in Portland. There are so many things to say about this. I just want to address the portion that adds pavement against adding pavement. Whether or not the build increases pollution or decreases pollution or let out this heat effect or more greenhouse gases, I can put that to the side and I just want to say that building this project sends the message that there's not a problem. That we've been living just fine and will continue to live just fine. We don't need to change our behavior. We don't need to develop new patterns of thinking. We don't need to rethink our relationship with the land that we live on and that feeds us and makes us healthy. We don't need to be creative. It just sends the message that technology will always solve more problems. We can build our way out of things. And I don't like that message. That's not the message that I try to teach my children, and I think that as leaders and decisionmakers, you can do better than that. I'd also like to say that improving driving is a weird idea. It's kind of like saying I want to improve the slipperiness of my bathtub so I fall and hit my head and die. I just -- I don't get that phrase, "improve driving." What this seems to me is a better kind of wrong. And whether or not -- you know, the no-build isn't great either. Let's just -- let's look beyond the current system that we have. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0401 Daniel Amoni

Comment: I am opposed to increasing the amount of pavement within Portland. Transportation needs to be expanded much more in modes that do not contribute to climate change, divide communities, encourage sprawl, and cause high rates of fatality. The era of the automobile needs to come to an end. Its costs for us and the environment are too high. Instead of talking about widening I5 in inner Portland, you should be talking about what Portland will look like in a post-car future.

Have vision and do something great instead of repeating the mistakes of the past. Its time to move on.

Thanks,

Daniel Amoni

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Daniel Serge G Constantino

Comment: Dear Oregon Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration:

I oppose the I-5 widening through the Rose Quarter. I would like to encourage you to instead consider making wide-ranging safety and travel time improvements for pedestrians, bicyclists and public transit vehicles operating on orphan state highways throughout the Portland metro area.

Between increased air pollution, increased carbon emissions, induced traffic, the opportunity costs and the very real impacts to the surrounding community over multiple decades (and their disproportionate impact on historically underrepresented and oppressed populations), it very much seems like widening I-5 through the Rose Quarter is worse than a waste of time.

The underlying reasoning for this project relies on the notion of scratching an itch. It is frustrating from the engineer's-eye view (and the driver's-eye view) to see a 3x3 section narrowing to a 2x2 section, only to widen again to a 3x3, in a section where demand is highest. As someone who spends my life designing transportation networks, I understand the itch. God I do.

But scratching itches to make a cleaner diagram rarely makes for good transportation policy. Especially when scratching the itch will cost hundreds of millions of dollars to favor driving, already the most favored part of our transportation system.

Congestion isn't induced by the 2x2 freeway width bottleneck; it's induced by the fact that driving is the only reasonable way to get around for too many people. By investing massive resources to make driving more convenient yet again, widening I-5 in the Rose Quarter just exacerbates this problem; it's not a reasonable way to spend our society's capital resources.

This project barely can stand on its own two feet from a safety perspective. In a best-case scenario, less congestion means higher speeds in the most crowded part of the regional



freeway system. High speeds + high volumes = more and deadlier crashes. Recent crashes in the Woodburn area show what can happen when you widen the roadway and smooth out traffic in a high-volume area. It's great when it works, but how many people need to die or be maimed so I can get to Salem on time?

At the same time, we know that this project will have long-lasting and severe community impacts. Increased air and noise pollution will affect residents, schoolchildren and workers in inner N/NE Portland. Increased traffic locally (on and off the ramps) will lead to further evident hazards of injury and death to anyone not driving a car in the Rose Quarter area. Statistically, induced traffic within several miles of I-5 will lead to more injuries and death due to driving in Portland as a whole.

All of this before we talk about what else you could spend a few hundred millions of dollars on, and the massive improvements in public health and safety those could bring. How many miles of safety improvements, new and repaired sidewalk, signalized cross-walks and protected bike paths along state highways does \$500 million buy? How much better could Barbur Boulevard, TV Highway, Powell Boulevard and East 82nd Ave be for all users if we invested even a fraction of the amount contemplated here for I-5 in the Rose Quarter?

And all of this before we talk about the climate denialism underlying the notion that it's OK for car traffic volumes to increase or even continue at present levels. The carbon footprint of a freeway stretches much farther than the fuel burned in just that one segment. Road construction and maintenance, new car and truck production, induced land-use change in the exurbs; all of those are carbon-intensive, too.

Even the project's purported benefits, achieved on its own terms, are likely to be mirages. Higher speeds and less congestion mean induced traffic, which has been demonstrated to cancel out travel time improvements within 5 years' time if not sooner. How many times does LA need to widen 405 or Houston need to widen the Katy freeway before we learn that lesson? Is there really an argument that 3x3 (or 4x4, or 10x10) bumper-to-bumper traffic is better than 2x2 bumper-to-bumper traffic?

I want to add that it is extremely disheartening that ODOT and FHWA couldn't even deliver the technical appendices showing the numbers underlying your impact analysis. This is poor practice, and a disservice to your hard-working professional staff and consultants: anyone with a knowledge of models knows they can be tortured. Not showing your work is essentially implying to the wider professional community that your work cannot be trusted. It makes me feel very bad for your modelers, whom I'm sure spent as many arduous hours working on the EA as anyone else.

In summary, for all the reasons above, and I'm sure others I have not had time to detail, please do not widen I-5 in the Rose Quarter. It's not worth it, just to scratch the itch.

If you want to spend several hundred million dollars in the Portland metro area in less harmful ways, please instead develop a comprehensive rehabilitation and improvement plan for the major orphan highways, concentrating particularly on improvements to safety and travel times for vulnerable road users and public transit vehicles. Done on a broad enough scale, this is the



only way to actually lower the massive vehicle travel demand on our region's freeways that causes the traffic jams in the first place.

Thank you,

Daniel Costantino

SE Portland

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Daniel Derrick

Comment: Hello,

My name is Daniel Derrick and I live in SE Portland. I am 25 years old and a third-generation Oregonian. I care deeply about the future of my city and my state. This is why I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the construction of the Rose Quarter I-5 Freeway Expansion. I think that this project will harm nearby communities, increase traffic volume in the city center, and degrade our public spaces. It will do so while doing nothing meaningful to combat climate change or to improve safety on our streets.

ODOT has touted the safety benefits of this project, but this is misleading. Traffic safety is very important to me. I find it very troubling that more people die on our streets than are murdered in Portland, and I think that we need to take traffic safety and traffic deaths seriously. But this project does not meaningfully address safety. I know the locations in Portland where traffic deaths happen most often. It is public information. Fender-benders are common on the Rose Quarter stretch of I-5, but crashes that cause serious injury or death are rare. Many of Portland's most dangerous roads (Powell Boulevard, N Columbia Boulevard, SE/NE 82nd, etc) are state-owned. If ODOT was truly concerned about safety, they would be spending serious money on improvements on the streets where people die and are seriously injured, instead of spending half a million dollars to improve a location where people get into fender-benders and slow down traffic.

I used to cycle daily through the Rose Quarter, and the improvements for pedestrians and cyclists on Rose Quarter surface streets do not convince me that this project is worthwhile, either. The removal of the useful Flint overpass is not addressed by the plans, and the proposed bike/ped bridge over Clackamas seems like a solution in search of a problem. A meaningful improvement to the surface streets of the Rose Quarter would be include full, buildable caps over the interstate, not dressed up construction staging areas. Adding lanes to ramps will also degrade the experience of the Eastbank Esplanade. Places like the Esplanade make Portland special, and this project will encroach and cast shadows on portions of the path, which already



suffers from its proximity to the interstate. We should not be spending money to have an even larger freeway ramp loom over our river.

This 500-million-dollar project has also been billed by ODOT as something that does not increase the capacity of the interstate. This is misleading. You cannot convince me that the same number of cars currently flowing through 2 lanes will now flow through 3 or even 4 lanes. It does not matter if the lanes are called through or ramp to ramp - this project increases capacity. When we plan for the future of our area's transportation, we need to find solutions that reduce car use and seriously reduce emissions, such as public transportation and active transportation.

Moreover, has the effect of congestion pricing been examined in the modeling and projections related to this project? I don't believe that it has. Congestion pricing has the potential to relieve congestion throughout the area, not just in one "bottleneck", and it does not require huge infrastructure investments. If it is ineffective, congestion pricing could be reversed. Before we spend \$500 million dollars on an investment in infrastructure, we should be sure that it is absolutely necessary and assess whether alternatives could yield the same effect.

This project will also increase air pollution at Harriet Tubman Middle School, where a majority of students are people of color. Research shows that children exposed to poor air quality have a higher risk of asthma - and these effects are more pronounced in young African Americans (<https://www.epa.gov/sciencematters/links-between-air-pollution-and-childhood-asthma>). Exposing these children to increased pollution is especially unconscionable given the fraught racial history of N/NE Portland. A more thorough environmental assessment is needed to ensure that this project does not inflict even more harm on Portland's marginalized communities.

I strongly support transportation spending, but not on freeway expansions. Has any city ever built its way out of congestion? We need to invest in public and active transportation to reduce the demand on our freeways. We need to explore congestion pricing as a tool to manage the infrastructure we already have. We need to spend our transportation dollars to prevent deaths, not fender benders. We can do so much better than this in 2019.

Sincerely,

Daniel Derrick

Attachments: N/A



2019 0329 Daniel Edward Bund

Comment: Dear ODOT,

this freeway expansion is a terrible idea. It will not improve congestion, it will not improve safety, and it will not improve the neighborhoods around it.

If you want to really improve things here in North/North East Portland consider burying the freeway altogether or ripping it out and routing all traffic over 405.

Or just try congestion pricing!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Daniel Frye

Comment: I am a Portland resident and I am opposed to the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion in it's entirety for the following reasons:

#1) It will not improve traffic. Congestion is wide-spread in our road system and this "expensive minor tweak" will not solve anyone's commute issues.

#2) It will disadvantage people living and working in the neighborhood. If any benefits accrue they will accrue to long-distance commuters who don't have to suffer the consequences.

#3) This proposal will increase the production of GHGs by encouraging more individual vehicles on the road. Climate change is the most significant economic and environmental issue we have and this is an expensive step backward.

#4) ODOT is not being forthcoming about its analysis and data. We need transparency in transportation planning.

Instead we need ODOT to invest for the future, not the past. We need

#1) Congestion pricing - see London, see Stockholm, see Milan, see NYC coming. It works.

#2) Investment in fossil-fuel free public transportation.

#3) Investment in improving walkability and biking infrastructure.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0302 Daniel Frye

Comment: I write in strong opposition to the proposed Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion because it represents exactly the wrong direction for the Rose City and Oregon. Climate change is real, climate change is happening now, and climate change represents the most critical economic, environmental, and national security issue of our time. Investing in more fossil-fuel-powered traffic will increase Oregon's Greenhouse Gas (GHGs) emissions at a time when we need to be decreasing them. We need to our transportation \$\$ in public transportation, electric vehicle infrastructure, and walkable communities.



Thank you.

Daniel Frye

Portland, Oregon

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Daniel Frye

Comment: We need to stop the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project. It is direct opposition of where Portland needs to go in the coming years. The main points:

#1) The proposal will increase Greenhouse gases (GHGs) by putting more people on the road when the our city and our state have committed to lowering emissions to fight climate change. We need to be funding infrastructure that provides for fossil-free transportation.

#2) The entire road grid around the proposed project is at capacity. Increasing freeway capacity on the interstate will simply clog up the entire system - putting more cars idling. We need to be funding smart-city infrastructure that takes cars off the road.

#3) More cars will make it less safe for pedestrians and cyclists. We need to be funding infrastructure that builds walkable communities and better biking commute paths.

#4) Freeway expansions never reduce traffic congestion. Every major city in the US has proven this over the past decades. We need to implement decongestion pricing instead.

#5) Once again, Portland is pushing a project based on inequity. This proposal would decrease the livability of a Portland city neighborhood for the benefit of suburban commuters, who won't see improvements anyway. We need to provide better mass transit options for suburban commuters that don't impact city neighborhoods.

Thanks for listening.

Daniel D.. Frye

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Daniel Gebhart

Comment: This project cannot go forward without an Environmental Impact Statement and a fully independent review of the traffic modeling.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Daniel Jaffee

Comment: Dear Members of ODOT I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project team:

I am writing with urgent concerns about the environmental, pedestrian/bicycle, transit, and human impacts of the proposed I-5 Rose Quarter project.



Adding new lane capacity on the the Rose Quarter segment of the I-5 freeway is not a short-term or a long-term solution to traffic congestion. It is essential to recognize that freeway expansion has never solved traffic congestion, and has often made congestion far worse at a high human and environmental cost.

Construction of the proposed auxiliary lanes will subject the region to many years of congestion-inducing construction in the Rose Quarter that will cause delays and detours across the region for bus riders, pedestrians, and bicyclists. The very groups who are already making the environmentally-sound choices needed to reduce congestion will be harmed by the construction of this auto-centric project.

I urge ODOT to perform a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that includes analysis of meaningful alternatives to the current proposal. Prioritization of single-occupancy vehicles has significant adverse impacts on Oregon's ability to meet the carbon reduction goals enshrined in state law, as well as significant adverse impacts on public health in the the local community. A full EIS should honestly assess and mitigate the potential negative, disparate impacts this project may bring to the surrounding Albina neighborhood and to the region as a whole. The methodology and outcomes of these revisions should be made available for public review and comment.

I also urge you to remove the addition of auxiliary lanes on I-5 from the I-5 Rose Quarter plan, and instead to pursue the following two solutions:

1) To work with municipal, regional, business and community partners to implement decongestion pricing (aka tolling) on I-5 *before* any further study or work to expand the Rose Quarter Freeway is conducted. HB 2017 mandated that the Oregon Department of Transportation move forward with decongestion pricing initiatives on I-5 and I-205. Overwhelming research indicates that decongestion pricing is the only successful method of eliminating metropolitan traffic congestion. Thus, it is only sensible to move forward with decongestion pricing first. Our state's tight budget, our local neighborhoods air quality, and Oregon's initiatives to combat carbon emissions are reason enough for ODOT to demonstrate leadership and implement decongestion pricing before spending half a billion dollars on freeway expansion.

2) To work with municipal, regional, and transit agency partners to construct continuous dedicated bus lanes, protected bike lanes, and high-quality pedestrian environments on all roadways within ODOT jurisdiction in the Metro region. Many of these ODOT-controlled roads have significant safety problems and contribute significantly to regional congestion. ODOT has the opportunity to apply \$500 million to address congestion systematically, rather than applying an expensive and ineffective spot solution. Money contributed by regional taxpayers must be spent on the most cost-effective infrastructure, infrastructure proven to reduce congestion, air pollution, and carbon emissions. High-quality Bus Rapid Transit lines cost approximately \$50 million a mile, and our region would be far better served by 10 miles of BRT on our most congested corridors.

These two recommendations provide a significant opportunity to reduce congestion, emissions, and public health threats, while improving safety on the region's streets and providing more



equitable access. Congestion pricing can create additional revenue that could be used to implement transit-priority improvements and to construct dedicated lanes for existing and new bus lines and the Portland Streetcar. This project as currently outlined in the Environmental Assessment document actually slows public transit through the neighborhood, an unacceptable outcome for a \$500 million investment in transportation infrastructure.

The Environmental Assessment document, as provided, is inadequate. I urge ODOT to recognize this inadequacy, and to conduct a complete EIS of the project before taking any further steps.

Thank you for your attention,

Yours Truly,

Daniel Jaffee

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Daniel Peppenger

Port of Portland

Comment: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Rose Quarter Environmental Assessment. The intent of this letter is to express support for the Rose Quarter project at this phase of review.

The Port views the project area as one of the top freeway bottlenecks in the Portland region. As an agency whose mission is tied to the safe and efficient movement of travelers and cargo, the importance of this project is paramount to us.

The highway components of the project will add auxiliary lanes to reduce conflicts and allow a safer facility for vehicles entering and leaving the freeway. The safety benefits of the project will also result in reduced delays and therefore reduced vehicle idling time.

The surface street improvements provide lid structures over the freeway to allow for more active transportation connections and public space connecting the city in ways that haven't previously been possible and providing more options for bikes and pedestrians.

The Environmental Assessment identifies long-term project benefits of improved speed and travel time on 1-5, increased safety and crash reduction on 1-5, improved freight movement, multimodal benefits for areas east and west of 1-5 and stormwater treatment for the project area. The Port believes the longterm benefits outweigh the temporary construction impacts identified for the project.

We fully support moving the project forward in its current form through to completion to realize the many benefits it will bring to the city and region.

Thank-you for the opportunity to comment on the Environmental Assessment for this important project.

Sincerely,



Daniel Pippenger

Director, Planning and Development

Attachments: [2019 0312 Daniel Peppenger ATT](#)

2019 0331 Daniel Sinderson

Comment: I recently moved from NE Rodney ave. The idea that the city of Portland is going forward with this project is ridiculous to me: we have the benefit of hindsight and know that highway expansion has never actually worked to reduce traffic, and this takes money away from other projects/options that could do more to actually solve the stated issues (reducing traffic and carbon emissions could both be more significantly and economically battled with a well-planned road pricing policy, for instance). Please don't go through with this. It's a massive waste of money that may actually make the problems worse and that will most certainly put extreme stress on the surrounding communities.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Daniel Sloan

Comment: To whom it may concern:

This expansion project flies in the face of what Portland claims to be about. Portland should be the leader in transportation solutions in the United States, not regress to the 1950s. This money could be used to significantly improve existing infrastructure and expand access to public transit, directly impacting the entire Portland community. Instead, it's a hyperfocused boondoggle that likely won't actually serve its proposed purpose of easing congestion.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Daniel Wilson

Comment: I am writing to sincerely express my opposition to the I-5 Rose Quarter freeway expansion. As climate change becomes a more and more urgent crisis, the last thing we should be doing is exacerbating our already absurd transportation choices. My understanding based on the testimony of people smarter than me is that freeway widening will only make congestion worse, further polluting the city and making it less livable. There are so many wonderful ways to promote human transportation. Bus rapid transit, light rail expansion, infrastructure for safer and more efficient walking and biking. All of which are pro-social, pro-environment, pro-happiness, and far cheaper!

We need fewer people driving, and we need to stop making it so easy to do so. Please do the right thing and end this project. Thank you for your time and consideration!

Attachments: N/A



2019 0324 Danielle Dorman

Comment: As a longtime resident of Portland, I am strongly opposed to freeway expansion. Seeing how freeway expansion has just created even more traffic in places like LA and other major cities, I don't think this is the right move for Portland. I feel especially strong about this in a time where our population is expanding, especially into new apartment complexes with very few or absolutely no designated parking for residents. To follow suit and keep our freeway traffic at a minimum, we should be encouraging Portlanders to ditch their cars, or only have one per household, and commute by bike, e-scooter, and public transportation as often as possible. If we can dedicate city funds and resources towards educating the public about the already existing bike routes, create more bike and scooter friendly streets, and maintaining our already crumbling roads instead of expanding the freeway, I think we as citizens and a city will be much better off.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Danny Dunn

Comment: Please do not encourage more people to drive single occupancy vehicles through the heart of our city by going through with this project.

Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Darla Truitt

Comment: I'm against expanding the portland freeway system. More mass transit, less cars! Portland has made for a great city with excellent transportation system. What we don't need is more cars! Bigger freeway = more cars, NOT less traffic. You cannot fix the congestion with bigger freeways. NO TO BIGGER FREEWAYS!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0316 Darsey Landhoe

Comment: Hello!

Thank you for taking comments on this project.

My general sentiment on this project is that we're facing a potential earthquake here in Portland, and we've seen study after study show that the damage to our bridges would be catastrophic. I don't understand using state funds for a road expansion, when our bridges desperately need to be upgraded.

Part of living in Portland is accepting the fact that if you happen to be using all but a couple of the bridges when an earthquake happens, you will most likely die. Let's please take care of



what we have before we think about how we can introduce more traffic, pollution and congestion into our inner city.

Thank you.

Darsey Landoe

Designer, business owner, and 10-year Portland resident

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Darshan Rajesh Chauhan

Comment: I completely disagree with freeway expansion. Portland being the leader of active transportation in the US, should NOT put money down the dump for freeway expansion. It has never solved congestion, it never will. Portland should instead invest in high quality infrastructure for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Dave Boggs

Comment: Please perform an EIS. It's the right thing to do with Middle schoolers at Tubman being literally right next to this project. Also, consider capping the freeway next to the Middle School to reduce emissions exposure.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Dave Royer

Comment: Oregon Department of Transportation

I would like to submit my comments on the I-5 Rose Quarter project. From all the available information, ODOT has not made the case for why this project should move forward. In fact, the evidence strongly supports that this project should not move ahead, and a different set of proven and cost effective measures taken instead to meet the underlying requirements.

-- Expanding freeways is not an effective strategy for reducing congestion, and in fact will make things worse in the long term. ODOT should fully evaluate proven strategies such as congestion pricing, public transportation, and support for active transportation (biking, walking).

-- The project goes in the wrong direction from Portlands Climate Agenda. 40% of Oregons emissions are from the transportation sector. We need to focus on strategies that reduce dependency on cars, not perpetuate 1950s style highway projects.

-- For a project with an estimated cost of over \$500 million (and which would certainly grow much larger on execution), the projected community benefits have not been at all demonstrated, while the opportunity cost of using these funds is far too high. It ignores serious road safety problems in East Portland and would make air pollution worse in an area that actually needs the most improvement in the state.



Thank you for the opportunity to share my comment on this project. I hope that the project is completely reworked in order to actually improve the environment and quality of life in Oregon, not actively make it worse as the project as currently proposed would do.

-- Dave Royer

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Dave Shaut

Comment: ODOT looks like it is not being transparent with the data models provided in during the public testimony. The impacts to the Harriet Tubman School are horrible. How can you expand a freeway with the impact being that the kids cannot go outside for recess? Please take a hard look at the impacts as well as the impact of facilitating more traffic, which will contribute more GHG to the environment. Our planet is in climate crisis. Do not deny your agency to stop this project and send the money back to the legislature for some project that will pay for mass transit. We need to get people out of cars, and this project doesn't do that. It will continue to hurt black communities along I-5, further perpetuation of what happened when I-5 was built in the beginning.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0324 Dave Smith Bass

Comment: we desperately need to widen the rise quarter freeway. Please add a couple lanes. Also enforce zipper merging.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Dave Stevens

Comment: Hi, this project is an ill considered step in the wrong direction, especially in the face of catastrophic climate change. We also know that it will not ultimately relieve congestion.

Please stop.

Sincerely,

Dave Stevens, RN

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Dave Whipple

Comment: Hi,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed expansion of I-5 near the Rose Quarter. I do not believe this is the right path forward for our community nor is it a good use of our tax dollars. The freeway expansion is unlikely to improve congestion long-term, and attracting more



vehicle traffic is not good for the health of the surrounding communities. My family lives in North Piedmont, where we already face air polluted by industry and freight trains in the Columbia corridor, as well as exhaust from traffic on nearby MLK and Lombard. As our population continues to grow, we need to invest our limited resources in sustainable transportation options, not more freeway lanes that are going to quickly fill to capacity. We need to be smart and bold in our approach, and focus on planning a transportation system that will serve everyone effectively into the future. Thank you,

Dave Whipple

NE Portland

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 David Andrew

Comment: ODOT,

Your plan to add additional highway lanes through Portland's Rose Quarter is a wasteful, ineffective, environmentally damaging and dishonest infrastructure investment. I believe you should listen to the community voices that are speaking loudly in unison against this project due to all the negative impacts it will have on the community.

First and foremost, with 12 years left to prevent catastrophic climate change from devastating our planet, it is morally and economically indefensible to continue to invest in expanding fossil fuel infrastructure like highways, especially in urban areas where dense, transit oriented development can allow for growth that does not require automobiles. The concept of induced demand has proven time and again across the US that highway expansion only induces more automobile trips and further incentives sprawling automobile-centric development that is carbon intensive. This program will not reduce congestion. It is further foolish to pursue this expansion without first implementing road pricing or congestion pricing, which could significantly reduce automobile volumes through the corridor. Thirdly, the air quality impacts and impacts to local streets due to increased vehicle miles traveled will harm health, neighborhood vitality, and further degrade quality of life in areas around the project.

Transportation investments in the Portland region should prioritize reducing VMT and increasing the mode share of walking, biking, and public transit. Suburban car commuters should not be encouraged to further burden others with the negative externalities of their conduct for decades into the future. Portland is rapidly losing its reputation as a leader in smart growth due to this deceptive and dangerous project and it should not go forward in any form.

David Andrew

Attachments: N/A



2019 0401 David B McCoy

Comment: I am writing to express my extreme disgust at the choice made by ODOT to cut a deeper wound through a black neighborhood in order to facilitate the convenience of white suburbanites. The expansion of urban freeways in 2019 is an act taken with full knowledge of the racial, environmental and fiscal harm that will be inflicted on the community and world. Adding capacity to urban freeways is climate denialism. I-5 should be routed around the city and the existing right of way reclaimed for green space and affordable housing.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 David Bellis-Squires

Comment: I'm a lifelong Portlander (born at Bess Kaiser... er, Adidas headquarters now), and I drive. I've seen our city expand and change, seemingly more rapid than ever in recent years. One of the things I love about this city is the importance which has always been placed on quality of life. The many bubblers and fountains providing pure drinking water to anybody who needs it. This ethos led to creating Director Park out of a patch of asphalt, and moving a freeway to create the Esplanade.

Now that beautiful Eastbank Esplanade is threatened. The serenity many Portlanders enjoy as they walk or bike along the Esplanade each day (leaving their cars at home, I might add) would be infringed by noise and the shadow cast by a larger, unneeded utilitarian highway. The beauty, the uniqueness of the esplanade and our city would be irreversibly spoiled.

And it would be spoiled without any tangible benefit. Increased noise, pollution, and disruption to peoples' commutes for 5 years as this ill-advised project is completed will not be offset by a faster commute for ANYBODY.

Ultimately more cars will fill the road, and Portland would fall in line with every other city which has tried this experiment. There'll still be congestion, there'll just be a lot more of it.

More lanes do not solve the underlying issues here. Instead it encourages more people to drive, clogging roads as well as our beautiful Northwestern skies with pollution.

If I were a cynical man, I'd say that there's some significant lobbying money, if not outright bribery, taking place behind the scenes at ODOT and our city hall. But it would be foolish of me to think that somebody would place personal short-term gain over the health, safety, and beauty of an entire city. However, that's exactly what this project would do: sacrifice the beauty, health, and unique feel of Portland for a short-term gain which ultimately falls flat.

Please learn from other cities' mistakes. Do you really want to make Portland's traffic more like L.A. or San Francisco's? Do you want to grind everyone's commute to a halt for the next five years, only to see a marginal short-term improvement?

This is money which could be spent repairing and upgrading existing roads, fixing potholes, and God willing, even paving the unimproved areas of East Portland.



Listen to the people of this city. Walk or bike along the Esplanade on some sunny summer day. Sit on a bench, look across the sun-dappled Willamette at the west hills, and breathe in the rhythm of the city. The faint noise of traffic almost fades away.

It's a healing experience, and every time I walk along the Esplanade I feel joy and pride in my city. All of that would be another dead memory if this project goes through. Not all change is an improvement. Do the right thing. Do the ecologically and economically wise thing and stop this project before it starts.

Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 David Berge

Comment: I am writing in opposition to the proposed I-5 freeway expansion. Instead of repeating the mistakes many others have made by trying to improve traffic flow by highway expansion, we should be realizing the proven facts. 1) Increased capacity creates increased demand. 2) The vast consumption of land for vehicle traffic negatively affects the livability of any community by disconnecting neighborhoods and increasing pollution. 3) Climate change is real.

What we need is bold leadership to improve our transportation system. Spending \$500,000,000 on a misguided project that will not improve anything is a waste of resources, but worse than that it will further consume valuable land resources. We need to work to rectify the mistakes already made and to take steps to improve public behavior. If a city is going to grow and remain a livable city, its modes of transportation need to adapt. The old attempts to build ever increasing highway capacity is not effective or sustainable. Over the last 15+ years I have experienced an increase in air and noise pollution from vehicle traffic. Expanding the freeway is not going to improve this. Only bold steps to reduce vehicle usage in the city are going to make advances to correct these problems. The proposal to implement decongestion pricing may be one of those steps. Improving public transit is clearly another.

To date the data showing that this project will help improve transportation has not been provided. I suspect it is because that data does not exist and this project should be scrapped before any more money is wasted on it.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 David Binnig

Comment: ODOT's justifications for the I-5 Rose Quarter expansion project comprise a multitude of failures: failure to realistically assess the effects of the expansion; failure to use relevant comparisons for the no-build scenario; failure to talk honestly about effects on nearby sections of the interstate; failure to consider other, more urgent uses of funds; and, most fundamentally, the failure to take seriously the interests of anyone not in a car.

First, the environmental assessment assumes that expanding the freeway will have no impact on the number of drivers seeking to use it despite generations of experience, from 1930s New



York to present-day Los Angeles, showing that adding lanes to roads draws more drivers onto them and fails as a long-run solution to congestion. (Robert Moses in 1948: Today we are well underway to a solution of the traffic problem.)

At the same time, while Portland is actively moving toward congestion pricing on I-5, ODOT's environmental assessment deliberately declines to consider the effect of road pricing on future road use or congestion. We've recently seen the example of Louisville, spending a billion dollars on new freeway lanes while at the same time implementing tolls that made those lanes unnecessary; ODOT is willfully uninterested in finding out whether Portland is making the same mistake.

While ignoring Portland's plans for congestion pricing, ODOT's environmental analysis instead premises its analysis on the construction of the Columbia River Crossing, a twelve-lane, three-billion-dollar freeway expansion project that halted over funding breakdowns five years ago. Given the present reality that the CRC does not exist, even if the Rose Quarter expansion successfully speeds traffic through that section, it will funnel more cars into the existing bottleneck approaching the Interstate Bridge. Will ODOT then ask for billions of dollars to revive the CRC in order to address the new congestion it's created a few exits north? That would put us in an environmentally disastrous vicious circle of building freeways to build more freeways.

Apart from its claims for congestion relief, ODOT continues to promote the Rose Quarter expansion as a needed safety improvement. Yet other ODOT-administered roads (82nd, SE Powell) are far more deadly and the only death within the Rose Quarter section of I-5 in the last few years, a pedestrian on the freeway, *would not have been addressed by this project*. If safety is a priority, why is ODOT giving precedence to damaged vehicles on I-5 over lost lives on 82nd? It's unfortunately hard not to see the rhetorical emphasis on safety as a disingenuous tactic: making our lives a marketing tool rather than a primary value.

That exemplifies the central failure of ODOT's Rose Quarter freeway expansion plans: the failure to take seriously any values other than faster private car travel.

For transit users, ODOT tells us that after years of construction and hundreds of millions of dollars to rearrange surface streets, busses will move slower than they did before.

For cyclists, the project will remove the well-used (and flat!) grid connection at North Flint, while running new freeway lanes above the Vera Katz Eastbank Esplanade. In return, ODOT proposes new connections with steep grades and switchbacks insulting afterthoughts to its freeway expansion plan, reflecting a disregard for the time and convenience of anyone not driving.

For people on foot, ODOT's plan replaces straight crosswalks and right-angle corners with wide-radius turns and long, skew-angled crossings promoting faster driving, again at the expense of the time and safety of people traveling by other modes.

For people who live in the area a neighborhood where ODOT bulldozed hundreds of homes in the 1960s the expansion project will push the freeway farther into the literal backyard of the neighborhood middle school. Instead of reconnecting the area it destroyed, with contiguous,



buildable freeway caps, ODOT proposes jagged, disconnected triangles, surrounded by traffic. These are future wastelands, not community spaces.

In 1955, Lewis Mumford wrote of the planners of his day:

Your one-eyed specialists continue to conduct grandiose plans for highway development, as if motor transportation existed in a social vacuum, and as if [the city] were a mere passageway or terminal for vehicles, with no good reasons of its own for existence. To these experts, a successful solution of the traffic problem consists of building more roads, bridges and tunnels so that more motorcars may travel more quickly to more remote destinations, from which more roads will be built so that more motorists may escape from these newly clotted environments; Instead of curing congestion, they widen chaos.

Sixty years later, ODOT is still operating by that blinkered logic, treating the people who live, walk, bike, and go to school on the east side of Portland as inconvenient afterthoughts to the real business of pushing more cars up the freeway. Instead, ODOT should halt this project, redirect available state funds to fixing lethal roads like 82nd, allow Portland to work toward a long-term solution to congestion with dynamic road pricing, and start working on a plan to repair and reconnect the neighborhood fabric it destroyed in Albina, either through freeway and ramp removal or by burying the freeway under real, continuous, buildable caps a plan that takes the east side of Portland seriously as a place to live, rather than just a place to drive past.

David Binnig

Portland

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 David Binnig

Comment: My name is David Binning, resident of Portland, but the remarks I'm going to read are the words of our Mayor Ted Wheeler in his State of the City address two years ago. I-5 on the east side has separated us from the river, created a physical divide between east and west Portland, stunted development opportunities, and created an environmental hazard, damaging both water and air quality. This multi-generational mistake will probably not be resolved in my lifetime, but I will ask BPS to begin concepting for the burial or removal of I-5 on the east side so that future generations of Portland can complete it. Portland has done it before, turning the Harbor freeway into a park and community gathering place. We can do it again with I-5 on the east side, and reinforce our commitment to the environmental challenges we face on a planetary scale. Any vision for their future of our city needs to acknowledge that climate change is the most pressing issue we face. It isn't just our planet that's at stake, it's our very existence. Our mayor has since given up on that vision, but I have not. With this freeway expansion project, instead of healing the scars that are left on our city, ODOT will make that scar wider and more permanent. Instead of reconnecting the neighborhood, it will destroy yet another historic connection on North Flint. Instead of improving our transit network, it will spend a quarter of a billion dollars to make buses run slower than they did before. Instead of creating public space, we will hang wedges of grass in the onramp exhausts to pretend that they're picnic grounds.



Instead of valuing our lives enough to fix streets like 82nd where people die every year and have this year already, it will pour money into a stretch of road that sees only bent fenders. And instead of seriously managing congestion through pricing, we're literally push that congestion down the road to the next bottleneck. In the 50 years since it destroyed the core of Albina, ODOT has continued to treat the east side of Portland as a place to drive through rather than a place to live in. Now you ask another generation of Portlanders to pay for your mistakes with our tax dollars, with our polluted air, with our divided city. I ask consent that we stop perpetuating this multi-generational mistake and stop this freeway expansion. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0308 David Bisers

Comment: Expanding freeways is climate change denialism. That this is even being considered is offensive. This effort and money should be spent on improving our public transit to something approximating a European city. In addition induced demand will return congestion to present levels and the neighborhoods surrounding will suffer from increased pollution. Please show a little imagination and care for the future of our society.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0315 David Brant Reza Farhoodi

Portland Streetcar Advisory Committee

Comment: On behalf of the Portland Streetcar Advisory Committee, we write to provide feedback on the draft Environmental Assessment for the 1-5 Rose Quarter project. The Committee comprises neighborhood leaders, representatives for people with disabilities, representatives from educational institutions and the business community, and other Portlanders with a variety of perspectives.

For the duration of the project's construction, it is imperative that streetcar operations are maintained as reliably as possible. Specifically, the streetcar should be accommodated to run as scheduled across temporary tracks built on the structures provided during construction to maintain motor vehicle travel. The ability to accommodate normal streetcar mobility should be a minor addition to the mitigations provided for motor vehicle travel. This is far preferable to forcing riders to leave the streetcar and board a bus, only to then transfer yet again to the streetcar on the other side of the project area.

Furthermore, the end result of a project of this scale should not simply provide the same level of service for transit that exists now. The project team should seek ways to improve not just 1-5 travel times and reliability but also better service for streetcar operations. Given that both Broadway and Weidler are Major Transit Streets facing potential reduction in the number of travel lanes for auto, streetcar and bus traffic to accommodate new bicycle facilities, we recommend that the project, in partnership with the City of Portland, develop a cross-section that provides a dedicated lane for the streetcar. The dedicated lanes should be accompanied by



signal priority or a dedicated streetcar signal phase at Victoria, Williams and Vancouver, along with the elimination of driveways and other proven tools to speed up transit.

Thank you for your full consideration of these measures as the project moves into the design phase. We appreciate your efforts to ensure that the project benefits the streetcar system during and after construction to the extent possible.

Attachments: [2019 0315 David Brant Reza Farhoodi ATT](#)

2019 0225 David Celis

Comment: To whom it may concern,

I am a resident of Portland, Oregon who would like to state my opposition to the proposed expansion of I-5.

There has been documented evidence gathered for decades that shows expanding capacity for traffic only leads to increased demand. The belief that adding a lane would decrease congestion is deeply flawed and incorrect. If congestion decreases, this would only last for a short time before more people notice and take to the highways. We will be back to the same place we currently are, but with more cars and all of the consequences of having more cars on the road. This is something that ODOT's own consultation concluded.

We need to be taking immediate action against climate change and reducing our carbon emissions, not expanding I-5 in a misguided attempt to decrease congestion that will only bring MORE cars onto the interstate. We should not be trying to accommodate more cars in our city. We should be implementing tolls, decongestion pricing, and increasing the cost of owning and parking cars. With this, we can approach progressive legislation that prioritizes affordable and equitable transit, and a much improved infrastructure for cyclists and pedestrians.

We should be improving the quality of our public transit infrastructure by expanding service areas, expanding the offered time of service, adding dedicated bus lanes, and more.

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

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

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 David Dalby

Comment: Please ignore the equally absurd arguments against.

Shall have the masses of cars -quite necessary in our Western state - idling and wasting fuel as well as the lives of the commuters every rush hour?

Shall we go on wasting the hours of those passing through carrying freight or their families?

Please green-light this necessary project.



I honestly do not know a single person against widening the Interstate Freeway at the Rose Quarter. Not one.

Regards,

-David Dalby

Portland, OR

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 David Dysert

Comment: I strongly disagree with the current ODOT proposal. If we are to expand the freeway infrastructure at this location and spend this amount of money, we must cap the the entire freeway section with build able caps not mere parks that will not be used. If we are to invest in automobile expansion at this site we must at minimum provide the infrastructure that will allow the grid to be stitched back together to offset the increase in auto traffic and pollution. We must repair the damage from the original freeway building not add to it.

Respectfully,

David Dysert

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 David F Hayes

Comment: This expansion harkens back to the 1960's - the uncontrolled freeway expansions of that era did not serve the public in the ways intended. Congestion is better mitigated by better and more frequent public transportation options. Thinking more about the environment and the future generations than about alleviating minor inconveniences is a better way to go. I am very opposed to ODOT planned freeway widening.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 David Hupp

Comment: I oppose the project to widen I-5 at the Rose Quarter. The main reason is that ODOT has created the very congestion its project purports to solve. Another important reason is that current science in the field shows that widening does not solve traffic congestion, partly due to new trips induced by the widening project. A third reason is that the forecasting used is inappropriate for a future that is already dominated by global warming. My testimony is based upon personal experience. In the early 1970s I served as the Multnomah County Commission's Environmental Advisor and Policy Planner. During service in that official capacity I knew and worked closely with several members of the Oregon Highway Division (later renamed the Oregon Department of Transportation), including the Administrator, the Deputy Administrator,



and the Regional Engineer for the Portland Metropolitan area. I also represented Multnomah County on a bi-state commission charged with addressing problems on the Interstate Bridge. After that service I lived in Portland for the next three decades, during which time I regularly traveled on Portland's freeways. For the last decade I have continued to live in Oregon, in Hood River. I travel to Portland often and continue to use the freeway system in the region. I will state my testimony in the most direct terms: Since the Fremont Bridge and I-405 opened (during the time I served as a public official), the state has mismanaged the traffic on I-5 and essentially created most of the congestion that has plagued the Rose Quarter for the decades since. This has occurred continuously since the construction of I-405 and the Fremont Bridge, I repeat: ODOT itself has caused the bulk of the congestion at the Rose Quarter. Here's why I know this: In 1973 the purpose of I-405, as stated personally to me by then-Highway Division Administrator George Baldwin and Deputy Administrator Bob Burchell was to relieve congestion on the Marquam Bridge and Eastside I-5 and to enable cars and trucks intending to move through Portland to southerly destinations to bypass the city center. There was an additional de-facto purpose of I-405, which was to link to another proposed freeway, I-505, the St. Helens Freeway, a project that subsequently was killed. I had this discussion with those top officials in an official capacity, representing Multnomah County as the Board of Commission's Environmental Advisor. The mismanagement problem lies with the information shown on the big green direction signs. As a driver proceeds south on I-5 they can see a pair of direction signs in the vicinity of the Killingsworth/Alberta crossings. One says "I-405 Beaverton and US26 West" and the other says "I-5 Salem". These signs have always said that. So newcomer motorists and truckers who choose to pass through Portland are explicitly directed to use I-5, thus funneling them into the Rose Quarter and adding to the Eastside and Marquam Bridge congestion that was to be avoided. Not bypassing at all! From data made available to the public, I cannot estimate which portion of southbound I-5 traffic will pass through central Portland and thus could be directed to use I-405. I presume ODOT does its usual "origin and destination" studies, but I see no data on that. I will comment on two other issues, both technical and both political: the traffic projections that drive all other numbers; and global warming. I am an ordinary citizen, retired, who has adequate competence to address both issues. But my ability to comment on these issues is completely hindered by ODOT's Environmental Assessment. Someone referred to this document as "a promotional brochure", and that is what it is. It presents us with a virtual tsunami of numbers, creating the illusion of technical support for the project. But the presentation is opaque and dense. Impenetrable by the average citizen, the document offers no evidence or persuasion at all, just a lot of puff. ODOT is presenting technical detail as a weapon to obfuscate, confuse and distract. Traffic projection numbers drive all other stated impacts of this project and therefore are foundational. The foundation is so flawed as to be cracked. It is not clear in the technical reports made available so far how ODOT has arrived at these projections. ODOT states that their methodology is based upon a federal 2014 document, the National Cooperative Highway Research Program's Report 765, "Analytical Travel Forecasting Approaches for Project-Level Planning and Design". In my review of that document I see that other factors "are considered", but basically traffic projection methodology appears to rely, as it always has, on past traffic numbers. In the present era, this methodology is fatally flawed. A certain future of imminent manmade global climate catastrophe (what some call "global



warming") makes these forecasting approaches useless. Modern transportation planning recognizes that the goal is to move people and commodities, not to move machines. ODOT's I-5 Rose Quarter project is structured along classic highwaylines: the goal is to move machines, and lip service is given to other modes of moving people and goods. Further, from experience I am confident that this project, if built, will cost close to a billion dollars. Your current cost projection is disingenuous and misleads the citizens who will pay the cost. Start over. David Hupp

Attachments: [2019 0330 David Hupp ATT](#)

2019 0305 David Kafrissen

Comment: Dear ODOT

As a resident of North Portland and a bike commuter who travels on Vancouver daily I am against this additional expansion of the I5 freeway in the Rose Quarter . This needless waste of limited public monies to perhaps temporarily alleviate congestion could be spent on so many better solutions. We should be studying congestion pricing, encourage carpooling and tolling the out of state drivers who use the roads daily and pay nothing in the up keep. This is not even addressing the environmental damage and irrevocable harm done to residents.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 David Jensen

Comment: To Whom It May Concern,

I am disappointed that this very expensive project does not include any money for public transportation, which would truly help alleviate the problem of congestion. Additionally there will no doubt be construction delays and huge cost overruns associated with this project. Further the financing for this project could be better spread out to include tolls, and (as I mentioned) public transportation upgrades to provide an alternative to people who don't want to pay those tolls.

Another idea my include expensive tolls on large trucks between certain hours, this would encourage companies with large truck to operate in non peak hours.

Thanks,

David Jensen

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 David Keeler

Comment: As a life-long resident of Portland, I am writing to register my opposition to any expansion of I-5 or any other freeway in Portland. We have ample evidence that freeway expansion does not reduce congestion and in fact increases it (just look at LA). The increased congestion will decrease air quality in the region. Furthermore, now is not the time to invest in initiatives that encourage individual car use. We need mass transit options that overall have less



of a negative impact on the environment. This project is a harmful waste of money. Thank you for your time, David Keeler

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 David Kishpaugh

Comment: The Rose Quarter freeway expansion is a terrifying misuse of half a billion dollars of public money. Our civilization is threatened by catastrophic climate change. Rather than have the courage to make the necessary changes to our transportation system to end that threat, our decision makers are doubling down on failed policies. Freeway expansion does not solve congestion - other cities have tried and failed and ODOT's own report about the project agrees. Increased capacity simply encourages more driving - with all its associated environmental impacts. A well designed, equitable system of congestion pricing - with funds raised fed back into the corridor to offer people real alternatives - is a far better method to tackle congestion and air quality.

Imagine instead what \$500,000,000 could do for our city if it was invested in transit, connecting neighborhoods for pedestrians and cyclists, or improving the air quality and health for Harriet Tubman Middle School students in the crosshairs of this misguided project.

Please don't continue with this disaster of a project. Let's build for the future, not the past.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 David Kunz

Comment: Spend resources on getting people to live closer to their work so they can walk or bicycle. We must learn from the previous mistakes: more freeways only leads to more congestion. Think bigger, outside the box.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 David LaPorte

Comment: Portland and Oregon should be ashamed of what is proposed in this project. With this city's history of anti-freeway culture, and goals to increase trips by non-car transit modes, it is unbelievable that public money is planned to be spent to make driving easier in the heart of Portland. Building and expanding freeways in urban areas is now seen as a mistake of past planning in the United States, where urban neighborhoods were destroyed in favor of car-oriented freeways and suburban development. When this highway in particular was built, it was used as an excuse to destroy the black community that was there. I cannot believe that the freeway will be expanded, once again at the expense of the black community, their school, and their air quality, in favor of the convenience of suburban auto-users. Claiming that this project addresses environmental justice is a cover, as the project does not align with the future vision of Albina. The backers of this project have been politically savvy not to call it a freeway widening project, but instead only adding "auxiliary lanes" and increasing "safety." There are even



"improvements" to bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in the project area to distract the public from its primary goal of making it more quick and convenient to drive in our city's urban core. If public money was to be spent on safety, then it would focus efforts on the well-documented high crash network and other Vision Zero efforts. If money is to be spent to improve transit and active transportation, all of that can be done without adding lanes or widening the footprint of the freeway. In fact, to best address the needs of transit and active transportation, projects should make it less convenient, reliable and easy to drive in Portland. More public space can be dedicated to exclusive lanes for buses and bikes, as well as more sidewalks and multi-use recreation paths. But this project plans to induce demand of single-occupancy private automobile users at the expense of everyone. The planned grassy cover looks nice on the cover of the EA, but it is conveniently hiding a freeway expansion that defies Portland's culture, history, and future goals.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0304 David Levine

Comment: I am opposed to the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion.

This is a short-term, incredibly expensive approach that in the long term will only contribute to future congestion, pollution, and climate change. This is not sensible.

Please, please, please consider other less-expensive, environmentally-friendly strategies, including congestion pricing.

Thank you,

David Levine

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 David Lewis

Comment: Looking at ODOT's presentations at the Open House tonight (7 March), I felt lied to. In particular, the posters addressing climate and pollution impacts showed impressive reductions by 2045, but under examination essentially all of them were due to things completely unrelated to the project. And the small ones due to the project assumed no induced demand. Similarly, the caps shown in green on the posters were in fact isolated sections with little access, with no reason to believe they would become vibrant public spaces. I was impressed by the outreach to minority-owned businesses, which seemed active and sincere. But overall, the traffic I was told would be mostly diverted from surface streets would be much more effectively served by bus rapid transit for the project's projected half-billion dollar cost.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0307 David Lewis 2

Comment: The touted reductions in GHG and other emissions are quite disingenuous. The top-line graphs and text show reductions due to factors having nothing to do with the project.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 David Macbale

Comment: Hey!

My name is David Macbale and I live and work in Portland, Oregon as a Software Systems Engineer. I've recently heard about the project to expand I5 by the Rose Quarter and have some big concerns. To be very forward, I think it's a bad idea that we shouldn't consider even if it only costed us \$1.

I've read through the proposal and I'm surprised at how poorly the situation is presented on the website (<https://i5rosequarter.org/project-impacts/>). There's so much to unpack in these proposed solutions. At the very least, this project needs to spend a lot more time studying the situation and the environmental impact of the proposal.

In a vacuum, some of these proposals may seem like a good idea, but they do not take into account full context of the situation. For example, they do not address climate change concerns nor do they address the problem of lack of mass transit and even local public transit in Portland. The city of Portland isn't getting smaller and we need to be thinking much longer-term than this proposal does.

Freeway expansion in Portland will not reduce congestion. Period. There is not a single city in the United States that has fixed its congestion problem by expanding freeways. To quote Charles Marohn, "trying to solve congestion by making roadways wider is like trying to solve obesity by buying bigger pants."

In particular I take issue with the proposed local street improvements. These proposed "improvements" don't improve or ameliorate common problems experienced in local streets. The proposed concepts simply make the local streets fit with the freeway expansion. We will absolutely not be safer on these streets if the proposed concepts are implemented.

We should be investing in and discussing ways that we can make I-5 obsolete in a way that benefits all Portlanders and Oregonians. The rest of the country believes we are leaders in sustainable transit. Let's solve this problem in a way that reaffirms our commitment to sustainability and livability and shows the rest of the country what real leadership is.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0401 David Medford

Comment: Spending a half-billion dollars on an anti-congestion project which will increase congestion , slow down bus service , and make biking harder is a terrible idea and should be abandoned .

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 David O'Dell

Comment: Freeway expansion in the middle of a city is just wrong. It will increase pollution as increased capacity always induces increased demand. If we see any reduction in congestion it will only be temporary. The only way to reduce congestion permanently is through tolls. We need to implement congestion pricing before expanding. Congestion pricing will reduce CO2 emissions at a time they are desperately needed. Reduced pollution is what those kids at Harriet Tubman Middle School deserve and that can only come through congestion pricing. The Environmental Assessment has come to an erroneous conclusion about reduced emissions apparently because it is not taking into account the well documented affects of induced demand. A full Environmental Impact Statement should be done for this project. The \$500 million budget for this project could be much better spent improving transit and bicycle and pedestrian safety around the city.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 David Owen

Comment: Hello! I'm writing in opposition to the planned I5 expansion project at the Portland rose quarter area. I am opposed to spending public money on this project. All that freeway expansion does is increase the number of cars on the freeway. It has no appreciable affect on the speed or flow of traffic. Instead, these funds would be better invested in work that expands pedestrian, bike, and transit accessibility throughout our region.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 David Pagano

Comment: Hello. I am very concerned about the environmental and health consequences of this freeway-expansion project and believe that it requires major reconsideration. As a native Portlander, I am well aware of the increased traffic congestion over the five decades of my life, but in this time of environmental crisis we need to find transportation solutions that do not encourage the use of fossil fuels. It is shocking to me that this project has not taken into account decongestion pricing, which has far more research supporting its effectiveness than freeway expansion, which only induces demand without ultimately solving any problems. Moreover, expanding in the Rose Quarter is a painfully textbook example of the kind of injustice we are increasingly seeing as the climate changes: it is precisely those with the least power--in this case, the students of Harriet Tubman Middle School, whom PSU researchers have already



suggested avoid outdoor recess due to poor air quality--who stand to suffer the most. Please reconsider moving forward with the Rose Quarter I-5 expansion. Thank you for your time.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0303 David Powell

Comment: Here are a few of the reasons that I am opposed to this highway expansion. I would like to encourage ODOT to use more progressive strategies to help Oregon move into a better transportation future.

1. 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.

2. 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.

Thank you for your consideration

David Powell

Attachments: N/A

2019 0303 David Regan

Comment: Building more freeway isn't going to reduce traffic. We need 500 million dollars for electric buses, sidewalks, and safer bicycle paths to reduce pollution not to expand the freeway in a small area. Why not use Decongestion Pricing? It's a revenue source not an expenditure.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 David Regan

Comment: I oppose the Rose Quarter Freeway expansion because it an enormous amount of money that could be put to better use to address climate change.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 David Schafer

Comment: Commissioner Eudaly and Director Windsheimer, thank you for your time. My name is David Schafer. I am a long-time Portland resident, north Portland resident. I am the father of two children, one who is at Boise Elliot and will soon be at Tubman. I had them here for a while but their usefulness as moral props was finally trumped by their boredom. And I am less



informed and less engaged. A lot of people I see here are very proud of my city right now, but we're all here saying the obvious, which is this is a no-brainer. You can't do this. You can't build more car infrastructure in 2019 in our city. And I drove my minivan here and paid 10 bucks to park underneath this gigantic building and I drove around a lot today. And I am very car implicated and car compromised. And I really look forward to living in a city that's going to be -- be ahead of the current here and, like, not help us live this way anymore. In fact, make it harder for us to live this way so that we can live at all. And I walk around every day wondering how I can help. You guys are our fortune because you know what you can do. You can oppose this project. It just makes no sense to build more car infrastructure right now, not for the time we find ourselves in, so please do the right thing. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0305 David Shafer

Comment: To the Oregon Department of Transportation,

I am deeply and fiercely opposed to your plan to widen the I-5 Freeway at the Rose Quarter. I have lived in North Portland for half my life. My children attend Boise-Eliot Humboldt and soon will attend Rosa Parks. But it is not only my physical proximity to the project that causes me to oppose it. Knowing what we now know about climate breakdown and the perils that we face as a society, it would be morally indefensible to spend any significant amount of money much less \$500,000,000 to build more infrastructure to serve private automobiles. Yes, driving cars will become more and more unpleasant. That is how it must be. In twenty years all of the freeways that ring and choke our beautiful city will need to be transformed and re-tasked. Please please do not spend money and effort propping part of the system that has brought us to the terrible point. Have the courage and vision to make this city an example of the New Way; part of the solution, not the problem. We will all be judged on what we do now.

Thanking you sincerely,

David Shafer

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 David Shafer

Comment: I don't understand why we can't do all these wonderful neighborhood-repairing and freeway covering aspects of this project w/o adding any capacity for vehicles. Every piece of infrastructure built from this point on should be designed to disincentivize driving private cars.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 David Stein

Comment: Much has already been said about this project by others associated with groups and organizations I have followed throughout this process. As a member of the Portland Bureau of



Transportation's Bicycle Advisory Committee, the comments provided represent my general feelings on the matter - that this project is best left in the 'No Build' state. However recent developments have left me, and apparently others, with a feeling that this project is being forced down people's throats through a deliberate series of misrepresentations, obfuscation, lies, and suspect assumptions that, in aggregate, are not representative of the reality in which we exist and as such are inappropriate in an Environmental Assessment (EA) which is asserting that there are minimal impacts which can be largely or fully mitigated. When the EA was first released, it lacked proper supporting documentation to fully encapsulate this project, including project design documents and traffic assumptions. The documents were also not searchable, in clear violation of the ADA and only corrected after brought to ODOT's attention. After sustained efforts by multiple people and organizations these documents were finally acknowledged to exist and released, though most of the comment period had been exhausted by the time these were available. Regarding specific details of the project there are many that merit a complete Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as the impacts cannot be fully mitigated. Further the greenwashing and faux-equity outreach efforts have made any ODOT provided documents suspect as the only concern clearly articulated is the need to keep as many cars moving as quickly as possible. There has not been a good faith effort to improve mobility options for people who are not utilizing privately owned single occupant vehicles or stitch the Lower Albina neighborhood back together using highway covers. The first example of a project element that will require an EIS to establish the full non-de minimis impact that will need to be investigated further is the expansion of I-5 around/over the Eastbank Esplanade. As a multimodal pathway that is owned by Portland Parks and Recreation, this project proposing expanding the highway over the path/park and does not outline where additional support will be required. The expansion will also limit the type and amount of plants and trees that will survive in that environment. Further, ODOT states in the EA that: "Periodic closures may be required during facility operation, but they are expected to be short in duration. This would constitute a Section 4(f) use of the property as it would be permanently incorporated into the transportation facility. Measures to minimize impacts include the preparation of an intergovernmental agreement between ODOT and the City of Portland (the Official with Jurisdiction) that limits the duration of closures and creates a temporary detour for users that would allow for the continued use of the trail during closure periods associated with construction and operation. The implementation of the agreement would reduce impacts such that the features, attributes, and activities that qualify the property for protection under Section (4) would not be adversely affected consistent with 23 CFR 774.17 and thus support a de minimis impact determination by the FHWA. This is inconsistent with a de minimis finding however as there are no viable detours available for this path and any closures at this time are not related to highway maintenance. There is also no plan stated for how detours would be handled during construction activities, which could be significant, though no one really knows because the EA does not require ODOT to specify impacts to that level of detail. A second example, identified by Iain MacKenzie in his comments regarding the (lack of) public process, is surrounding the Madrona Studios. This building with "low income" residents where "more than half of the residents are racial minorities" is an example of the obfuscation campaign that merits an EIS. The section of N Weidler in front of this building will be expanded from three vehicular lanes to four vehicular lanes which will



necessitate a reduction in sidewalk space. This is not something that be readily mitigated, even if additional right-of-way were available to be acquired as the placemaking ability is impaired when there are four lanes of traffic flying by. Third, in every visual presented in i5rosequarter.org, in meetings, and videos there are greenspaces complete with large trees shown close to roadways. What fails to be mentioned is that the location of those trees is not compliant with ODOT policies or biological needs. ODOT has made no claims as to how the trees designated in their visuals will be compliant with their Integrated Vegetation Management Statewide Plan (2017) which would appear to indicate that there is insufficient space available in the project area. On the lids, there are no references to irrigation sources or a watering plan to maintain the health of an plant life introduced to the project area. The Board of Portland Parks and Recreation is against the greenspace proposals that would be transferred to their ownership – primarily on the non-buildable lids. This is due to “the fragmentation of the ‘greenspaces,’ with the larger pieces isolated by vehicular traffic, and thus of limited utility” which is ignored by the ODOT project team. As mentioned earlier the lack of project designs early in the comment period has prevented citizens from appreciating how car-centric this newly crafted project area will be upon completion and the presence of fast moving traffic, in a highly polluted area, will not be of use to a population that is already adversely impacted by the high level of pollutants attributable to car and truck traffic. Fourth, there are only two options provided in the EA. This misrepresents the impacts of congestion pricing on utilization of this project area, this is a tool that is proven in other cities to exert significant downward pressure on utilization. The EA also assumed that all projects currently slated to be built will happen by 2045, including the Columbia River Crossing, the \$3+ billion project that in its most recent iteration failed to advance due to a lack of funding from Washington and if it does happen is likely to be much different than the original incarnation. There are many elements that others will certainly be able to speak to with much more clarity but merit a mention as elements that are either not adequately resolved to a de minimis status or represent a failure to properly model the impact of this project in the EA: Buildable lids are not even presented as an option in the EA, even though the Albina Vision requires them to effectively stitch the neighborhood back together to a minimal extent. Utilizing the lids that are required to stage materials during this project to create “greenspace” that is not likely to stay green due to lack of irrigation, not usable space due to noise, pollution, and high traffic is disingenuous and not accurately represented by the many, many graphics provided by ODOT when modeling this space. Induced demand is strangely absent from traffic projections. The addition of new freeway lanes, albeit ramp to ramp, will indeed create more capacity than currently exists. In every instance where this type of expansion has taken place the amount of traffic has increased, absent any other changes. This EA asserts that the number of cars utilizing the added road space will decrease in direct contradiction to every highway expansion project in this country’s history. Construction impacts are vague and have the potential to change the city’s modal profile. By shutting down portions of bicycle infrastructure in one of the most heavily utilized sections of Portland without adequate detours could change the transportation habits of Portlanders for years or decades. There is no precedent for shutting down for such a heavily used corridor to bicycle traffic and ODOT has neglected to study this. In fact, this element is barely referenced in the EA, only noting in the Active Transportation Technical Report that “the CPC [Construction Phasing Concept] Plan



does not address [...] details for maintaining pedestrian and bicycle movement throughout the entirety of the Project's construction timeline." This failure to account for modes other than car transport during the construction timeline is an abject failure and could result in even worse congestion than forecast as people shift from bike or foot to cars to safely get through the project area. After construction is complete the changes to pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure are not likely to be any better and in many cases will be worse than present conditions. The Hancock-Dixon Crossing will not provide satisfactory bicycle facilities to engage bicyclists to utilize this resource based on preliminary designs – even with good design the 9-10% grade is prohibitive for all but the most dedicated cyclists. The Clackamas Crossing does not support current travel patterns and designs vary wildly as to how and where the bridge will connect with the street grid. There is no reliable way to fully assess the utility of this resource for any potential future users. Even through this project is billed as a safety improvement, the only fatality attributable to the project area in the past decade happened in 2009 and was the result of a pedestrian crossing where no crossings are provided. This project would not have prevented that fatality and in fact would make it more likely given the projected higher rates of speed. The vast majority of crashes in the project area are low speed fender benders that are likely to become more serious if ODOT's projections in the EA are accurate. The impact of this project on transit times and availability both during and following construction is adverse and not addressed by the EA. While I understand that Portland Streetcar is engaged in discussions with ODOT about availability and handling of this option during construction it is nonetheless not detailed and thus needs to be further investigated through an EIS. Portland Public Schools thoroughly addressed the impact to Harriet Tubman Middle School in their March 19, 2019 Board meeting. Suffice it to say there is abundant skepticism to the many positive claims being made in the EA and accompanying presentations. An EIS is the smallest step necessary to understand the full impacts to this vulnerable population to attempt to address the many significant impacts to the building and students. The I-5 Rose Quarter project insufficiently details and addresses the many impacts to users of all types within the project area and for this reason requires a full EIS to understand and address the many issues raised in the EA. These issues are not de minimis and will have a profound impact on the entire city, especially if not addressed before complete design and construction. Regards, David Stein

Attachments: [2019 0331 David Stein ATT](#)

2019 0303 David Worthington

Comment: As a substitute teacher, I travel all over Portland to get to work. Expanding the highway is NOT the solution to traffic issues. It will actually make it worse. And it will add to pollution. Let's not add to our carbon emissions problem.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0304 Dawn Smallman

Comment: Dear ODOT,



I'd like to please submit my comments in opposition to the proposed I5 freeway expansion project in Portland's Rose Quarter area. The scientific consensus on climate change projections are clear, as are the dangers of building more infrastructure that reinforces and/or expands the use of fossil fuels. We need to stop investing in these modes of transportation that put all living beings in harm's way.

There is no form of mitigation you can do that would lessen the dangerous air pollution and diesel particulate levels in the neighborhood nearby. People living, working and attending school in this neighborhood would suffer negative health impacts. Of particular concern are the students of Harriet Tubman Middle School - exposure to this unhealthy air quality is not only harmful to their health, it is yet another example of our government showing the highest level of disregard for a historically marginalized community.

Oregon needs to make a better commitment to the health of our citizens and our ecosystem. This project would do so much harm to our region and community, and there's no proof it would help relieve traffic congestion. Please look to options proven to work - such as decongestion pricing, instead of expansion of more fossil fuel infrastructure.

Sincerely,

Dawn Smallman

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Dean Funk

Comment: As an overarching matter, population growth and the recognition that automobiles are, and will remain the primary mode of moving people and freight through the region, and argue for the project. It will be important to continue pursuit of a Columbia River Crossing project to ensure optimization of the I5/RQ project. It is also important to honor 10 years of consensus building on the priority projects for this region. This project has run that gauntlet based on comprehensive input from a broad and diverse array of interest. It is a project of regional consequence. As such, the frame of reference for support should not be weighted toward any single interest group or geographic area. Environmentally, I suggest that the CO2/GHG reductions aren't underestimated in the near term, and certainly in the long term. Ultimately, and on much steeper curve than forecasted, internal combustion engines will be dramatically reduced, and replaced by electric vehicles, whose energy is likely to come from renewable energy. It suggests that local air pollution will decline quickly, as well, and it is not an unreasonable assumption that pollutants will decrease considerably more than projected. As regular bicycle commuter and bicyclist, I think it is unfortunate that the N. Flint overpass would be removed. It is a fast, safe and efficient route to the west side of the river. However, the proposed project would appear to improve the safety and comfort for less experienced bicyclers, which presumably will encourage more trips on bikes and less impact on the freeway, arterials, and better outcomes on air quality. The short auxilliary lane (which is incorrectly labeled an expansion) is much welcomed safety improvement. This project meets the economic, environmental and safety objectives of a growing metropolitan region. It has some 10 years of



community engagement, and a well-established record as a regional priority. It meets the requirements of environmental assessment. The design represents the comments of a diverse set of stakeholder interests.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Dean Sigler

Comment: Building more roads only draws more vehicles. Staggering opening and closing times for businesses could less "rush hours" and gridlock, for instance.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Dean Sigler

Comment: We only waste money and exacerbate the problem with increased freeway building.

<https://www.brookings.edu/research/traffic-why-its-getting-worse-what-government-can-do/>

Attachments: N/A

2019 0304 Deanna Cintas

Comment: Hi there. I am writing in opposition to the proposed freeway expansion project. As a resident who lives in the area, and who has lived in cities with wide freeway systems, I know expansion won't help anything and in fact will cause more problems, but on a larger scale.

Congestion wont improve. Freeway expansion has never solved traffic congestion, in any North American city, anywhere. Ever! The fact that this project would go through the property of Harriet Tubman Middle School is another issue that could be discussed all on its own.

There will be an increase in air pollution. With the school being in the path of the proposal, in an area already with poor air quality, my opposition is also an environmental justice issue 40% of Tubmans students are Black.

Freeway Expansion is Climate Denialism. 40% of Oregons carbon emissions come from transportation. Expanding single family vehicle transportation makes no sense if we are truly trying to improve the state of our environment. 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. \$500 million could build a lot of sidewalks in East Portland, bus rapid transit lines across town, create shelters and trash cans for all stops, 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.

Finally, if we want to encourage people to decrease their footprint, that means encouraging them to take transit and ride their bikes more. My understanding is this project intends to remove the Flint Avenue crossing (one of the citys most popular bike commuting routes).



I think there are other things that could be tried before moving forward on any freeway expansion, namely Decongestion Pricing. Road pricing is the only policy actually proven to reduce traffic congestion; its also proven to improve air quality and reduce carbon emissions as well.

I hope you will take my thoughts to heart and will consider the impacts this project will have on local communities, specifically communities of color who have been extremely mistreated historically. I also want you to consider what message this sends about our priorities and how we want to move forward as a supposedly sustainable, forward thinking, environmentally friendly city.

Thanks for your time.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Debbie Gordon

Comment: It is time to stop adding to the problem. We must stop paving and expanding for the fossil fuel economy.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Deborah Nass

Comment: I strongly oppose the freeway expansion project. I was just in LA and experienced the absolute failure of an expansion to address congestion.

The increased exhaust will affect Tubman students negatively.

Portland will be seen as a Climate change denier.

The answer is reducing cars. There are many cheaper available answers:

More buses.

Congestion pricing tolls.

Increased HOV lanes.

Please give these other approaches a chance.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Debra New Poscharscky

Comment: We need green solutions, mass transit and other non car options. No more freeways, pollution, country and animal habitat loss.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0225 Deanna T Grossman

Comment: Please do not expand the freeway system at the I5 rose quarter! More freeways do not improve car congestion! More freeways just get us more car and trucks on the roads. We must use other options such as expanding public transit, high speed rail, making dedicated bike roads, and expanding bus services and light rail. Thank you for considering the big picture and long term viability of Portland and our planet. Sincerely yours, Deena T. Grossman Public School Teacher

Attachments: N/A

2019 0225 Deena T. Grossman

Comment: ODOT:

Please do not expand the freeway system at the I5 rose quarter!

More freeways do not improve car congestion! More freeways just get us more car and trucks on the roads. We must use other options such as expanding public transit, high speed rail, making dedicated bike roads, and expanding bus services and light rail. Thank you for considering the big picture and long term viability of Portland and our planet. Sincerely yours,

Deena T. Grossman Public School Teacher

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Deanna T Grossman

Comment: Please do not approve the freeway expansion project at the Rose Quarter. Now is the time to put all resources into better public transit and protected bike paths. Expanding freeways just leads to more traffic as has been proved time and time again. Air pollution at Harriet Tubman school is terrible and this freeway expansion will make it worse. We need to act now to help curb greenhouse gases and make our planet livable for our children and grandchildren. We are in a climate change crisis.

Please, do not make it worse by expanding the freeways for more cars and trucks. Thank you for your consideration.

Deena T. Grossman, public school teacher Portland

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Deanna T Grossman

Comment: Please drop the plan for Rose Quarter freeway expansion. More freeway space just means more vehicles polluting and crowding our roads. The money should be used for expanding public transit and protected bike ways. It is time to make our environment healthy for our children and this project does the opposite. The air is already terribly polluted for the school children and teachers at local schools near the Rose Quarter.



Stop the expansion of the freeway, please.

Sincerely yours,

Deena T. Grossman, public school teacher

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Dell Goldsmith

Comment: We know we will never decrease traffic and pollution by expanding freeways! We are insane to keep doing this and worse than insane to keep pushing us toward the cliff of climate failure. How much money would you pay for the health of your loved ones? Would you take money to kill your grandchildren? This is what you are doing by proposing yet more fossil fuel burning on the freeways and roadways.

Use this huge amount of money, our money, to increase non polluting ways of travel--bikes, walking, electric vehicles. You can do better than this fossil fuel worshipping, fossil fuel, expensive, myopic "plan".

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Dell Goldsmith

Comment: Do not build another, bigger, wider freeway! We are paving over our beautiful homeland. For what? So we can have more and more fossil fuel driven machines roaring through our neighborhoods? All of this threatens our health, the health of countless organisms, including us, and then gives back a huge amount of money to already wealthy people. We must move to renewable energy if we are to have a planet for the living.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0227 Dena Turner

Comment: Please deny the proposed expansion of freeways in the Portland area. Experience has shown that freeways do not ease congestion, but encourage more traffic. Our air pollution is already so bad in the Harriet Tubman Middle School neighborhood, that PSU researchers recommend students stay indoors for recess! This is unconscionable, that we should solve a traffic problem by submitting students to unhealthy air. Instead efforts must be made for mass transit, more bike transportation, and encouragement of tele-commuting. We cannot simply continue to foul our air by building for more and more traffic and more and more pollution. We know that we must mitigate the worst of climate change and building freeways contributes to climate change. Say no to freeway expansion.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0331 Denis Heidtmann

Comment: It seems hard for me to believe that Portland (and Oregon?) is proposing adding highway lanes in 2019. It even harder to understand why you would want to spend \$500,000,000 to do what is environmentally unsound. History shows that adding lanes only postpones the inevitable traffic problems that proponents of lane capacity mistakenly think they will address. Not only will the traffic problems get worse, the correct solutions will be made more difficult, more costly, and hence delayed.

I hesitate to try to explain why such a proposal managed to find the light of day in Portland. Surely transportation planners have been exposed to the overwhelming evidence of what happens when lanes are added. Surely transportation planners have heard of the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Surely transportation planners have seen the positive impacts of alternative transportation modes have on these issues. So no explanation comes to mind other than the transportation planners have been replaced by something else.

Please reconsider. Put the \$500,000,000 to much better use. Make Portland a still better place,

-Denis Heidtmann

Attachments: N/A

2019 0320 Denise Query

Comment: Finally relief from the constant stalled traffic. Air quality should improve dramatically just by the ability of traffic to move more efficiently. This area has been a bottle neck for years causing many accidents. I support this project to help relieve congestion as well as accidents.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0302 Dennis Karas

Cully Association of Neighbors

Comment: Dear Decision Makers,

This is the time to put our money and efforts into increasing public transportation and not expansion of freeways which is counterproductive to a sustainable future. Do as Tom McCall did in 1970: cancel plans for the freeway and develop infrastructure.

Thank you,

Dennis Karas

Cully Assoc of Neighbors

Attachments: N/A



2019 0314 Derek Hines

Comment: This section of I-5 (and I-84 & I-405) always seems to back up and as a driver I feel unsafe. I'm thankful that the result of this project is safer commutes and less traffic, lessening the amount of carbon released into the atmosphere.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Derek Lund

Comment: Hello,

I am a citizen concerned about the proposed I-5 expansion. I'm 18 years old, and the threat of climate change sends me into bouts of anxiety and dread on a regular basis. While the environmental cost of the expansion is what worries me the most, I'm also worried about how effective this project would be.

It's been shown again and again how freeway expansions fail to reduce traffic. The costs of this expansion far outweigh the imaginary benefits. We should be looking into bold, innovative strategies to reduce the traffic in Portland in a just way.

We, as a supposed beacon of progressivism and environmentalism should be leading the way in showing other cities how to decrease congestion justly. This includes ideas like building a subway network and decommissioning freeways among others.

The impact that this expansion would have on Harriet Tubman Middle School alone should be enough to sack this idea. This project is misguided and we, as Portlanders, can do better.

Thank you,

Derek Lund

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Derek Ray

Comment: Please end this infinite building of lifeless roads. I'm a tax paying and voting citizen and I have no need for more highways.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Derianna Mooney

Comment: Do not make more congestion and more fossil fuels dump into the area around the coliseum.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0312 Desi Wright

Comment: Good afternoon. My name is Desi Wright, Portland resident for the last 12 years. I just want to start by saying thank you to ODOT and the City of Portland for all the work and effort you guys have put into this project already. You can see, especially all the outreach and different committees that you guys have been organizing, events like these, so thank you very much for that. I've been a Portland resident for the last 12 years. I live here. I work here. I play here. Actually, 20 blocks down the road from here so very frequently hopping on the MAX in this area, walking in this area. Unfortunately, I still do need to drive some places. And when I'm looking to have a good time, I'll hop on my motorcycle around this area. I support this project because they're safety improvements for all modes of transportation here. It's not a freeway widening project. It is a freeway safety project in my opinion. Riding a motorcycle on this section of I-5 with all the freight traffic and cars is a little sketchy to say the least. But having those auxiliary lanes would give people places -- room to merge, more time. And I think it's extremely important having the hospital, Legacy Emanuel right there, that we have access for ambulances and emergency responders to be able to make it down I-5. I also support the connectivity. Whenever there's a large concert, Metallica comes to town, Justin Bieber, there's pedestrians everywhere. There's MAX. You've got the streetcar, you've got cars from all over the place. And these improvements would address that and make it a lot safer, especially when the Blazer game gets out late at night and you've got all these people hitting the streets in the dark and all of these cars trying to get out as well. I think that this project is not going to solve all the woes in this region, but it definitely is a much needed step in the right direction for this community with regards to safety.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0227 Desiree Tullos

Comment: I am writing to strongly oppose the I5 expansion. My objection centers around the concepts of 1) induced demand and 2) social justice.

Regarding induced demand, I am trained and licensed as a civil engineer. While my primary focus is on water resources, one of the fundamental principles I learned in my transportation theory classes as an undergraduate was that increasing capacity leads to something called induced demand. It has been widely demonstrated that expanding freeways results in greater use of highways, often leading to worse traffic problems than what occurred prior to the expansion. Please use common sense and basic transportation theory in deciding not to approve the I5 expansion.

Second, regarding social justice, the expansion of the highway into the back yard of Harriet Tubman middle school is shameful. Certainly the ODOT and decisionmakers wouldn't want their children playing outside in the poor air quality produced by the interstate. How could anyway think it is okay to do this to kids from disadvantaged families? In addition, adding more cars to the road is not the solution to addressing the growing concentration of carbon in the atmosphere



that leads to climate change. The \$500B could be used to legitimately address the traffic issues in a way that doesn't contribute to climate change.

This proposed expansion is totally out of line with the vision of Portland as a livable space, and I ask that you reject this proposal.

Many thanks for your consideration,

Desiree

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Diana Glidden

Comment: As a cyclist, driver, and resident of North Portland, I am concerned about the widening of the I-5 Corridor. From the information that I have read and has been presented about this plan, it will only ease congestion for a short time, and then we will be back to where we started. This is all for a very large sum of money and seems very wasteful and could have environmental impacts on the communities that are located near I-5. I am not in favor of the expansion at this time.

I am supportive of trying tolling at the Vancouver, WA border (at the I-5 bridge) and/or congestion pricing during peak times. This may help ease congestion and not require expansion. If we do not toll at the WA border (ideas have been floated about tolling a few exits further into OR) drivers will flood the streets of North Portland to avoid tolls, causing a huge uptick in traffic and increased safety concerns to our neighborhoods with so many more cars speeding thorough our streets that were never designed for highway traffic.

Thank you for reading this and thinking long term about our communities!

Diana Glidden

Daily bike commuter from N. Pdx to OHSU

Attachments: N/A

2019 0227 Diana Oxley

Comment: Now is the time to resist old solutions and institute new ones, that is, invest in public transportation, sidewalks, and bikeways systemwide. We need finally to support our trains and buses sufficiently so that they attract and serve passengers to the point of full capacity. People still drive cars because trains and buses are simply not convenient enough. We need to increase runs, reduce weight times, etc. We have never invested enough in them to make them operate to their fullest benefit. Now is the time!! Multnomah Blvd is a good example of what we could do citywide. Instead of widening that Blvd, wide sidewalks and bike lanes were added. There is now safe and pleasant transit to Mult. Village from Barbur Blvd. Unfortunately getting to Mult. Blvd is still problematic so these improvements have not yet been fully realized. Barbur lacks continuous sidewalks, and Taylors Ferry is literally dangerous to walk on. Unless improvements follow a systemwide plan, the spotty accomplishments don't justify their cost -a



set up for failure! Let's make PDX a place where people are out walking, biking, riding buses/trains, meeting up, and creating community. In short let's make it a habitable place!!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0306 Diana Richardson

Comment: Put the \$500 million to use that will actually solve congestion while lessening air pollution. Better public transit, better sidewalks, etc.

Freeway expansion equals sickness and death to black children in school at Harriet.Tubman. There are laws against this environmental injustice and racial discrimination.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Diana St Amour

Comment: Dear ODOT,

I am very opposed to the Rose quarter expansion for numerous reasons. As a mother of two children living within 1.5 miles of the Rose Quarter, I am very worried about the impact on air quality. An expansion will increase traffic and cause more toxics to be emitted into the air. I am also worried about the students and staff at Harriet Tubman Middle School who are will also be exposed to greater amounts of pollutants. I am also a bike commuter and very concerned about the proposed changes to biking lanes and bridges and a ramp going over the Eastbank Esplanade. The plans for biking seem poorly conceived and not conducive to safe biking. Overall I do not think my community was made aware of all the negative impacts and I therefore think that there should not be a freeway expansion without better environmental assessment and a more transparent community engagement process. Please protect our quality of life and our air by not expanding the freeway at the Rose Quarter.

Sincerely,

Diana St Amour

Irvington resident and mother

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Diane Jacobs

Comment: Hello and thank you for listening to my concerns. \$500 million to widen the freeway is insane. We are at a tipping point with climate change and environmental disaster. All efforts and money should be on real hard change that will have a lasting impact on our future. This takes courage and a bold change in policy and societal habits. investing in public transit, bike paths, and carpooling etc. are what we need. Widening a freeway only makes it so more people will drive - it will increase air pollution.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0312 Diane Meisenhelter

Comment: Dear ODOT and whomever else may be concerned,

I would like to register my opposition to the I5 Rose Quarter expansion. We have a very narrow window to address climate change in a real way and we do not need for public monies to be spent on projects that are likely to lead to more driving. The \$500 million in public funds would be much better spent improving and prioritizing public transportation and creating more walkable and bikeable communities.

At a time where decarbonization is key, we do not want to be increasing air pollution which is also an environmental justice issue because data has long shown the negative health effects on the historically communities of color already throughout this corridor and this particular project is right in the back yard of Harriet Tubman Middle School. We do not want to be spending Oregon dollars on highway expansion when Vancouver residents have repeatedly voted down light rail options that would truly reduce congestion and air pollution especially before even giving congestion pricing a chance in this area. Data showing that this is the best use of our public funds has not been forthcoming from your department and it is time to put these auto-centric solutions aside and come up with real solutions for our future. Please do not move forward with this project.

Sincerely,

Diane Meisenhelter, NE resident for over 30 years

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Diane Waggoner

Comment: If the Rose Quarter project is done, it must include funds to move Harriet Tubman school! I'm the grandmother of a current and a future Harriet Tubman Middle School students.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Dominic Belcastro

Comment: The freeway expansion plan is a travesty. Data shows that congestion is not fixed by expanding freeways and this project is far too expensive to waste on a foregone result.

As someone who uses public transit as my primary way to fer around, the proposal to increase spending on a freeway by half a billion dollars is insulting to say the least. We badly need to repair / improve residential roads especially in east Portland where many neighborhoods lack safe sidewalks. We need to increase the viability and affordability of public transit to reduce the amount of cars on the road because: Oregon has committed to climate action over the next few decades. Using our resources which would only serve to exacerbate our CO2 production through transportation is not acceptable.



I hope that our state can begin to seriously reconsider doubling down on high emission transportation investments as the long term existential crises that is our global climate disaster continue to make themselves apparent.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Donald Hsu

Comment: Investing in better public transportation would do much more to alleviate congestion and accommodate commuters. Decongestion pricing is another option which would be much more effective and cost the taxpayers less. Furthermore, continuing to push freeway expansion is climate change denialism.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0224 Donald Winn

Comment: Spending nearly half a \$BILLION dollars on less than 2 miles of freeway is one of the dumbest uses of that money that I can think of! The city will end up with 1.8 miles of additional jammed roadway, polluting more downtown air and making the nearby Tubman school almost part of the freeway! There are THOUSANDS of better ways to use this money, one of which is to implement at least partial freeway tolling to get the 25% off that could travel another time or way. Please reconsider.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Donna Martin

Comment: Howdy-

I'll leave the detailed arguments to those better suited to make them.

Please let this email serve to add another voice to the argument against further freeway construction of any kind, including widening I5 around the Rose Quarter.

It's practically an old chestnut that freeway construction encourages more traffic rather than less. We know that intense changes are needed in our city/national/global infrastructure in order to address climate change in the very near future. Let's show the courage of our convictions and put our money towards more effective measures.

I write this as a self-employed person who uses I5 regularly, and who is actively seeking to decrease my own driving in a seemingly driving-centric business. Please help me help myself by not making it any easier to drive.

Thank you,

Donna Martin

Attachments: N/A



2019 0326 Dorothy Mitchell

Comment: I'm writing to express my deep concern about the proposed Rose Quarter freeway expansion. While conceived with good intentions, the implementation will cause more harm than good. I am particularly concerned about the environmental impact of more traffic adjacent to Tubman school. From an environmental justice perspective, this is not the way Portland should go. Induced demand will bring even more traffic to the freeway sooner or later, and increase the harmful health consequences to young people of color, who are already cautioned not to play outside at their own school.

As a person who lives in NE Portland and bikes downtown, I am reliant on the Flint Street overpass for a calm and low-stress route to get to the Broadway Bridge. I can't imagine how any of the proposed pathways will be more direct or calm than this current option. I know thousands of other people who are not increasing congestion, thanks to their mode choice, feel the same.

I would strongly advocate for "decongestion pricing" as the answer to crowded freeways. Coming from the east coast 10 years ago, I find it absurd that Oregon has not yet tapped into this source of reliable revenue. We are leaving millions on the table.

I could respectfully request that a full environmental impact study be performed to ensure that the health of Portlanders, particularly that of low-income and people of color, remains a matter of high priority.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dorothy Mitchell

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Doug Clauder

Comment: True colors displayed by city council: Fixated on optics of LGBTQ+ (I am the plus, by the way) and white supremacy and equity, the underlying reality is unchanged. Pave the Earth for profit. My position could not be more opposite of the aims of this project. Interstate traffic has no business running through the center of our city. I-5 should be dismantled. It has existed for 50 years, and should be considered a failed experiment, just like our current city government. It is pure insensitive pro profit anti livability, anti urban, outsider politics with a veneer of piety. Disgusting.

Was that impassioned enough?

Attachments: N/A

2019 0225 Doug Hanke

Comment: To whom it may concern,

There are many problems with I-5, but the proposed expansion plan under consideration is not a good answer for any of them.



I live in North Portland and commute south daily. The biggest problems are the number of cars coming from Vancouver, which this project does not address. Nor does this expansion do anything to repair the damage to the Albina neighborhood caused by its initial installation.

I urge you to reconsider this project. Years ago, when the Mt Hood Highway was on the table, the city took the money and spent it more wisely elsewhere. We are a better city for it, and similar courage is required now.

This is the wrong project at the wrong time and will be a massive waste of taxpayer money. Do not do this thing.

Sincerely,

Doug Hanke

Attachments: N/A

2019 Doug Hecker

Comment: Where can we get the official Aaron Brown Bullhorn? Also, does that include the delusional vision glasses too?

Attachments: N/A

2019 0000 Doug Klotz

Comment: We don't need to expand (or even add any lanes) to our freeways. Congestion pricing is the only effective way to make better use of the freeways.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Doug Klotz

North/Northeast Quadrant Advisory Committee

Comment: Mr. Windsheimer and Commissioner Eudaly, my name is Doug Klotz. I live in Portland. I, along with Allen Rudwick, was on the north/northeast quadrant advisory committee as this project was being developed. And it was clear to me the project was about looking like you're reducing congestion on the freeway, not injuries or death. And it was imperative for the surface streets was to move traffic on and off the freeway and to clear out Rose Garden traffic quickly. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities were threaded around the edges of these auto-oriented designs. In the plans, pedestrians will face at least six intersections with very wide and dangerous corner radii that they don't have to navigate now. Flint Avenue, which is one of the low traffic streets that walkers and cyclists use will be removed. The supposed replacement, Dixon to Hancock, will be so steep, walkers will use a series of switchbacks so you can get up it. The Clackamas ped-bike bridge serves no movement that can't be done by the Weidler Bridge and takes three extra blocks to do it, so I don't think it will be used. The improvements on the surface are downgrades instead. And the improvements on the freeway, may reduce side swipes, but even according to ODOT, they won't reduce recurring congestion. What they likely



will do through the mechanism of induced demand is attract more traffic, like what happened on I-5 further north as has been mentioned. This is a project driven by politics and not an assessment of safety needs in the region. It should be stopped and the much less expensive decongestion pricing should be implemented instead.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Doug Klotz

Comment: I have read the Environmental Assessment for the Rose Quarter I-5 project, and find it lacking in enough details to adequately assess the detrimental impacts I believe this project will have.

First, ODOT has admitted that the project will NOT address "recurring congestion". For a project that is being promoted as reducing congestion and increasing traffic flow, this is a jarring admission.

Second: This is not the highest crash location on an ODOT facility. Many of the surface arterials in the Portland region have higher crash rates. Controlled-access freeways have significantly lower crash rates, a detail that seems left out, when ODOT claims this is the highest rate "of this type of facility". It also misses the point, when the great majority of these crashes are minor, with drivers side-wiping or rear- ending other drivers. Few, if any, major injuries occur here, except for people walking on the freeway, which is not being addressed.

Third: The project does NOT improve the surface street conditions for pedestrians.

A: It eliminates Flint Ave. bridge, which was a quiet street that walkers could use to access the area.

B. In an early implementation of the Rose Quarter project, ODOT has eliminated the use of the sidewalk on the west side of the Vancouver Ave. bridge when they rebuilt the southbound I5 off-ramp. The new bridge could correct this and build, and allow for use of, this west sidewalk, instead of eliminating it as planned:

Vancouver/Broadway as planned:

<<Figure in letter attachment>>

Vancouver/Broadway with Vancouver bridge shifted 20 feet east, and angled back to the intersection, leaving room for west sidewalk on Vancouver:

<<Figure in letter attachment>>

C: The planned Hancock/Dixon connection is too steep for ADA specifications, so a series of switchback ramps are planned on the south side at the west end. This is a sign of an inadequate facility. All sidewalks should be accessible and meet ADA without a special out-of-direction path. There is a reason there wasn't a road connection here historically: The grade is too steep.



D. Many of the intersections in the project will include wide (50'-80' radius) corners. Although the drawings don't give these details, I confirmed in a conversation with Caitlin Reff, Project Manager for the PBOT surface street configuration, that these intersections would be designed to meet specs for WB-67 trucks, which necessitates these large turns. These are very dangerous for pedestrians, especially when walkers have a "walk" signal, and drivers can proceed around the corner, not only making a right on red (when they will have to stop first), but more dangerously, when they do not have to stop, and can make a sweeping turn (left or right) on the green light for through traffic. I expect that more pedestrian-involved crashes will occur when this is finished than occur now. No assessment of this has been done. The Traffic Stress analysis, for instance, does not take corner radii into account.

Here are the dangerous crosswalks, at intersections that the preliminary plans call for to have large radii:

<<Figure in letter attachment>>

Here's what the situation would be, for instance, at NE Victoria and Weidler, with the large radius turns to "design for" WB-67 trucks:

<<Figure in letter attachment>>

And here's how drivers and pedestrians would interact when traffic has a green light for eastbound Weidler:

<<Figure in letter attachment>>

E. Because of the swooping design, and indeed even switchback ramps, the Clackamas pedestrian/bike overcrossing will require almost two blocks of out-of-direction travel, vs. walking over the freeway on the Weidler bridge, or even the Broadway bridge. Hence few will use it.

Fourth: The project will increase Vehicle Miles Traveled within the region, and through this section of I-5, through the well-known phenomenon of "induced demand". This will lead to an increase in greenhouse gases emitted in the region. The claim that carbon emissions will be reduced because of less idling is not backed up by the scientific literature, which, in fact shows that, within a few years of the construction, the traffic will increase to fill the now free-flowing (?) freeway. And this is if indeed the project achieves a free flow of traffic, which from all indications, it will not.

The project is the wrong direction for the state to be going if the state intends to meet its Climate Action Goals, and also the wrong direction for the region's Climate Action Goals.

Fifth: The impact of the students at Tubman School, who already are prohibited from playing outside, is unknown. I note that the Portland Public School District has asked for a full EIS to look into the health impacts of this project.

Sixth: This money could be better spent addressing real safety needs on ODOT street facilities like NE/SE 82nd, Powell Blvd. and Lombard, and the legislature, the region and the city should redirect these funding resources to those locations.



Seventh: The legislature directed ODOT to study “Value Pricing”, another name for Congestion Pricing, which is the only proven way to reduce congestion on highways. This should be tried first, before this expensive project is built.

At the very least, I ask that ODOT do a full Environmental Impact Statement, as it is not obvious that there are no “impacts” from this project, but is obvious that there WILL be deleterious impacts to the climate, to public health, and to surface street pedestrian safety.

Attachments: [2019 0325 Doug Klotz ATT](#)

2019 0328 Doug Klotz

Comment: I believe that the EA for this project does not show “No Impacts”, and I contend that the project will have undesirable, unmitigated impacts, in several categories, which I will list. Because of this, I request that ODOT undertake an Environmental Impact Study for this project.

Here are some of the findings that I disagree with:

3.2.2.2 Air Quality in Build Alternative. I disagree that there will be no worsening of air quality. The analysis ODOT did does not assume any Induced Demand, which is a well-known and documented effect of improving flow on a highway.

3.5.2.2 Climate Change. I disagree with the conclusions here. As with the Air Quality section, it appears that ODOT has not accounted for the Induced Demand that will result from this project, and the increased Greenhouse Gases that would be generated, compared to the No-Build alternative.

3.6.2.2 and 3.6.2.3 Environmental Justice. I disagree that the project will mitigate the injustices wrought upon the neighborhood by past projects. The street connectivity is made worse by the removal of the Flint Ave. bridge, which runs in the historic corridor where Flint Ave. was. The Dixon-Hancock bridge does not replicate an historic street, and indeed will be so steep that it will not meet ADA specifications, and not be accessible to the disabled or the elderly. The series of switchback ramps proposed will make the walking trip at least a block longer than a car trip on the new bridge. The large radius corners on Broadway and on Weidler will make it more difficult, and indeed dangerous, to walk along these two main streets through the project area.

3.9.2.2 Land Use. I disagree that there is not land use impact or that no mitigation is needed. The parking lot behind the Paramount Apartments is a parcel that could be converted to housing now. The size and shape of the parcel are suitable for multifamily housing as well as commercial. The project plans to acquire a segment of that parking lot, diagonally through the middle of it. This would render the parcel almost undevelopable, and also permanently remove that land from being “buildable land”, within a “high opportunity area” as identified by the Portland Housing Bureau, an area where people have better access to jobs, schools, and other vital needs that are especially necessary for those suffering from previous racial discrimination in the area to thrive. No alternative parcel is being created with the development capability of the parking lot north of the Paramount Apartments. No mitigation for this loss of valuable land is being proposed.



3.10.2.2 Noise. The addition of a sound wall adjacent to Tubman School will reduce light into the school, and perhaps reduce the noise, but is not an adequate mitigation, considering part of the Tubman property will be impacted by moving the freeway canyon closer to the school. The noise of pile-driving under (!) the school will probably cause displacement during construction. Moving students out and then back disrupts the learning process, and cannot be mitigated.

3.11.2.2 Right of Way. The acquisition of the swath through the parking lot north of the Paramount Apartments, in order to build the Hancock/Dixon street is an adverse affect on that buildable parcel, and an imposition on the property owner that is not adequately mitigated. Land that could have been used to compensate the owner is being consumed for the switchback ramps along the new street. This is an impact that is not mitigated.

3.13.2.2 Socioeconomic Impacts. Because the new roadways, bike lanes and sidewalks on the surface streets are changed in such a way as to make travel more dangerous for pedestrians, there will probably be an increase of pedestrian/auto crashes along the south side of Broadway and the north and south sides of Weidler in the “box” area. The large radius (50’ to 70”) turns, and signaling (as described to me by the PBOT Project Coordinator) that do not give pedestrians a signal phase where they are not threatened by “left on green” traffic movements (and also possibly by “right on green” movements at the southbound on-ramp), will very likely result in more pedestrian injuries or deaths. This is a significant negative impact that is not mitigated. See also the Transportation section below.

The connection that N Vancouver used to provide, was a casualty of early work on this project, which realigned the I5 southbound offramp where it landed at Vancouver and Broadway. Historically there were sidewalks on both sides of Vancouver, leading to Broadway. Until about 2014, the west sidewalk was usable, although not ADA compliant.

<<Figure provided in letter attachment>>

However, in 2015 that sidewalk was narrowed to a point, just shy of the crosswalk, and a sign place 400’ north, stating the sidewalk was “closed”.

<<Figure provided in letter attachment>>

This removal of a critical sidewalk connection is a negative impact to the connectivity of the neighborhood to the north, down to the project area.

This could be remedied in the project, by shifting the Vancouver bridge to the east, to allow those auto lanes to “aim” Southwest into the intersection so that lanes connect, and there is still room for the west Vancouver sidewalk to connect:

<<Figure provided in letter attachment>>

ODOT proposed design

<<Figure provided in letter attachment>>

One proposed design that could accommodate a west sidewalk.

These comments would be applicable to the Transportation section below, as well.



3.14.2.2 Transportation. There are many transportation changes, some positive, but there are enough negative changes that would disproportionately affect pedestrians, that this is a “significant impact” of the project, that is not mitigated.

The worst changes will likely result in more pedestrian deaths from crashes at 5 intersections on the Broadway and Weidler corridors. These two drawings, recently released by ODOT, show the block of Weidler from Vancouver to Williams. The NW corner of Weidler and Williams, for instance, now has a corner radii of about 10'. The proposal shows a corner radii (confirmed by conversation with Caitlin Reff of PBOT as being designed for a WB67 truck), of about 50' to 70' radius:

Here's the current configuration (presumably the No-build):

<<Figure provided in letter attachment>>

Notice that the NW corner of N Williams and Weidler (at right) has about a 10' radius, (similar to the corners of N Vancouver and Weidler)

Here's the proposal, showing the large radius corners at the NW and NE corners of N Williams and Weidler:

<<Figure provided in letter attachment>>

Notice that the very large corners mean that autos will speed around these corners. Heading east, traffic will proceed on the green light along Weidler, likely at the same time that pedestrians on the north side of Weidler are proceeding across the crosswalks. Also, the locations of crosswalks, “around the corner” from the tangent roadway, puts pedestrians out of sight of a motorist, or out of the view they're concentrating on, for some time before the driver is close enough to notice pedestrians in the crosswalk.

While PBOT/ODOT staff claim to use the ODOT Traffic Level of Stress measurements to gauge this danger, the TLS tool ODOT specifies does not even address corner radius as a significant issue. ODOT/PBOT do not use the NACTO Guide, a industry-wide guide to constructing better pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

The corners in the project that have these large radii, and the dangerous crosswalks, are shown here:

<<Figure provided in letter attachment>>

All of these crosswalks would be more dangerous for pedestrians to cross than the current crosswalks, and I expect to see more crashes resulting in injuries or deaths to pedestrians as a result of this project. The Best Practices cited have not helped in the City of Portland. Pedestrian injuries and deaths have been on the rise, not falling. The increased turning radii here are used to allow large WB67 trucks to turn without using the entire receiving roadway, or slowing down significantly. And such radii inevitably result in faster car speeds in corners. The only safety remedy that could work is to create signal intervals where pedestrians could use these crosswalks, with no right or left turns on red, and no right or left turns on green either, interfering with pedestrian travel. I realize that this would result in slower traffic movement, but if ODOT truly wants to increase safety, not decrease it, this is what should be done. I'm told that



ODOT will not do this because it will reduce capacity. I think this is an unacceptable tradeoff, increasing traffic deaths in order to increase or preserve “capacity”.

3.17.1.2 Cumulative impacts. I disagree that the project is doing “safety improvements” as a whole. While the project may result in less crashes on the freeway, I contend it will result in more crashes on the surface streets, especially pedestrian-involved crashes, which have more incidence of injury or death. This impact is not mitigated.

Thus, I request that ODOT do a full Environmental Impact Statement for the project, and address the impacts I have mentioned here.

Attachments: [2019 0328 Doug Klotz ATT](#)

2019 0319 Doug Oneill

Comment: I'm really surprised you're letting a small vocal minority push you around on freeway expansion project. The study makes it clear it's definitely safer and will reduce congestion and thus idle pollution. Eventually electric and greener personal transportation will replace gasoline cars and this argument will be antiquated. Everyone I talk to supports this. Very liberal residents support this. Business supports this. A very tiny anti freeway group is being allowed to dictate what you do and the will of Portland. Please do the right thing and move forward with this project. You have a majority support in Portland.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Doug Pratt

Comment: Please get this project built. We need it badly. Thanks

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Douglas Kelso

Comment: The proposed Rose Quarter freeway expansion is an inexcusable waste of money. The entire history of freeway expansion shows that widening highways doesn't help congestion; at best, it simply moves the bottleneck. This project will consume hundreds of millions of dollars with no public benefit, at a time when we should be seeking ways to reduce carbon emissions.

It will also remove the Flint bike crossing, which I frequently use for commuting, and "replace" it with a steep, unclimbable slope.

The money wasted on this project would be better spent on on improved bike and transit facilities instead of adding worthless extra lanes to a short freeway segment.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0331 Doug Allen

Comment: 1) The EA describes significant environmental impacts from this project, therefore it requires a full Environmental Impact Statement.

2) The magnitude of this project, simply in terms of taxpayer dollars expended, warrants an environmental impact statement that examines the cost-effectiveness of this expenditure of \$500 million.

3) The EA only compares build with no-build, so we have no way to evaluate the true impact of the build alternative. This is because both the build and no-build alternatives involve significant increases in auto travel and therefore increased levels of GHG emissions and other pollutants, which would likely not occur with a reasonable build alternative. An EIS would examine reasonable alternatives to the project that would avoid these significant impacts.

4) The EA provides a lot of conclusions but not in a clear way that explains the assumptions or reasoning behind them. There are many references to benefits to pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders, yet most are subjective and unsupported by demonstrable facts.

5) Regarding cumulative impacts, the EA mentions a number of historical decisions and future plans, but does not provide any analysis of past and future projects on the Portland freeway system, and how these projects, in conjunction with the Rose Quarter project, cumulatively affect the environment. A variety of additions have been made to the freeway system after it was built that have resulted in increased traffic, including the East Marquam ramps connection between I-5 and I-84, which was one of the larger projects.

The National Environmental Policy Act, in defining "cumulative impact" notes that

"Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time." On page 23 of the EA, we are told that "The analysis of value pricing (or tolling) in the I-5 corridor will be considered in the future."

The impact of value pricing is clearly a cumulative impact that must be analyzed, since value pricing is mandated by Oregon law for this freeway. Other construction on the freeway system has occurred, including widening, re-striping, reconstruction of onramps, addition of ramp meters, etc., and it is the obligation of the project sponsors, not this reviewer, to catalogue these activities and their cumulative impact.

Page 34 of the Climate Change Technical Report (CCTR) says that the area for study of cumulative impacts is same as the so-called Area of Potential Impact (API) described in section 4.1 and shown in figure 9. However, projects outside the API, but on the freeway system, influence traffic volumes within the API, and projects, including this one, both inside and outside the API but on the freeway system, affect regional trip-making well beyond the API. The total cumulative and regional effects should be analyzed.



On Page 36 of the CCTR, we are told that reasonably foreseeable future actions include future actions that are identical in both build and no-build scenarios. This does not mean that we can ignore them. An obvious purpose of the cumulative analysis is to warn us of cumulative effects, presumably so we may change course, not only with respect to the project at hand, but for other reasonably foreseeable actions.

6) The claim of no capacity expansion is erroneous. The project creates an additional through traffic lane on I-5 by shifting weaving movements off of the two existing through lanes to auxiliary lanes.

7) The explanation of capacity versus speed versus travel time is opaque. What are the assumptions? There is no clear narrative explanation of the basis for assumptions about future traffic levels, nor is there an explanation of what "capacity" means in various contexts. For example, on page 6 of the Traffic Technical Report, it appears that "future volumes developed for the year 2035" by Metro are the same for build and no-build.

What are the assumptions that could produce such a counter-intuitive result?

8) The EA does not give a fair idea of the true impacts of construction, which will close off travel paths for both motorists and non-motorists. The resulting congestion will subject the region to years of delays and detours. We can expect the Portland Streetcar to be closed for five years, and bus riders will be similarly impacted for five years of construction.

Detours will slow bus service, causing longer trip times, while a "bus bridge" for the Portland Streetcar will add huge increases to trip times caused by bus detours caught in congestion and construction delays plus waiting times to board and deboard shuttle buses. One alternative presented in the EA involves replacing the entire east side streetcar operation between OMSI and the east end of the Broadway Bridge with buses. Since buses are unable to traverse the streetcar bridge over the Union Pacific and Oregon Pacific railroads, considerable out-of-direction travel will be required to travel between the MLK-Grand couplet and the OMSI stop. This information is not presented in the EA.

Likewise, streetcars are known to attract higher ridership than comparable bus service, so this extended replacement of streetcar service will reduce ridership, which should be reported in the EA.

Transit service far beyond the project bounds will suffer unreliable arrival times and gaps in service due to unpredictable delays from congestion and construction activities within the project area.

9) The EA fails to offer an adequate analysis of alternatives.

a) The EA fails to consider transit alternatives. These would include options such as priority bus service on the freeways as well as a parallel extension of the Yellow light rail line east of the Willamette River from the Rose Quarter Transit Center to the Tilikum Crossing, and an extension of the Yellow Line from Expo Center north to Hayden Island for better connection with C-Tran service. Note that alternatives outside the API may be reasonable options for producing



reductions in congestion within the API, particularly when we are talking about components of an integrated transit system.

b) The EA does not adequately analyze TSM alternatives, including value pricing. Page 23 of the EA states "As a result, value pricing (also called tolling) was not included within the TSM/TDM alternative because value pricing, as a tool for transportation demand management, was not among the existing strategies at use in the study area at that time. The analysis of value pricing (or tolling) in the I-5 corridor will be considered in the future. The potential termini for value pricing in the I-5 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." This conclusion regarding value pricing ignores that fact that HB 2017, passed by the 2017 Oregon Legislature, directs the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) to implement value pricing "On Interstate 5, beginning at the Washington state line and ending where it intersects with Interstate 205." On January 8, 2019, FHWA sent a letter to ODOT stating: "...the FHWA's approval of tolling projects under the VPPP has typically been a straight forward process, commonly taking as little as a few months."

10) The EA should make clear that money can be re-allocated by the Legislature to better projects. HB 2017 does not direct the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) to build the Rose Quarter project, rather it provides future funding for the project in return for a series of reports on costs, designs, construction packages, financial status, and progress over the coming years. There are multiple opportunities for ODOT and the Oregon Transportation Commission to recommend alternatives to the Oregon Legislature.

11) The EA should clarify how support for this project was generated through extensive lobbying of legislators and other public officials, at taxpayer expense, resulting in numerous misconceptions among those officials, including Portland Mayor Wheeler who is on record as believing that transit will be a major beneficiary of this project.

12) This project is out-dated, the design having been essentially fixed in 2012, when the urgency of combating climate change was not as widely understood. It was ignored by the public because of lack of funding, until TriMet officials put forward the idea that taxpayers in this region could be persuaded to fund both this project and the South West Corridor Light Rail project in a combined bond issue. Behind-the-scenes dealing eventually resulted in the appearance of this project in HB 2017, despite the fact that it is such a poor way to spend public resources.

13) The EA fails to identify the impacts of removing the Flint Ave. structure. Page 72 states "Additionally, when the Flint structure is demolished, motor vehicle traffic from Flint would be diverted to Vancouver or Williams, where bicycle traffic would also be diverted." While this is listed as a short-term impact, it is actually a long-term impact. Page 75 says "The one intersection expected to close to motor vehicles is located at N Flint/N Broadway but would be replaced with a new intersection at N Flint/N Hancock." This is not at all equivalent in terms of travel patterns.



14) The benefit for transit, post construction, is essentially nil -- a wash. Conclusions in the EA wrongly state otherwise. Impacts to transit travel time occur throughout the day, but are only shown for peak hours. The majority of transit ridership occurs outside the peaks, but the EA ignores these riders in its analysis.

15) The EA analysis of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions is inadequate, opaque, and not based on scientifically sound methodology. The most fundamental flaw in the EA is the assumption that GHG emissions are irrelevant at the project level. According to the Climate Change Technical Report (CCTR), "Efforts to affect climate change typically occur programmatically at national, state, or regional levels as opposed to the project level and are based on regulations that control emissions at a much broader level and focus on planning efforts to affect greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions." This is a crazy notion. Our entire roadway system is the sum of a multitude of projects over many years. The whole is equal to the sum of the parts. This project needs to be held accountable for producing GHG emissions reductions that are proportional to the dollars being spent. Furthermore, GHG emissions are studied only for the Area of Potential Impact (API). If travel times are reduced and become more reliable as a result of this project, then trips and VMT will necessarily increase because of the elasticity of demand. This does not seem to be reported in the EA. Much of this VMT increase will be outside of the API.

Page 23 of the CTR states: "A larger analysis area that included emissions from the entire Portland metropolitan area was evaluated but did not as effectively show the changes resulting from the Build Alternative." Page 23 also explains what area was studied, which is just the project area and links that might experience changes in congestion +/- 5%. The EA clearly admits that it fails to show GHG emissions resulting from this project that occur outside the designated API, but does not explain what the phrase "did not as effectively show the changes resulting from the Build Alternative" means. Was the attempted methodology defective, or was this a deliberate choice to avoid showing impacts? There is a reference on page 19 of the CCTR to the Statewide Transportation Strategy for Greenhouse Gas Emissions (STS) adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission in summer, 2018. Page 43 lists it as a reference. The EA gives a totally inadequate explanation of how this projects relates to the STS. There is no reference to the STS-2018-Monitoring Report given to the OTC at the same time that the OTC adopted the STS. This shows that Oregon is falling drastically short of its mandated goals for GHG emission reductions in the transportation sector. Where in this project are the pricing and funding mechanisms mentioned in the STS? What is the cost-effectiveness of this project in achieving a proportionate share (relative to dollars spent) of the needed emissions reduction goals? Where is the transit component of this project? The EA should clearly point out that for \$500 million, this project fails to make any contribution to meeting the STS goals.

Page 39 of the CCTR states: "Additionally, the estimated large decreases in emissions from existing conditions to future conditions (2045) are the result of changes in vehicle emissions due to federal, state, and local efforts to develop more stringent fuel economy standards, inspection and maintenance programs, and transition to cleaner, low-carbon fuels for motor vehicles." The 22% drop shown, none of which comes from this project, is far below the roughly 60% drop needed for the STS vision.



Page 37 of the CCTR talks about GHG emissions being "localized." This is an oxymoron, as GHG emissions have cumulative global effect, unlike pollutants that degrade or settle out of the atmosphere and so do not "accumulate" beyond a local zone.

Page 38 of the CCTR says "Estimated GHG emissions from the No-Build and Build Alternatives are below levels typically considered to have an adverse effect on global climate change. Mitigation is not proposed for the construction, maintenance, or operating emissions." This conclusion is unsupported by logic, science, or public policy. GHG emissions from the transportation sector constitute roughly 40% of Oregon's total GHG emissions, and United States per-capita GHG emissions lead the world. How can the EA claim that GHG emissions, from either the Build or No-Build alternative, do not have a significant cumulative effect? By the logic in the EA, any single individual could claim that they do not have an adverse effect on global climate change. This is terribly wrong. All actions need to be looked at for their proportionate effect in REDUCING GHG emissions.

Attachments: [2019 0331 Doug Allen ATT](#)

2019 0328 Doug Allen

Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates

Comment: AORTA (Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates) is an Oregon non-profit with statewide membership.

We feel this project and Environmental Assessment are fatally flawed. We ask ODOT to cancel this project by requesting the Oregon Legislature to redirect funds to more cost-effective and environmentally sound projects.

In the alternative, ODOT must withdraw this EA; rethink the purpose and need; restart the scoping process; consider alternatives that provide greater benefits in light of current needs for greenhouse gas reductions and environmentally sustainable transportation modes; develop a Draft Environmental Impact Statement; select a Locally Preferred Alternative; follow with a Final Environmental Impact Statement and project construction and implementation.

In support of the above request, we offer the following criticisms of the Environmental Assessment and prior project development work:

- 1) A project of this scope and magnitude needs a full Environmental Impact Statement. The 2017 Oregon Legislature defined a mega transportation project as one that "...includes transportation projects... that cost at least \$360 million to complete, that attract a high level of public attention or political interest because of substantial direct and indirect impacts on the community or environment or that require a high level of attention to manage the project successfully." The Rose Quarter project meets this standard.
- 2) The EA offers conclusions in an opaque manner that reveals neither the assumptions behind them, nor the logic employed.



- 3) The EA fails to offer an adequate discussion of past and future projects on the Portland freeway system, and how these projects, in conjunction with the Rose Quarter project, cumulatively affect the environment.
- 4) The claim of no capacity expansion is erroneous. The project creates an additional through traffic lane on I-5 by shifting weaving movements off the two existing through lanes onto auxiliary lanes.
- 5) The project does not solve the "weave" problem, which is supposedly the reason for this project in the first place.
- 6) The EA minimizes the construction impacts. Construction will close off travel paths for both motorists and nonmotorists, and the resulting congestion will subject the region to years of delays and detours. We can expect the Portland Streetcar to be closed for five years, and bus riders will be similarly impacted for five years of construction. Detours will slow bus service, causing longer trip times, while a "bus bridge" for the Portland Streetcar will add huge increases to trip times caused by bus detours caught in congestion and construction delays plus waiting times to board and deboard shuttle buses. Delays to transit service will degrade the quality of transit service well beyond the vicinity of the project, particularly by causing unreliable arrival times and gaps in service. The very groups who are already making the choices needed to reduce congestion will be severely and extensively impacted by the construction of this autocentric project. The EA totally fails to give an adequate picture of the scale of this disruption.
- 7) After the construction impacts are over, the net benefit for transit is essentially nil, yet the EA concludes otherwise.
- 8) The EA fails to consider transit alternatives. These would include priority bus service on the freeway as well as a parallel extension of the Yellow light rail line east of the Willamette River to the Tilikum Crossing, and extension of the Yellow Line north to Hayden Island for better connection with C-Tran service..
- 9) It fails to consider TSM/TDM alternatives, including value pricing. Page 23 of the EA states, with regard to the consideration of TSM/TDM options during project development: "As a result, value pricing (also called tolling) was not included within the TSM/TDM alternative because value pricing, as a tool for transportation demand management, was not among the existing strategies at use in the study area at that time." This is one of the most ridiculous circular arguments of all time: Because value pricing had not been implemented already, it would not be considered for future implementation! The EA goes on to state: "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." This is a mendacious distortion, as HB 2017, passed in the 2017 Oregon Legislature, directs the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) to implement value pricing "On Interstate 5, beginning at the Washington state line and ending where it intersects with Interstate 205." On January 8, 2019, FHWA sent a letter to ODOT stating: "...the FHWA's approval of tolling projects under the VPPP has typically been a straight forward process, commonly taking as little as a few months."



10) Regarding greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, the OTC adopted a Statewide Transportation Strategy for Greenhouse Gas Emissions (STS) on August 16, 2018. An appendix to the EA, the Climate Change Technical Report (CCTR) gives a totally inadequate explanation of how this projects relates to the STS. For example, where in this project are the "pricing and funding mechanisms" mentioned on page 20 of the CCTR?

11) GHG emissions are studied, according to the EA, only for the so-called Area of Potential Impact (API). If travel times are reduced and become more reliable as a result of this project, trips, and vehicle miles traveled (VMT), will necessarily increase because of the elasticity of demand. This does not seem to be reported in the EA. Much of this VMT increase will be outside the API. On page 23, the CCTR claims: "A larger analysis area that included emissions from the entire Portland metropolitan area was evaluated but did not as effectively show the changes resulting from the Build Alternative." One must conclude that analysis of GHG emissions in the EA is defective and inadequate.

Attachments: [2019 0328 Doug Allen ATT](#)

2019 0312 Dr Jesse Lopez

Comment: Hello, my name is Dr. Jesse Lopez. I live in Portland where I work as a scientist managing and analyzing massive environmental datasets. Also, I have experience acting as an expert reviewer for environmental impact statements. So given my background it shouldn't surprise you that I've read the entire EA. Well, not the entire EA. It's impossible because there's still critical components of it that haven't been published. Which begs the question, if ODOT can't gather and post a bunch of PDFs to a website, why should the public trust you to build a highway expansion through the middle of Portland on time and on budget? It doesn't quite work in my mind. Going further, the current descriptions in the project and the current studies lack adequate descriptions of methodology, transparency of data and clear project metrics to really perform a scientific assessment. It really needs an environmental impact statement. There's a lot of fluff here. Given the problems with the EA, it's impossible to identify any improvements in the plan that you state in the executive summary. Specifically, there's no evidence that it will improve the bike and pedestrian network over current conditions, it will address surface traffic issues, or relieve congestion on I-5. So given that, it's not clear that this will improve safety at all, which is supposed to be one of the top motivators. So here's a simple plan on how to improve this project so the desired goals will actually be achieved. Number one, put a lid over I-5 through the entire Rose Quarter to facilitate the Albina Vision, and number two, implement deep congestion pricing to alleviate traffic. This will address past injustices imposed by ODOT, repair the street grid to improve bike and pedestrian network, and actually reduce I-5 congestion and vehicle emissions. Please take these as sincere, good faith suggestions to modernize the plan so it aligns with contemporary values, community aspirations, local and state climate mandates, and fact-based reality.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0327 Dr Virginia Feldman

Comment: As a pediatrician, and parent, I urge you NOT to put \$500 million (a price-tag which would be just STARTERS) for this freeway expansion. Instead, sponsor projects which won't cause further climate disruption: cars are the largest source of the greenhouse gases which are making our planet unhealthy by the day. Such expansions have never decreased congestion--as ODOT's own consultants say: MORE cars just keep traveling. Only better public transportation will help here, as will KEEPING the Flint Ave. bridge, so for our fossil-fuel saving bicycle traffic won't be affected. "Decongestion pricing' is a proven way to go as a means of cutting traffic & pollution; we need to give a go at that first. (Or a least not have ODOT hide data from us on the details of this alternative).

My patients live in the Tubman School area, where PSU research on air pollution indicate that students there, even before such an expansion, were being exposed to air pollution levels which make it unhealthy to go outdoors for recess. Such projects are never proposed in OUR backyards--but always proposed for the backyards of the poor, or people of color--70% of Tubman students. Albina & other community organizations do NOT support this, contrary to what ODOT suggests with its 'reconnecting the community' PR statement.

THANK YOU for your attention.

Dr Virginia Feldman MD FAAP

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Dr Carrie Leonard

Comment: Hi, my name is Dr. Carrie Leonard. I'm an oceanographer, a mom, and a resident who moved here because this is a place that used to make decisions that bucked the status quo, that did the right thing for the environment and community. According to ODOT's traffic safety analysis appendix, what I found is exactly just like what the last speaker found. The highest rate of crashes that currently occur in this corridor happen in the middle of the day, which is when I presume people are actually moving the fastest. So therefore, if the plan of this project is to increase through-put speeds through this region, but you also want to reduce the number of crashes. This actually goes against a lot of the data in the transportation world and actually against a lot of what the City of Portland itself is doing, which is reducing speeds across the whole city with a life force safety and reducing crashes, safety for pedestrians, cyclists and non-car users. If the data were there to justify this project, I can slightly be on board. But right now, the information as presented in the EA does not justify the expense and the time and the impact to the rest of the community, especially life while we're facing in climate change. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0311 Dr Marna Hauk

Comment: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion. As a professor of sustainability, with over ninety peer-reviewed publications and presentations, including on the topics of climate change, environmental racism, and climate justice, I want to strongly oppose the proposed Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion. I understand the Oregon Department of Transportation has a desire to build infrastructure that best supports the transportation needs of Oregonians. I suggest ODOT go back to the drawing table to imagine other solutions that address the deepest needs of Oregonians. What are these deep needs? Oregonians want to stop building infrastructure for more business-as-usual with automobiles at the center of an earth-ravaging transportation system. What of the needs for students, particularly students of color and communities of color, who live and learn near the proposed expansion, to not bear the brunt of the ecological and public health cost for gentrification as well as subsidizing throughways for Washington residents with a loss of lung health and increase in pollution. I extend a strong suggestion to revisit your ideas and come back to the community with vibrant, visionary designs, proposals, and approaches that build structures and processes to nurture climate-justice, low-carbon public transit infrastructure, and a strengthened capacity for resilience. The students of color in inner northeast Portland should not pay the cost for higher speed, single-user car transportation. We are living in an age of the New Green Deal. What infrastructure and systems would continue to put Portland on the sustainability map for a successful 2020 and 2030. ODOT, you are creative visionaries and wise thinkers and must come back to the community with different, life-sustaining alternatives instead of this unconscionable proposal.

Warmly,

Dr. Marna Hauk

Northeast Portland

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Drew Blount

Comment: Hello,

8 year Portlander, lifetime PNW native, soon-to-be homeowner, and 7-year-Eastbank Esplanade-rider here

Please do not expand the freeway! It will not make anything safer- fatalities in that corridor have been from homeless pedestrians on the freeway shoulder. It will not help congestion -study after study after study has shown that more freeway lanes just brings more cars onto the freeway, which is the opposite of what we need in Portland in 2019.

This proposal is a shocking step backwards for city development and land use, and an unconscionable waste of money when we should be focusing on urban density and affordable housing. Please do not go through with it.



Thank you for considering public comments, and for your hard work trying to improve this city,

Drew Blount

Software Engineer & Flukebook.org Lead Developer,

Wild Me

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Duane Fickeisen

Comment: I oppose the proposed expansion of I-5 near the Rose Quarter of Portland. I am very deeply concerned about the effects of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions on the climate. We must not encourage the least efficient means of transportation, but instead be working to eliminate as soon as possible most sources of GHGs. Expansion has been shown to result in increased congestion as traffic counts go up in response, in this case, moving the problem down the road. We cannot afford to delay in responding vigorously to the need to eliminate GHGs. This project does the opposite. Instead of more freeway lanes, we need congestion pricing and better alternatives to driving including mass transit, walking, and biking.

I have long felt that Portland's riverfront is potentially a gem but is limited by the presence of I-5. Any expansion that threatens to bring further traffic with attendant noise and PM2.5 pollution through areas near the river and that increase the investment in highway infrastructure in a place it should not be is just plain wrong. We ought instead to look to other west coast cities that have opened up their waterfronts by removing adjacent highway infrastructure (e.g., San Francisco, Seattle) and begin planning for the eventual removal of I-5, not for its expansion.

A full environmental impact statement should be developed with fully open and honest access to the underlying assumptions and a real no-action case. Recent revelations that ODOT has not been more transparent about assumptions (including the no-action case) and that the expansion would encroach further on the eastbank esplanade point to the need for more public information and involvement in determining the future of our city's highway infrastructure.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Duffy Epstein

Comment: To whom it may concern,

This letter is to let you know that I 100% vote no on the expansion project. I am an Eliot resident and have lived here for over 30 years. The once thriving area is not ready for yet another project that will negatively impact our neighborhood. The students at Tubman Elementary are already being told not to play outdoors (criminal!) and that situation will only get worse. Flint street is such a great access road for bikes to bypass all the traffic and it would be a shame to lose it. If all that weren't enough, the fact that your studies are not using accurate numbers is disheartening and a bit scummy, in my mind. If you want us all to actually believe that the air quality will stay the same (not good), and that the expansion would not make it more inviting for



an increase in cars on the road, you should know we are not idiots. There was an article in the Oregonian today, 4.1.19, showing how the stats being used to justify the project are not based in reality....lies, to be exact. The majority of Eliot residents are opposed to this project, as they will be punished for 4 years of dirty construction, overflow traffic and pollution. But far more importantly, we should not be putting money into a project that promotes the burning of fossil fuels as we are facing the most imminent threat to our well being on this planet...GLOBAL WARMING! To ignore this calamity does not reflect the concern that Oregonians have for this danger. Why would we invest that much money to make it easier to drive and burn fuel??? It's sad that you all seem to be ignoring this fact. THIS IS NOT A TEST! THIS IS REAL! I vehemently oppose this wasteful project.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak my mind.

Duffy Epstein

Eliot resident since 1987.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Duncan Baruch

Comment: Planet Earth's biosphere is in crisis -- too much carbon and methane in the atmosphere. Increasing the output of carbon emissions, which is what increasing fossil-fuel powered traffic along I-5 will do, is a wrong-headed thing to do.

Climate crisis is already impossible to ignore, and that's only after about a degree C increase. If, as a recent study predicts, the temperature rise reaches 4 degrees C, clouds will cease to exist, and then it's really all over -- count on another 8 degree C increase.

We have no choice, if civilization is to survive, but to rein in fossil-fuel burning. Now. That cannot be accomplished by expanding I-5.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Duncan Baruch

Comment: Global warming/crisis is now. Ignore it at all of our peril.

We've been told by a large body of scientific analysis that we have 12 years to bring carbon and methane emissions way down. More likely we have less than 12 years -- plan on it.

A half million dollar tinkering with the I-5 freeway completely ignores the screaming reality of our biosphere's existence.

Time to wake up. No time to lose.

Attachments: N/A