



Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with G

Ordered by first name

Contents

2019 0326 Gabrielle Roth	3
2019 0000 Gabriele Hayden	3
2019 0328 Gabrielle Burkard	3
2019 0301 Gabrielle Karras	3
2019 0326 Gabrielle Karras	4
2019 0316 Gaby Lasala	4
2019 0401 Gail Ohara.....	4
2019 0401 Gail T	5
2019 0311 Gar	5
2019 0330 Garlynn Woodsong	5
2019 0327 Garrett Downen.....	6
2019 0312 Gary Granger	7
2019 0325 Gena Backenkov.....	7
2019 0325 Geoffrey Womack	7
2019 0331 George Ammerman	7
2019 0303 George Walter Feldman.....	7
2019 0326 George Walter Feldman.....	8
2019 0327 George Wier.....	8
2019 0326 Gerald Lindsay	8
2019 0331 Gelenna Hayes	9
2019 0402 Gloria Taylor	9
2019 0402 Gordon Hickey	9
2019 0226 Grace Mervin	9
2019 0328 Grant MacGillivray	10
2019 0401 Grant Remensperger	10

Environmental Assessment Comments
First Name Begins with G



2019 0312 Grant Sawyer	11
2019 0327 Grayson Loving	11
2019 0320 Greg Flores	12
2019 0328 Greg Lunsford	12
2019 0326 Greg Stevens	12
2019 0313 Gregory Williams.....	12
2019 0401 Greg Bell	13
2019 0401 Guthrie Straw	13
2019 0401 Gwen Cadogen	14
2019 0327 Gwendolyn King.....	14



2019 0326 Gabrielle Roth

Comment: I'm opposed to this freeway project. It will not help our current traffic situation, and will make air quality worse. We can't afford to keep acting like climate change isn't real - let's do something about it now.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0000 Gabriele Hayden

Comment: Hi, I live near the Rose Quarter, and I essentially can't drive through there at certain times of day because of the congestion, so I understand the reasons why this expansion is being proposed.

But all the evidence suggests that this expansion would worsen air pollution in my neighborhood without actually lessening congestion. Why should my tax dollars go to making the problem worse instead of better? The freeway is already the very worst thing about my neighborhood. It blocks it from the rest of the city and is very unpleasant to walk over. If you want to spend a few hundred million capping the freeway, go for it. I strongly support the Albina Vision. We could put a toll on the freeway and put the money towards reparations. But don't, don't, don't force this through without a democratic process, while hiding your data and lying to all of us.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Gabrielle Burkard

Comment: Hello! I'd like to make a comment about the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion. I am a young person who grew up in Portland. Right now I'm trying to figure out my future plans, but I'm being being hampered by depression about climate change. The future doesn't look great even if we manage to make use of these 11 years to change our relationship to fossil fuel consumption, so we have to do every little thing we can! Traffic congestion is a problem, but I agree with many Portlanders that investing in fossil fuel infrastructure like the expansion seems extremely unhelpful in the long term. I hope that ODOT will at least release a more comprehensive Environmental Impact statement, and well as publicize more of their analysis of the expansion's effect on traffic.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0301 Gabrielle Karras

Comment: In the age of climate change we should be reducing our reliance on cars (a fossil fuel machine) and putting our tax money into alternative transportation. As someone who has never owned a car and has relied on public transportation as well as biking and walking all my life - it is possible to live and work in a city without a car.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0326 Gabrielle Karras

Comment: I oppose the freeway expansion. We should be putting money into alternative transportation and leading the way to a carbon free future instead of funding projects that only put more carbon into the atmosphere. As we know adding more freeways does not reduce congestion. There are many studies that prove that point. *40% of Oregon's carbon emissions come from transportation. We need to encourage people to leave their cars at home. I don't want to live in a city with poor air quality so some people can make tons of money off of a project that will help to doom our planet. Try harder ODOT.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0316 Gaby Lasala

Comment: My name is Gaby Lasala. I am employed in Vancouver, WA and I live in the SE quadrant of Portland, OR. I am writing to express my opposition to the freeway expansion project by ODOT. I drive the I-5 to get to work. I get on at Morrison Bridge/I-5 N on ramp. I am frequently going up and down this corridor. I'm not in favor in expansion because it will not solve the bottleneck or congestion. At best, it will add more space for more vehicles to cram on the expanded lane. This is not going to alleviate the problems we commuters face. I am all in favor of establishing tolling lanes and allowing users to pay for the use of toll lanes to get around the issue. But expanding will be a waste of public funding, endanger the surrounding neighborhoods health with more pollutants in the air, and continue to encourage Clark County to commute by single-user vehicles rather than via transit. I understand there are problems and I, personally, am very involved in the Vancouver, WA community and am aware of their concerns, however, their lack of interest in expanding transit options including their previous denial of expanding a Max line to Vancouver is ultimately a problem they must answer for themselves. When they are ready to expand train and rapid bus transit, I am sure PBOT and ODOT will welcome that with open arms. Until then, we cannot regress into the 1950s & 1960s model of interstate expansion. The future will judge us very starkly if this gets approved. Invest that money in providing the area with transit-friendly, scooter-friendly, & bike-friendly forms of transportation. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Gail Ohara

Comment: As a citizen of Portland for the past decade, I would like to express my concern and argue that spending half a billion dollars on a freeway expansion is not something I want to see my tax dollars pay for. I already don't like that we have a highway running through the center of our city, close to schools, local communities and businesses. We should be spending money to help make sure everyone has a place to

live and health care and basic needs, and thinking of new ways to transport Portlanders in and around the city. How about investing in MAX -- make it more secure so that single women don't feel unsure about riding it alone at night. Invest in more carriages, express trains so people can get to work in less time so they don't feel compelled to drive. Invest in electric buses or trams,



ferries across the river, let's try to move traffic away from the center of town, not increase it. One of the reasons I moved here was because it was accessible and a leader among green cities. I don't see how this project will help our community prosper. Let's try to figure out how to bring more jobs to the East Side so fewer people have to commute. I'm concerned about the costs and the environmental impact of this project, and I would like to see it stopped. I also don't think we should be using tolls and congestion prices, which will mostly impact the poor. Yes, make incentives for people taking public transport but also invest in clean/green energy so we can have a sustainable future.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Gail T

Comment: Please note the following concerns about the I5 Rose Quarter Project:

Freeway Expansion (or auxiliary lanes) has not been shown to relieve traffic congestion

Environmental concerns (e.g. carbon and air pollutants) abound with the current plans and have not been sufficiently addressed

Lack of transparency in the proposed plans (e.g. lids)

At minimum, a full EIS report is warranted

Cost – this is a very expensive project with few to no outcomes involving relief of traffic congestion

Please consider: Returning to the drawing board to take into consideration education and children—specifically the students at Harriet Tubman Middle School, environmental impacts, and cost

Congestion pricing

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Gar

Comment: This is no time to build more infrastructure to support fossil fuel consuming vehicles. The money, my money would be better invested in research, infrastructure for non-fossil fuel transportation and education. Consider the beneficiaries, future generations. It will be difficult but as they say, "When the going gets tough the tough get going. We people are tougher than this problem. The changes must be under taken.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Garlynn Woodsong

Comment: I'm writing to you because I'm terribly afraid that we're about to waste \$500 million doubling down on infrastructure that supports and encourages the use of the automobile, at exactly the time when we instead should be investing in building out our bicycle, pedestrian, and



transit networks to help give people alternatives to having to produce greenhouse gases for every trip. I'm concerned that we only have a small amount of time to turn around our economy and make it carbon-neutral in order to avoid the worst impacts of global warming. I'm especially concerned that it appears that ODOT specifically avoided studying the impacts of congestion pricing on this project, but instead chose to assume that the dead 12-lane Columbia River Crossing project was built and funneling all that traffic at this interchange. This does not seem like ethical behavior by a public agency, and I question if it's even a legal assumption under federal environmental law. I'm also concerned that ODOT is violating the public trust doctrine, by continuing to double down on GHG-producing transportation infrastructure for cars in the face of all the evidence that we need to be doing exactly the opposite. I'm deeply worried that this extremely expensive project serves no purpose. It won't improve congestion, as if it initially facilitates smoother traffic flows, it will induce demand, and quickly back right up again once VMT rises to fill the available lanes. It won't reduce air pollution, as it may draw truck traffic over from the daily midday congestion on I-205 if it succeeds in temporarily easing a traffic bottleneck. It won't improve safety, as this interchange has already gone for years without a single fatal accident, something which cannot be said for other local facilities like the North Portland Highway (Hwy 30 bypass) that ODOT controls and has no plan to make safer. I think we, as a city and a region, would be much better off by enacting congestion pricing, decommissioning the Marquam Bridge, removing the east bank freeway, shifting the I-5 designation to I-405, and thus only having I-84 run through the Rose Quarter. This would be a much more Portland thing to do, along the lines of removing Harbor Drive to create Waterfront Park; this time, however, we could create a whole new neighborhood, with new public plazas and riverfront access routes. I currently ride my bicycle across the Flint Avenue Bridge every morning on my commute to work, from N Vancouver Ave to the Broadway Bridge. I'm concerned that ODOT has not put bicycles front and center in this planning process, despite the City of Portland's goal of making 1 out of every 4 trips a trip by bicycle by 2035. I'm worried that my bicycle commute will be made less, rather than more, safe as a result of this project. In short, I'm not completely opposed to this project. I think it should be a Tier 3 project, scheduled for construct sometime between 2035 and 2075. First, however, we should implement congestion pricing, and build out our regional bicycle, pedestrian, and transit networks. Then, we can see how much traffic remains on the freeway system, and plan for how to deal with it.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Garrett Downen

Comment: As a driver, cyclist, pedestrian, and father, I oppose the Rose Quarter I-5 widening project. A freeway project of this scale is a bad investment at this time. Funds and energy should instead go toward efforts that are more certain to promote safety, improve air quality, and reduce emissions. In regards to the Rose Quarter, please implement congestion pricing instead.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0312 Gary Granger

Comment: I am writing to urge you to reconsider any expansion of the I-5 freeway through Portland and look for other ways to use the half billion dollars such a project will cost.

Expanding freeways does not reduce congestion in the long term, encourages personal vehicle use, increases emissions, and negatively impacts people and the natural environment. The money could better be spent addressing known safety issues with existing transportation infrastructure (i.e., pedestrian and bike safety initiatives), and encoring expansion of environmentally friendly transportation alternative.

I do not support a freeway expansion.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Gena Backenkov

Comment: No Comment Included

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Geoffrey Womack

Comment: I am deeply troubled by ODOT's plan to expand I-5. Highway expansion has never alleviated congestion in the long term and claims that it will cut greenhouse emissions are, frankly, laughable (especially without a full environmental assessment). The science behind climate change is real and ODOT needs to be doing everything it can do to lead Oregon towards a carbon-negative future not pretending everything will be fine with another couple lanes of blacktop.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 George Ammerman

Comment: 500 million could build a lot of sidewalks in East Portland, bus rapid transit lines across town, and bicycle and pedestrian improvements across Portland. Let's support Vision Zero instead of adding more air pollution near Harriet Tubman Middle School, where air pollution is already a problem. Decongestion pricing should be tried before freeway expansion.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0303 George Walter Feldman

Comment: Building more lanes or highways simply allows more vehicle travel, with all the attendant air pollution which we need urgently to avoid. The answer, in my opinion, is



congestion pricing. We need less people driving vehicles if we want to have a chance to curb the pending disasters of climate change.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 George Walter Feldman

Comment: Mere freeway expansion (or so-called improvements) will merely enhance more driving and all its attendant pollution. Obviously, this is a disaster for the planet in terms of climate, and a disaster for our micro-environment in terms of health effects. Please spend our money on mass transit or other improved transit options. Our goal needs to be less rather than more car and truck traffic.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 George Wier

Comment: I am opposed to the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project. This proposed \$500 million freeway expansion will cause more traffic congestion, more air pollution, and more carbon emissions. And it is right in the backyard of Harriet Tubman Middle School, a public school that already has air pollution so bad that PSU researchers recommend that the children not go outside for recess.

Freeway expansion has never solved traffic congestion, in any North American city.

Furthermore, building a costly freeway project now is a blatant denial of the threat posed by climate change. Surely Oregonians can do better than this.

Now is the time to spend money on public transportation and pedestrian friendly improvements, not a costly project that will add to our city's air pollution and carbon emissions.

Please carefully study alternatives (including decongestion pricing) to this expansion and issue a full Environmental Impact Statement.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Gerald Lindsay

Comment: Please reconsider your decision to invest such large sums in the I-5/Rose Quarter expansion/improvement. The world of transportation is quickly changing in Portland and there are likely much better infrastructure projects that could leverage this enormous sum of taxpayer money for much more valuable long term public benefit. At very least, Please take the time to complete an Environmental Impact study to be really understand all the impacts both positive and negative this proposed will have both short term and long term and weigh that against other competing transportation/infrastructure needs.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Gelenna Hayes

Comment: I am opposed to the proposed Rose Quarter Freeway expansion.

ODOT's own hired consultants admit that this project won't address recurring traffic congestion on this corridor. I want our City and State government to work smarter and think about our children, the future and climate change when addressing problems of transportation and pollution.

Air quality in inner NE Portland is a very personal concern for me as my grand daughter lives and plays in the impacted area.

Specifically, this project proposes to expand the 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 as 40% of Tubman's students are Black, and 73% are identified by PPS as vulnerable populations.

We can do better than this! Please reject the proposed Rose Quarter Freeway expansion.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Gloria Taylor

Comment: please have the foresight to protect our city. i am very concerned with infill and density. we have enough traffic now and we cannot value growth over quality of life-we know what our large cities have become.we have a rare chance to preserve and enhance our city-please and improve our quality of life. more is not always better thank you

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Gordon Hickey

Comment: I am very much opposed to this project. It won't do much to relieve traffic congestion. The more lanes you build, the more traffic increases. There are better alternatives to this massive and costly project.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Grace Mervin

Comment: Climate change is real, and it is happening to us whether we choose to recognize it or not. My hometown burned down in 2017 due to drought fueled wildfires that were a product of climate change. Investing in freeway expansions is encouraging an increase in carbon emissions which only makes this problem worse, not better.



A project like this has an effect on generations. A more connected, efficient community is the legacy I would rather leave for the next generation, rather than perpetuating a system that is no longer working. Freeway expansions do not solve traffic congestion. The children of Harriet Tubman Middle School do not deserve to have increased exposure to harmful pollutants. The children of the people benefitting financially from this project most likely do not go to this middle school.

There are other solutions that are more equitable for all members of our community, would increase accessibility and allow us to set a positive example for other communities wanting to proactively address sustainable adaptation in the age of climate change. Please consider investing the money for the proposed freeway expansion into projects better for air quality, carbon emissions, public health, and congestion relief - such as improving public transit and building walkable communities.

This is an opportunity to be a leader at the forefront of public adaptation in the face of climate change. The systems we are operating within are going to be changing with the rapid onset of climate change, and the way we've done things in the past are not necessarily the way we should do things moving forward. Again - freeway expansion has never solved traffic congestion. Let's think bigger and more inclusively. There are more effective solutions and better ways to spend the proposed amount of money.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Grant MacGillivray

Comment: A freeway expansion is exactly the wrong move for Portland. Not only are freeway expansions historically known to destroy neighborhoods, they do not ease congestion, and to invest in fossil fuel infrastructure at this stage is such a phenomenally bad idea. Why not take that money that's been allocated for freeway expansion and use it for projects that would actually improve congestion and air quality and enhance Portland's livability, such as investing it in additional public transit? Constructing new max lines, busses, and biking and walking paths would be a much, much better use of the money. A freeway expansion would be an absolute catastrophe for the city.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Grant Remensperger

Comment: I do not agree with your I5 Rose Quarter Impact Project. As a new father I do not want to see my sons life spent sitting in a car because there are no other options that are efficient. We should spend this money on more bike lanes so we don't die and better sidewalks so my son doesn't get concussions from the poor curb cuts while in the stroller.

Please go back to the drawing board and create something that my son and our state can be proud of. Spending almost a billion dollars on highways is so 1960.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Grant Sawyer

Comment: Hello, my name is Grant Sawyer and I live in the People's Republic of Southeast Portland. I urge you people on the council there to look at this crowd. Look at them and figure out how many of them were sitting in a similar room to this 50 years ago, maybe 45 years ago. I was here at that time. And if you drive down Powell Boulevard right now on the south side when you're going from 39th to 82nd, you'll see the remnants of the Mt. Hood freeway that this city was able to stop the construction of and get the federal government to give us those highway funds for something that made sense for the future, which was the first electrified MAX train line from downtown Portland to Gresham. That's what you need to spend this money for. You don't need to spend it to invest in a fossil fuel project. I don't know if you've noticed, but have you seen the icebergs? They're melting. They're melting quickly. We don't have time to screw around. We've got to get away from fossil fuels. To invest any money that enhances fossil fuel use is absolutely insane. Thank you very much. Excuse my anger, but I'm <<...>>.

<<CLARIFICATION FROM MODERATOR>>

That's what the feds told us in 1975. That we couldn't spend highway money on MAX. We did it. We've just got to do the same thing all over.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Grayson Loving

Comment: I would like to express my opposition to the I-5 expansion through the Rose Quarter area. Portland has set a precedent as a leader in environmental pioneering, and this was the primary thing that attracted me to moving my life here and putting my roots down. On a daily basis I mentally celebrate how many public (or shared) transport options that I have, and how I could easily live without a personal vehicle. I am a car owner, and I enjoy the luxury of this option, but I would gladly give up ownership of my vehicle if Portland had even better transport options.

I would like to see a substantial investment in more infrastructure for transport in the city, and for us to be leaders in the movement away from fossil fuels. I believe that this will set us up for success economically and on principal.

Thank you for hearing my feedback, and I hope to see this proposal reconsidered.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0320 Greg Flores

Comment: ODOT, please use this money to make improvements across the city that serve our citizens and better reflect our values as a city. Expanding that section of freeway runs opposite of what we need for the future. A bigger freeway just means more pollution, more traffic, another insult and injury to our communities of color and disproportionate benefit to those already better off. Sidewalks, bikes, buses and rail bring more benefit to more people. Decongestion pricing is the only real solution.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Greg Lunsford

Comment: As you already know, widening freeways doesn't actually reduce traffic. This will simply allow more cars to be jammed into more space. It will not reduce travel times, but it will put more pollutants into the air and water, as well as the lungs of residents nearby. This money would be better spent on something that will truly reduce our collective carbon footprint or provide additional safety - maybe protected bike lanes on Beaverton Hillsdale Highway or seismic upgrades to one of the many bridges in the city. This project is not only a waste of taxpayer dollars, it actively hurts taxpayers. It should be shelved and the money used for a better purpose.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Greg Stevens

Comment: I am very concerned about the freeway expansion project that is proposed. Spending \$500 million on something that has proven in other cases this only will increase congestion and eventually cause more pollution. As a bike rider I feel my options will decrease. Is this planned because of the Moda Center? Has an environmental impact assessment been done? Please please reconsider this. This is not Portland.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0313 Gregory Williams

Comment: I strongly support the proposed I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project. Critics say it will lead to increased traffic, and that may be true, but traffic is essential to enable the flow of people, goods and services, so in a way that's a good thing. Right now it is often choked to the point of strangulation. I do not foresee this as a total long term solution, of course, but we must continually improve our infrastructure to be as efficient as possible.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0401 Greg Bell

Comment: Portland has an opportunity to increase livability and minimize impact on the environment. Please do not widen I-5 in Portland. Please do not spend \$500M on roads that will significantly degrade public transit and public spaces.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Guthrie Straw

Comment: My name is Guthrie Straw, and I oppose the Rose Quarter freeway expansion. From an ecological, economical, and historical perspective, this project should never have been considered viable in the first place.

Too long have we seen the effects of environmental degradation taking it's toll on our most vulnerable citizens, and if implemented, ODOT is going on the record as making a clear, intentional, and fully complicit effort to champion infrastructure that will directly result in the deaths of the very people it's job is to provide safe solutions for.

Transportation use accounts for 40% of carbon emissions in the Oregon. Even with numbers that weren't hidden behind pages of bad-actor math, the addition of freeway lanes in the U.S. has never reduced demand. Not once. Propagating a project proposed to be more eco-friendly, reduce demand, and improve safety is not only reckless, it is a bald-faced lie. ODOT should be ashamed by the tactics put to use in order to sell a dead-on-paper project to the general public. We have 11 years to work together between local, state, regional, and national bodies to tackle the greatest challenge facing our generation in capping and then reducing carbon emissions. We are all in this together, will ODOT step up to the plate in an era lacking it's Tom McCall's, FDR's, and others to stand on the empathetic side of history? Will ODOT employees feel comfortable telling their children and grandchildren that they had a chance, but decided future generations should suffer the negative impacts of climate change instead? There is a choice, and it starts here, and now.

We have smart, dedicated people from all aspects of life willing to work on this issue, but the Rose Quarter expansion project feels more like a hammer treating everything it sees as a nail. When will ODOT listen to some of our states most knowledgeable economic advisors that have shown for over two decades that while not a perfect utopia, decongestion pricing works on a level that is far more effective than the current paradigm. More concerningly, why is ODOT choosing to not do this before essentially rubber stamping a project built on the futures of our children, setting tax payers back 500 plus million, and contingent on a Columbia River Crossing that doesn't even exist? Taken at face value, it just doesn't make any sense. At best it's incompetent, at worst it's malicious.

ODOT, listen to your friends, your community members, and your neighbors clamoring that this simply isn't "it". Implement a full Environmental Impact Statement, and seek to provide the people you serve the clarity they are entitled. The time for narrow-minded institutional thinking is



over. The time for ODOT to wake up to the realities of the present is now. ODOT must act decisively in favor of helping our most vulnerable communities, pursuing proven carbon emission decrease strategies, and ultimately, deciding to fall within the favorable lens of history as we answer climate change and social justice not just for our present, but for those who will inherit our decisions and walk in our footsteps to come.

Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Gwen Cadogen

Comment: Gentlefolk:

I'm writing to respectfully request a full Environmental Impact Statement for this major and costly expansion of the Eastbank Freeway.

I'm not some anti-freeway zealot, and in fact fully support improvements outside urban areas. I'm not some people-from-Washington hater; I've spent more of my life in the Evergreen State than here in Oregon.

What's at issue is another expansion of freeway "capacity" that won't do anything concrete and is fated to be another attempt to build rather than remediate. It's also not all that difficult to avoid this choke point; I-205 should instead be modified to better carry through traffic and work on its choke points. I say this as an East Portland native; I know the traffic on 205 gets unpleasant, but it's not the end of the world and a high level bridge exists on 205. Congestion pricing might be an option which would incentivize going around not through and doing so at more reasonable hours.

But as it stands, this is a case where air quality won't be improved, and in fact may well get worse. I'll spare you the catastrophic climate litany, but I will say this: ODOT generally does well by its constituents, and this mess is...not what I expect from ODOT. It's sort of like Randy Pape Beltline mess down in Eugene: a half-built solution that won't fix much. You still don't get on the Beltline to make the very trips the road was sold to us as being "necessary" for. I respectfully ask that ODOT come forth with a full EIS and strongly suggest using traffic management techniques (like congestion pricing) to reduce demand rather than building us farther into sprawl.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Gwendolyn King

Comment: I am appalled by ODOT's proposal to widen I-5. Freeway expansion has never solved traffic congestion. Adding new roadway capacity creates new demand, and there are numerous examples of widening projects actually making congestion worse like Los Angeles'



freeway widening fail. Freeway expansion is climate denialism. Building more space for cars encourages more people to use them. Climate change is ending American lives right now, and many more lives around the world. 40 percent of Oregon's carbon emissions come from transportation, and we can't decarbonize Oregon's transportation sector without driving less. This money should be spent on improving and prioritizing public transportation and building walkable communities. This project, which encourages single occupancy vehicle commuting, comes at a price and it's far more than \$500,000,000. Climate denialism is costing us lives and destroying communities, and I stand with the students of Harriet Tubman Middle School, a historically Black school with a 40 percent African America population, where the air pollution is so bad PSU researchers recommended students avoid outdoor recess. ODOT's proposal to widen the freeway into Harriet Tubman Middle School's backyard will worsen the already-dangerous air quality by bringing the traffic even closer to the school. We have an obligation to protect vulnerable populations, including 73 percent of Harriet Tubman Middle School students. This is an environmental justice issue. Freeway expansion is toxic and prone to failure. A better solution is to implement decongestion pricing because road pricing is proven to reduce to reduce traffic congestion, improve air quality, and reduce carbon emissions. A capacity expansion like what ODOT is proposing has predictable results on air quality and traffic congestion, and does nothing to reduce single occupancy car trips. Because when you provide more of something, like highway, people are more likely to use it.

Attachments: N/A