



Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with J

Ordered by first name

Contents

2019 0218 Julio Weams	9
2019 0222 J Chris Anderson	9
2019 0305 J Kuuper.....	9
2019 0329 J Laster	9
2019 0401 Jack DePue.....	10
2019 0226 Jackie Turner	10
2019 0330 Joackie Yerby	11
2019 0323 Jackson B Horton.....	11
2019 0314 Jackson Hurst	11
2019 0307 Jacob Hoffman-Andrews.....	11
2019 0312 Jacob Hoffman-Andrews.....	12
2019 0327 Jacqueline Abel.....	12
2019 0226 Jacqueline Danos	13
2019 0317 Jacqueline Danos Purcell	13
2019 0401 Jade Beth	13
2019 0330 Jake Davis	14
2019 0326 Jake Weil	15
2019 0311 James A Whipps	15
2019 0329 James Berry	15
2019 0331 James Cavin	16
2019 0401 James Cooke	16
2019 0325 James Couch	17
2019 0329 James Falconi.....	17
2019 0327 James Harrison.....	17
2019 0330 James Juntunen.....	18

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with J



2019 0401 James Maartin	18
2019 0401 James Ofsink	19
2019 0226 James Rankin	19
2019 0311 James Rankin	19
2019 0321 James Wilkinson	20
2019 0327 Jamey Billig	20
2019 0311 Jan Wulling	20
2019 0327 Jan Wulling	20
2019 0329 Jan Wulling	21
2019 0401 Jan Wulling	21
2019 0307 Jan Zuckerman	21
2019 0315 Jana Jarvis	21
2019 0401 Jane Civiletti	23
2019 0226 Jane Smiley	23
2019 0326 Jane Sparks	24
2019 0228 Janet Roxburgh	24
2019 0325 Janet Talbott	24
2019 0330 Janice Shea	25
2019 0331 Jaron Heard	25
2019 0325 Jarrett Civelli	25
2019 0402 Jaslyn Cincotta	26
2019 0324 Jason	26
2019 0331 Jason Lengstorf	26
2019 0327 Jason Markantes	27
2019 0401 Jason Monk	27
2019 0000 Jason Nolin	28
2019 0402 Jason Nolin	28
2019 0329 Jason Parasco	32
2019 0312 Jason Powers	32
2019 0225 Jason Starman	32



2019 0327 Jasper Alt	33
2019 0331 Jay Cosnett	34
2019 0331 Jay Thatcher	35
2019 0327 Jean Beacher Brown 2.....	36
2019 0327 Jean Beacher Brown.....	36
2019 0226 Jed Hafner	36
2019 0331 Jeff Beyer	37
2019 0331 Jeff Dill	38
2019 0330 Jeff Lynott	38
2019 0312 Jeff Macey.....	39
2019 0312 Jeff Markey	39
2019 0331 Jeff Mills	39
2019 0325 Jeff Wright.....	40
2019 0302 Jeffrey A Hayes.....	40
2019 0329 Jeffrey Kaufman.....	41
2019 0326 Jeffrey Markovics	41
2019 0329 Jeffrey McDowell.....	41
2019 0312 Jeffrey Trull	41
2019 0330 Jeffrey Yaskin	42
2019 0329 Jen Bruce	43
2019 0317 Jen Davis	44
2019 0331 Jen Hansen.....	44
2019 0329 Jenna W.....	45
2019 0312 Jennifer Banatis	45
2019 0331 Jennifer Bradford	45
2019 0318 Jennifer Lundstrom	45
2019 0331 Jennifer Snarski	46
2019 0227 Jennifer Starkey	46
2019 0402 Jennifer Starr	46
2019 0325 Jenny	46



2019 0327 Jenny Ampersand	46
2019 0220 Jenny Jacobs	47
2019 0330 Jenny Mosbacher.....	47
2019 0331 Jere Fitterman	48
2019 0401 Jeremy McCauley	51
2019 0401 Jeremy Salmon	51
2019 0401 Jerome Comeau	52
2019 0226 Jerry Smith.....	52
2019 0329 Jesiah Martin.....	52
2019 0401 Jesse.....	53
2019 0401 Jesse Champlin	53
2019 0331 Jesse Chapman	53
2019 0402 Jesse Cooke	54
2019 0327 Jesse Lee Burgess	54
2019 0331 Jesse Lopez.....	54
2019 0330 Jesse Merrithew.....	55
2019 0311 Jessica Kelley	56
2019 0329 Jessica Star Bjorge	56
2019 0331 Jessica Willey	56
2019 0316 Jessie.....	56
2019 0401 Jey Biddulph	57
2019 0322 jil.....	58
2019 0327 Jil Morby.....	58
2019 0311 Jill Riebesehl.....	58
2019 0312 Jillian Detweiler	58
2019 0329 Jillian Detweiler	59
2019 0401 Jim Baldwin.....	60
2019 0401 Jim Baldwin 2.....	60
2019 0331 Jim Cavin	61
2019 0319 Jim Clay	61



2019 0330 Jim Hoff.....	61
2019 0312 Jim Howell.....	62
2019 0328 Jim Howell.....	62
2019 0328 Jim Howell.....	63
2019 0328 Jim Howell 2.....	64
2019 0401 Jim Howell.....	65
2019 0314 Jim McClure	65
2019 0312 Jim Owens	65
2019 0329 Jim Rupp.....	66
2019 0401 Jum Sjuln	66
2019 0402 Jim Withington	67
2019 0312 Jingtian Yu	67
2019 0331 Joan B.....	67
2019 0226 Joan Meyerhoff	67
2019 0307 Joan Petit.....	67
2019 0313 Joan Petit.....	68
2019 0307 Joanna Agee.....	69
2019 0305 Joanne Delmonico	69
2019 0228 Jocelyn McAuley	69
2019 0325 Jody Bleyle.....	70
2019 0401 Jody Creasman.....	70
2019 0307 Jody Guth.....	71
2019 0402 Jody Guth.....	71
2019 0312 Joe Cortright	72
2019 0401 Joe Cortright	73
2019 0401 Joe Cortright 2	73
2019 0401 Joe Hand.....	74
2019 0326 Joe Kadera.....	75
2019 0329 Joe Munsinger	75
2019 0307 Joe Rowe	75



2019 0307 Joe Rowe 2	75
2019 0331 Joe Rowe	76
2019 0325 Joel	76
2019 0304 Joel Statz	76
2019 0331 Johann Hannesson	76
2019 0312 John	77
2019 0326 John A Reesman	77
2019 0402 John Ammondson	78
2019 0312 John Carter	79
2019 0329 John Carter	79
2019 0314 John D Berry	80
2019 0312 John Dwyer	80
2019 0329 John Dwyer	81
2019 0320 John Freudenthal	81
2019 0312 John Hetrick	81
2019 0402 John Irwin.....	82
2019 0401 John L	82
2019 0312 John Lee	82
2019 0000 John Ley	83
2019 0307 John Ley	83
2019 0307 John Ley 2	84
2019 0401 John Miller.....	85
2019 0329 John Moriarty	86
2019 0331 John Nickel	86
2019 0401 John Nurse-Mayes.....	86
2019 0226 John Paisley.....	86
2019 0330 John Peterson.....	87
2019 0312 John Reeves	87
2019 0226 John Schuberg.....	87
2019 0331 John Somdecerrff.....	87

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with J



2019 0331 John T Westerman.....	88
2019 0304 John Watt.....	88
2019 0328 John Yohe.....	89
2019 0401 Jon Adams.....	89
2019 0224 Jon Agee.....	89
2019 0329 Jon Jensen.....	89
2019 0307 Jon Meersman.....	90
2019 0217 Jon Steinberg.....	90
2019 0219 Jon Wood.....	90
2019 0305 Jon Worley.....	91
2019 0311 Jonathan Halsey.....	91
2019 0331 Jonathan Hinkle.....	92
2019 0327 Jonathan Korman.....	94
2019 0306 Jonothan Maus.....	95
2019 0326 Jordan Faulds.....	95
2019 0328 Jordan Washington.....	95
2019 0328 Joseph Jannuzzi.....	96
2019 0327 Joseph Mains.....	97
2019 0329 Joseph Readdy.....	97
2019 0326 Joseph Santos-Lyons.....	98
2019 0327 Joseph Totten.....	98
2019 0329 Joseph Wartooth.....	98
2019 0222 Josh Berezin.....	99
2019 0307 Josh Berezin.....	99
2019 0327 Josh Frankamp.....	99
2019 3030 Josh Hetrick.....	100
2019 0222 Josh Linden.....	101
2019 0307 Josh Linden.....	102
2019 0314 Josh Mahar.....	103
2019 0329 Josh Roll.....	103

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with J



2019 0331 Joshua Baker	104
2019 0304 Joshua Berger.....	105
2019 0329 Joshua Goldstein	105
2019 0329 Joshua Roberts.....	106
2019 0226 Josiah Dodds	106
2019 0331 Joy Mamoyac.....	106
2019 0402 JP Perry	106
2019 0315 Judith Arcana	107
2019 0330 Judith Arcana	107
2019 0311 Judy Henderson.....	107
2019 0226 Judy L Todd	107
2019 0329 Judy Romano.....	107
2019 0326 Judy Todd	108
2019 0401 Jules Boykoff.....	108
2019 0401 Julia Karnes	108
2019 0329 Julia Staverosky.....	109
2019 0317 Julia Whiteford	109
2019 0401 Julie Hammond	109
2019 0328 Justin Sheets	110
2019 0331 Justin Skolnick	111
2019 0226 Justin Wolf	113
2019 0226 Jynx Houston	113



2019 0218 Julio Weams

Comment: No Comment Included

Attachments: N/A

2019 0222 J Chris Anderson

Comment: It makes no sense to spend money on freeways right now. There are people dying on ODOT roads all over the state. Spend the money on pedestrian safety and urban mobility.

Implement congestion pricing and freight / transit priority first. The last thing we need is more room for commuters to idle during peak hours.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0305 J Kuuper

Comment: Please o please add freeway lanes in the Rose Quarter and elsewhere it is dearly needed.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 J Laster

Comment: You know, the fact that you've been less than honest with your plans and with your research says all anyone needs to know about you. It's sad. It's telling. It's infuriating. You have been coming at this from every angle imaginable - except without honor - I find it difficult to see what your true aims are with this project. Do you just need something for your office to do? Or your employees? Because there are so, so many projects that you can -need- to turn your direction toward and accomplish, and focusing all this money on a project that is definitely not future-centered, is such a waste. Beyond wasteful. Fix the train infrastructure and increase the routes - that's something I would love to see bought into the present and used a great deal more.

This deception bullshit is old hat and we're not going to stand for it ... nor sit on it, anymore.

Oh, hey, you're gonna need some money to fix some things once that earthquake hits.

Shouldn't you maybe ensure that all the infrastructure across Oregon can handle a bit of a quake before you throw money at making Washington residents happier driving alllllllll the way home? Pish.

"You're gonna regret it." - Addy Langdon, American Horror Story

Attachments: N/A



2019 0401 Jack DePue

Comment: In October, 2018 scientists told us we had 10 to 12 years to reduce greenhouse gases, etc., enough to keep from having the most disastrous effects of climate change. This project looks like it will last about that long and will bring more, not less, pollution to Portland. No US city has been able to expand it's freeways and reduce congestion for any meaningful amount of time and this plan will bring the worst of that to our schools, neighborhoods and businesses.

Gov. Kate Brown has called for an Oregon-specific green new deal and has banned coastal fracking. ODOT needs to follow that lead and reduce the amount of petro-vehicles, not increase it.

The estimated cost from ODOT is suspect because they have consistently been unable to finish projects within budget. It also appears there are hidden costs and unnecessary extras.

\$500,000,000 would be better spent on more and better mass transportation, especially electric and sustainability-fueled vehicles.

When I was a young bankster right out of Lewis and Clark College there used to be specific non-daylight hours for semis on interstates within more densely populated areas.

Surely we can come up with an interconnected set of ways to deal with climate change that will benefit Portland and Oregon and the planet better than this monstrous and ultimately dangerous proposal.

Remember, we have only a decade to keep from the worst parts of an already horrific situation.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Jackie Turner

Comment: I am strongly against Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion. We have limited years in which to take substantive action against climate change. These funds need to be used to build infrastructure to combat climate change and reduce emissions - the last thing we need are more freeways. Especially freeways that won't even improve congestion, that will contribute to air pollution (disproportionately impacting marginalized communities), and that will make it more difficult for cyclists and pedestrians to get around.

That ODOT is considering a freeway expansion while we're staring down climate change is deeply concerning to me. The community has come out strongly against this and I'd like to add my voice. We owe it to each other and our planet to do the difficult work of reducing emissions, and we must not push on with projects like this that are selling out our and our children's futures in the name of profit in the present.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0330 Joackie Yerby

Comment: I am writing to express my opposition to the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project. I share concerns raised by the Albina Vision Trust.

I also want to express my dismay that ODOT does not seem sufficiently concerned about climate change. Transportation represents 40% of carbon emissions. The UN has told us that we have 11 years to address climate change before it becomes irreversible and catastrophic. And yet, ODOT wants to widen freeways that will likely result in more traffic not less. More carbon emissions not less. I have been stuck in traffic at the Rose Quarter and know that's a problem that continues all the way into Vancouver. If we're trying to address moving more people through why isn't transit part of this discussion? I'm tired of hearing that we can only use these funds to build highways. That's only digger a deeper hole for congestion and climate change.

At a minimum, ODOT should be required to submit an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for this project. I would prefer that in addition to an EIS, ODOT take a systems approach to the transportation network. What are you doing to address high crash corridors where people have been killed? What kinds of meaningful investments will ODOT make for transit, biking, and walking? I am eager to see ODOT move beyond a narrow focus on highways to all the ways that people and freight move. I am also eager to see ODOT meaningful factor climate change into how it operates and in all of its projects.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0323 Jackson B Horton

Comment: Making freeways wider has never solved congestion issues. Everyone knows this. Spend the money on the community instead. I dont support this and is one more reason I am adding to my list of reasons to move.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0314 Jackson Hurst

Comment: I like how the project is going to help the underprivalged community by reconting the historic african american neighborhood to the other side of I-5.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 Jacob Hoffman-Andrews

Comment: The most critical criterion for any new transportation project must be whether it does the most possible to reduce CO2 emission and stave off the devastation of climate change. Any project that increases CO2 emissions fails that simple guideline. The EA in its finding of minimal increase in VMT completely disregards years of findings that freeway expansions always



increase vehicle miles traveled. They also do not improve congestion, because the additional vehicles brought by induced demand crowd out any new lanes. The EA is wrong. Reject this project.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Jacob Hoffman-Andrews

Comment: I'm Jacob Hoffman-Andrews. I live in Portland in the project area. But I grew up in Boston, a city that is famous for the Big Dig, the most over-budgeted and over-scheduled project in the history -- transportation project in the history of the world. It is famous for not only being more expensive than expected, there is no part of my childhood that was not marked by the Big Dig. I was an adult by the time it was finished and it was started when I was a child. And today if you go to Boston and you drive, traffic is every ounce as bad as it was at the beginning of the Big Dig, even worse.

This project ignores the long history of freeway expansion projects that always result in traffic much worse or equally bad as it was in the beginning, and all these increased vehicle miles traveled. It's simple logic. If you make driving smoother, faster, easier, people will make more trips. They will live farther away from their job.

If we build this project, we will increase vehicle miles traveled. ODOT is hoping that someone else will solve the problem of pollution. That someone will build the electric cars we need. That someone will build the solar we need to power those cars, and that someone will figure out the distribution network to power it all. Climate change is not someone else's problem. It's our problem. It's ODOT's problem. And there will come a day when we are called on to account for the contributions you have made towards global warming that will be ravaging our world in just 11 short years. We need to do everything we can on all fronts, and I encourage you and every ODOT employee to act on your moral initiative, lay down your tools and refuse to work on this project. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Jacqueline Abel

Comment: I am writing to register my opposition to the ODOT Rose Quarter Freeway expansion project. I live about 2 miles from the Rose Quarter and will be personally impacted by this ill advised attempt to improve traffic by making more lanes - although research shows that more lanes result in more cars and congestion.

We can no longer ignore the impact of climate change here in Oregon, or anywhere on this finite planet. Since 40% of our emissions are from fossil fuel burning transportation, please try other methods to reduce congestion such as congestion pricing and improving, not undercutting, public transportation.



It will only increase the air pollution in NE Portland, which already has a public school, Harriet Tubman, that was warned to not let students exercise outdoors because of risk from pollution. My husband suffers from asthma and most stay inside on some days when pollution is high.

In addition to these reasons, surely there are many better uses of the public money that would be necessary to fund this useless project.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Jacqueline Danos

Comment: As a recent transplant from Southern California I have first hand experience in what freeway expansions do and don't do. They do increase traffic congestion rather than help it. They do increase GHG emissions which we are trying to lower. They do increase healthcare costs associated with pollution. They do not make for positive change.

Research has shown that limiting the ability to drive while at the same time offering alternatives works best. Rather than enlarging the 5 freeway, two lanes should be removed and train service should be added. The costs and the service could be shared by both California and Washington if we could get it together and work together on solving our transit and GHG emission issues.

I left California because of the poor planning and ever increasing car-centric lifestyle. Please don't turn Oregon into California.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0317 Jacqueline Danos Purcell

Comment: I submitted a letter voicing my belief that expanding freeways is not the right direction to go in considering global climate change. I would like to add the attached recent article that explains very well the dangers of following in the footsteps of California when it comes to freeways.

We here along the coast have a current housing shortage but if we solve the housing element while ignoring the transportation element we will have solved nothing and only made things worse. They go together. We need more public transportation rather than larger freeways.

<https://www.independent.com/news/2019/feb/28/inextricable-priorities/>

Attachments: [2019 0317 Jacqueline Danos Purcell ATT](#)

2019 0401 Jade Beth

Comment: As a native Portlander, I strongly oppose the I5 freeway expansion. Portland should be a leader in building sustainable transit as we face the realities of climate change and address the need to move away from low occupancy vehicles. We need to make it easier for Oregonians to get around using alternative modes of transit. Research and projects in other cities such as the Big Dig in Boston and the I405 expansion in Los Angeles has shown that freeway widening



does not decrease traffic. How can we improve transit that will continue to serve Portland 50 years from now?

In addition, the expansion project will impact the Harriet Tubman Middle School. This school serves primarily low income families and minorities. ODOT has acknowledged its history of destroying hundreds of black families' homes to build I5. Again, ODOT is hurting black bodies again and outreach isn't remediation.

I request a full environmental impact statement, a finding of significant impact, and to halt the project until we can find a proposal that looks towards the future with regards to climate change, and does not harm our community.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Jake Davis

Comment: Oregon has a history of planning excellence. When we passed Senate Bill 100 in 1973, we understood the role planning would play in shaping safe, sustainable, people-first cities and regions. When Portland declined freeway money in the 1980s to build the first MAX, it was in recognition of a changing dynamic of how people move. Investments in the 1990s towards an emerging bicycle network placed Portland at the forefront of cycling in the United States. These efforts and others have not been perfect, but have solidified Oregon's role as the trailblazer of good planning.

Yet in 2019, ODOT is looking to undo this legacy.

In 2019, instead of acknowledging the role driving plays in worsening emissions and traffic violence, ODOT seeks to double down by expanding I-5 through the Rose Quarter, despite concurrent efforts to address traffic such as congestion pricing, and despite decades of research which shows freeway expansion does not solve congestion, but makes it worse.

In 2019, ODOT is ignoring the rights of students, many of whom are students of color, to go to school without breathing in exhaust fumes, an insult in the face of historic racial injustice in this state. Worse yet, ODOT insists this project will "repair the neighborhood", despite local neighborhoods and institutions objecting to its very premise, and despite concerted efforts by ODOT to downplay the impacts and oversell the benefits.

In 2019, instead of improving bicycling and walking, ODOT throws those modes to the side so cars can drive faster on our surface streets, with wider turning radii and an emphasis on improving vehicular level of service instead of moving people. ODOT of course does this while claiming safety will improve, despite all evidence to the contrary.

In 2019, transit is seemingly not a solution to moving more people, but an afterthought, and a mode which ODOT seeks to worsen all in the name of "improving auto capacity", a dubious outcome at best.



And in 2019, ODOT seeks to advance these narratives and more through deceit and a minimal and perhaps even negligent public engagement process where not until later have we learned that the impacts of the project will be larger than imagined, that ODOT has hidden valuable information about traffic conditions, projects upon which this one depends, effects on the Eastbank Esplanade, one of the treasures of the Portland area, and other impacts. ODOT has continually labeled viable alternatives as "out of scope" to jam through this expensive boondoggle, which robs this state of over half a billion dollars that could be better spent in hundreds of different ways.

This project is the abdication of responsibility. It is an insult to our history and the role that planning plays in our communities. It is a project with seemingly no benefits and significant negative impacts.

ODOT must recognize this and make amends for an opaque, deceitful, and hostile process that has for the time being damaged its reputation irreparably. Cancel this project immediately and let Portland decide its own destiny for this corridor.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Jake Weil

Comment: The IPCC report commissioned by the United Nations states very clear that if as a planet we don't halve emissions 50% by 2030 and rapidly decrease to 0 after that life on earth is in peril. The freeway expansion as is the proposed Jordan Cove refinery and pipeline are a step towards ensuring an unlivable planet for future generations. I've got an 8 year old son whose future I'm very concerned about. I find the fact that the Oregon legislature continues to support infrastructure that flies against the advice of science unconscionable.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 James A Whipps

Comment: Simply, the future of our world is heading away from fossil fuels. Let's spend the money on projects that will increase the chances of a healthy future.

Thank you

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 James Berry

Comment: As a community resident living only a few miles from the proposed I-5 expansion, I strongly oppose this project.



My wife and I believe that climate change is the central issue of our time. We are taking concrete steps to shrink our impact on the planet, including biking and walking whenever possible, limiting our home temperature to 60 degrees in the winter, cutting down on consumption of red meat, and limiting air travel.

As an attorney, I am well aware of the harm that cars and trucks so often cause to members of our community. As a physician, my wife also sees the negative impacts of cars and trucks, including respiratory problems and injuries due to accidents.

We are also concerned with the recent revelation that the expanded freeway will overhang the Vera Katz Esplanade and require periodic closure of the esplanade as the interstate is maintained. The esplanade is part of our biking and running route, and we cross the point the interstate would overhang about 5 times per week. Bringing this busy overstate directly over the heads of the thousands of runners, walkers, and bikers who use the esplanade each day is certain to lead to respiratory ailments for those who pass beneath the interstate.

Fortunately, there is a better way forward. We would like to see our elected officials realize that sacrifices in auto travel time may be required to achieve our climate goals as a city and to create a safer environment. Instead of devoting a princely sum to expanding interstate capacity, lets invest in bike, pedestrian, and transit infrastructure. We would also gladly pay a toll to travel on I-5, and this would likely decrease auto demand.

We can make strides to combat climate change, but we need the help of our elected officials and policy makers. Thank you so much for taking the time to read my comments, and I will look forward to ODOTs future proposals to promote more sustainable forms of transportation.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 James Cavin

Comment: I would like to voice my strong opposition to this project. Though I use this twice weekly while traveling to work, the cost, associated pollution, negligible effect on commute speeds, and counterproductive investment in automotive transportation makes this project a move in the absolute wrong direction.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 James Cooke

Comment: Please don't ruin our city! We don't need more highways and it hurts the environment.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0325 James Couch

Comment: ODOT's Rose Quarter freeway expansion is a terrible idea. In a time where our opportunity to address climate change is rapidly closing, any project that increases driving should be stopped.

Furthermore in a time of increasing income disparity this is a project that benefits a small minority of the well off. This benefit comes at the expense of those less fortunate.

It is time that ODOT addresses current issues and stops wasting money that could be put to far better use solving critical problems. It is time for ODOT to move into the present and stop using old ideas that have been proven to not work.

No on the Rose Quarter expansion. No on more freeways. The time for real Change is NOW!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 James Falconi

Comment: The proposed freeway expansion will only make Oregon's situation worse in terms of congestion and air quality and we can do better than to move forward carelessly with a rushed and expensive project. Highway expansion has been proven to be ineffective. A child could propose "more roads" when congestion slows the flow of traffic. But the problem is more complex than simply Look at China. How many times have they expanded their highways only to continue producing more major traffic jams, like their famous 12-day, 74 mile traffic jam in August 2010. While this isn't China, we are facing similar issues. Induced demand is a real phenomenon! It's been proven that significant highway expansion does not solve the problem. What we need to do is approach the problem from different angles that emphasize alternatives to highway traffic and the frequency of highway travel. Such solutions require more time to implement, but in the long run will pay off. In the meantime, we are seeing the effect of "dissuaded demand" in place whereby congestion causes people and businesses to alter their plans in order to avoid the traffic jams. Expansion might be part of a more comprehensive plan, but it can not be the majority of the solution. If we have too much expansion too quickly there is an indication that it will overwhelm the region in negative ways. Furthermore, we deserve a full environmental impact statement as just one part of the data all Oregonians need to inform themselves on the consequences of any proposed solution. I'd like to add my voice to those asking for more consideration, more studies, and alternative solutions as part of a comprehensive and considered plan to tackle this issue.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 James Harrison

Comment: Yes, I agree that I5 Southbound at the Rose Quarter exit is a mess.

While it is indeed a mess for car traffic below, I judge that it is even more of a mess above, for surface cars, bikes, pedestrians, and other modes of transportation (scooters etc). Spending



money to fix below will just move the bottleneck to the next intersection, as it is 2019 and we know how Induced Demand and corollary effects work, from having seen every city in America try to build their way out of congestion. What I am asking you to do is to fix the above. Please put our tax dollars into making it easier for pedestrians and bikes to get into downtown from the Broadway corridor. Please put our limited resources into reconnecting the Rose Quarter with downtown. For the record, I do personally think that ODOT is a disaster of an agency, stuck in the past, and I'd invite you to learn from your little sister PBOT. Or, we'll take your agency away from you and assign it to someone who can play nice. While I'm being cheeky and passive aggressive (for which I apologize) there is an underlying truth. We can't continue to build freeways the way we have in the past. That's a tremendous amount of land that has been banked for the car. I'm a driver, I drive every day. The innovations that are coming are worth pursuing, not as parsley on the side of the plate but as the main dish. We really ought to be innovating, like we already have in the past, remember? This current plan is a start but the emphasis is not the right balance. Please look at the latest greatest things happening in the world right now (we know your engineers are up on this stuff) - and compile it all into a big presentation. Then present all of that to us, the public, and we'll take a look and decide what makes sense to pursue. That way you have lots of collaborative help, and we're all shouldering the decision.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 James Juntunen

Comment: As a resident of the Eliot neighborhood, I do not support the proposed freeway expansion for the following reasons:

1. It will induce demand, and in a short amount of time after completion, traffic will be just as bad or worse.
2. The lack of transparency with the EIS.
3. Negative impact for bicycle and public transportation users especially during the several years of construction.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 James Maertín

Comment: I am opposed to the Rose Quarter I-5 expansion project for a myriad of reasons. The gist of it though is that it is a colossal waste of money shoring up a transportation system which has been a total disaster.

But here's a thought I haven't seen at all among the other comments in opposition – this will largely benefit Washington commuters! Why should Oregon spend a half billion dollars because



Vancouver and Washington State support unmitigated sprawl and continually vote down bringing MAX across the bridge?!!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 James Ofsink

Comment: I am deeply concerned about human caused climate change and this project moves us in exactly the wrong direction. At a time when we need to be investing limited public resources in climate solutions, this project spends hundreds of millions of dollars increasing emphasis and reliance on fossil fuels. It also unnecessarily worsens surrounding air quality, encroaches on our bike and pedestrian path, and likely will not even solve the problem it purports to address. We need to stop living as though climate change is a far off problem and that we can continue business as usual without considering downstream effects. Business as usual is suicide. We should wait to see how decongestion pricing effects this area of the freeway BEFORE pursuing this costly and likely ineffective project.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 James Rankin

Comment: Efforts to ease traffic congestion should, rather than expanding roads & freeways, focus on expanding & facilitating alternative types of transportation, such as expanding paths for bikes & other non-motorized vehicles & keeping them separate from motor traffic, & expanding mass transit & developing a rapid transit system throughout the Willamette Valley (& eventually much further) that would include major cities such as Portland, Salem, Corvallis & Eugene, which would not only greatly reduce motor traffic & thus pollution & greenhouse gas emissions, but also serve the needs of young people, university students, low to middle income residents & others that want to minimize their carbon footprint & not to have to rely on cars to get around.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 James Rankin

Comment: We need to ease crowding on freeways by developing & expanding rapid transit. It is our only conscientious choice.

Currently it takes at least 6 hours to go from Corvallis to get to certain important landmark sites in Portland using public transportation, be it train, Greyhound bus, or the HUT shuttle, because of so many various connections needed as well walking time between bus stops, compared to less than 2 hours by car. This makes it extremely inconvenient & burdensome for someone to take public transportation.



Rapid transit is crucial to reducing pollution & greenhouse gas emissions, serving the public, & improving inter-city commerce in the Willamette Valley, while expanding the freeway will only exacerbate these inequities & dangers.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0321 James Wilkinson

Comment: No one is asking to expand the freeways. One bottle neck needs to be fixed. The rose quarter freeway project is being attacked by misinformation.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Jamey Billig

Comment: Waste of money, environmentally suicide.

More freeway is truly stupid.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Jan Wulling

Comment: YOUTH

TEACHERS

PARENTS

LUNGS

HOPE

TRUST

PRICELESS

People over uncreative , short term transport option

Thank you

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Jan Wulling

Comment: The more I think about what a poor decision this would be if I managed my household, to spend rare money on making conditions worse for people!!!!



NO freeway widening.

Let's get fewer cars

Thank you

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Jan Wulling

Comment: No expansion! Don't waste my money!!!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Jan Wulling

Comment: I really, really think this expansion is an impractical and ineffective idea, and thus it would be immense discouragement to my vigor and enthusiasm for living in Portland,.

I want to trust decision makers to think long long term

Thanks for all your life force/care that you give this subject!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 Jan Zuckerman

Comment: Will this project address the equity of adding freeway next to Tubman School where air quality already limits students' ability to play/be outdoors? Who most benefits? Concerned about expansion and actual fix of congestions—prefer to be spent on reducing traffic, not inducing it.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0315 Jana Jarvis

Oregon Trucking Associations

Comment: The Oregon Trucking Associations is a statewide trade association representing Oregon's trucking industry. Currently, the Oregon Trucking Associations has approximately 600 members comprised of trucking companies and suppliers to the industry. The members of the Oregon Trucking Associations would like to provide the following comments on the Environmental Assessment for the 1-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project.

One of the stated goals of the Environmental Assessment is to "improve freight reliability." Yet, the Environmental Assessment falls short on details regarding how this might be accomplished. This section of 1-5 is the gateway to the state's largest industrial areas including Swan Island, Rivergate and the Port of Portland. If this economic engine is to be maintained, much less expanded, reliable efficient truck freight service is essential.



Today, the Junction of 1-5 and 1-84, which is included in the 1-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project, has been designated by the American Trucking Research Institute, as the 28th worst freight bottleneck in the country. For a state with a relatively modest population, to have one of the worst bottlenecks in the nation is an embarrassment. To propose a project that does very little to address this situation is unconscionable.

So, what's the problem here? The project as currently designed does not include any additional through travel lanes. Today, the segment of 1-5 between the Marquam and Freemont bridges is limited to two through travel lanes. This project is in the middle of this two lane section. If Oregon desires to have its major industrial areas prosper and eliminate the embarrassment of having one of the worst freight bottlenecks in the county, then the 1-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project should be redesigned to include an additional through travel lane in each direction.

This is not an outrageous request. A number of years ago when Oregon and Washington were working on a project to replace the 1-5 bridges over the Columbia River, critics of that project noted that if the bridges were expanded to three travel lanes in each direction, the problem of congestion would simply move south to the Rose Quarter.

Washington legislators have recently initiated new discussions to resurrect the Columbia River bridge project. Failure to add a third through lane to the Rose Quarter project could further jeopardize the Columbia River bridge project as a major argument against it would remain unaddressed. The only remedy is to add a third travel lane in each direction as part of the I-5 Rose quarter project.

The Oregon Trucking Associations supported HB 2017 enacted during the 2017 session of the Oregon Legislature. This bill was the largest and most comprehensive transportation package ever passed by the Oregon Legislature. The centerpiece of this bill is three projects designed to address congestion on Portland area freeways.

The three named projects are the Rose Quarter, I-205 and Highway 217. The most important to the trucking industry was and continues to be the Rose Quarter project because of its proximity to the state's major industrial areas. The Legislature concurred and provided funding for the Rose Quarter project but not the other two.

At that time, we believed that the Rose Quarter project would include an additional through lane in each direction. If we had known that no additional through capacity was going to be provided, we would not have supported the legislation. This project is that important to Oregon's trucking industry and we believe, the state's economy.

There is the following statement in the Environmental Assessment regarding the project's impact on air quality, "Air quality in the Project Area is expected to improve over the next 25 years as a result of tighter emissions standards and regional efforts to control emissions. Air quality would be slightly improved under the Build Alternative due to higher speeds, less stop-and-go traffic, and less idling on/-5." We suspect that an additional through lane would reduce emissions more than slightly as it would have an even larger impact on vehicle speed and idling.



However, the option of adding a third through lane in each direction was not an alternative that was considered as part of the Environmental Assessment.

The lack of participation in the Environmental Assessment is startling. All participants were government entities of one sort or another. A number of entities declined to participate at all. These included the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Multnomah County and the US Fish and Wildlife Service. No private sector entities were included. Certainly, the Oregon Trucking Associations was not included nor were any representatives of the businesses we serve including those that ship through the Port of Portland and customers located on Swan Island and in the Rivergate Industrial Area.

This approach may meet the specific requirements for an environmental assessment established by the Federal Highway Administration but it certainly does not comport with common practice in the State of Oregon. It also makes no sense that the constituencies that our highway system is designed to serve were totally excluded from this process.

For the reasons enumerated above, the members of the Oregon Trucking Associations respectfully request that the Oregon Department of Transportation reopen the Environmental Assessment for the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project, expand participation to those that will be served by the project and consider adding an additional through travel lane in each direction.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this extremely important project. It is essential that we get this one right, as it will set the stage for future prosperity in the Portland region.

Attachments: [2019 0315 Jana Jarvis ATT](#)

2019 0401 Jane Civiletti

Comment: I absolutely disagree that widening the freeway near the Rose Quarter will solve anything. I just drove to Portland from Everett, Wa yesterday, and can see that 5 lanes in each direction don't help anything in Everett, Seattle, or Tacoma. The increased number of cars trying to pass the point will only increase air pollution. Better mass transit is the only way to get us out of this transportation fiasco.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Jane Smiley

Comment: The quality of air continues to be eroded in the Portland Metro Area. This infrastructure expansion would further erode it.

It will not solve the congestion issue but add to it.

Increase access by rapid transit or use bus enhanced services.



Wake Up!! The future must depend less on cars. You are looking backward. So thoroughly disappointed in Portland's sense of vision over the past decade.

It used to be a model green city. Now it is no longer.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Jane Sparks

Comment: I ask that you please stop your plan for I-5 freeway expansion through the Rose Quarter and the following removal of the Flint Ave crossing. Go back to the drawing board to come up with a proposal that addresses other traffic improvements such as public transport or real improvements for bikes and pedestrians.

The carbon emissions in OR are currently at 40% from transportation and expanding Urban freeways has been shown to increase the number of cars which will increase climate change.

ODOT claims safety is a major reason for this project but according to ODOT own data Powell, 82nd and Columbia Blvd are much more dangerous.

Please put the almost \$500 billion earmarked for this project and use it to make other areas more safe and new transit lines and Safe Routes to School.

Thank you for your consideration.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0228 Janet Roxburgh

Comment: This proposed freeway widening project would expand the I-5 freeway into the backyard of Harriet Tubman Middle School. I was shocked to learn that this is an area where air pollution is already so bad that PSU's researchers recommended that school students forgo outdoor recess! There is already a serious health risk and freeway expansion would bring this risk even closer. This is also an environmental justice issue as 40% of Tubman's students are Black. I am very concerned about any increase in air pollution and I don't believe that this proposed freeway expansion will solve the problem of traffic congestion on this corridor. Please think of these kids. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Janet Talbott

Comment: I am seriously concerned about the pollution that will be added to the area around a Harriet Tubman school, Those children already have to deal with elevated diesel pollution, Many times at unsafe levels, Where is the concern for their safety ?

Attachments: N/A



2019 0330 Janice Shea

Comment: We don't need more freeway lanes; WE NEED ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION that saves our environment and actually gets us on the right track for living within the parameters for sustainability. Encouraging more traffic is ridiculously retro.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Jaron Heard

Comment: I believe in a future where we spend \$500 million dollars on moving towards being the equitable, sustainable city that we have in our hearts.

I am deeply opposed to the proposed Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project that has a high likelihood not to achieve its goals of reducing congestion.

As a former actuarial analyst, I worked with projections for 7 years, and I believe strongly in checking statistical models with common sense. ODOT's projections are based on flawed methodology and assumptions.

1. It's not going to fix congestion. Induced demand! I hope you know about this by now, but if not, please look it up. Look at every other freeway expansion in North America. This doesn't work!

2. It's not going to save lives. The "safety improvements" that ODOT is saying are a reason for the project is pretty bogus. Past traffic deaths in the redesigned corridor area were from pedestrians in the freeway, not car collisions. There are so many areas in Portland where there are fatal crashes could be prevented by investment in infrastructure. This is not one of them!

This is not a good project. Please figure out how to redirect these funds to something more useful. THERE ARE SO MANY MORE USEFUL THINGS!

I appreciate your time. Thank you for your service.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Jarrett Civelli

Comment: I've honestly been pretty conflicted about this project, but after reading a lot and doing a lot of thinking I've come to the conclusion that this is not the path that we should go down. There are so many other ways we could spend that money that would help the city in the area grow a lot more than this costly expansion. I understand how frustrated people are with this Corridor of highway, and I am too. However, this is not the solution. Reinstate faceless square. Increase bus frequency. Do something like that. This is a waste.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0402 Jaslyn Cincotta

Comment: Please do not expand I5. Enlarging the interstate will only generate more traffic and negatively impact the community. Development needs to be thoughtful to support the type of community Portland wants to have, and that is a community that chooses alternative transportation and encourages residents to utilize other transit options, such as Trimet or Bikes.

There is not a single instance in history of highway expansion having a long-term positive benefit on the traffic of a region - in every single incident, when reviewed from the correct long-term perspective, has increased congestion and traffic.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0324 Jason

Comment: As a civil engineer I am sad to see that we are repeating tactics that don't work at a cost to the environment.... we are better than that.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Jason Lengstorf

Comment: Please reconsider the I5 expansion project. Freeway expansions don't fix congestion (<https://portlandmercury.com/news/2018/03/07/19724128/a-new-report-shows-highway-widening-wont-solve-portlands-congestion-woes>), increase pollution, reduce the quality of life for Portland citizens, and take us further away from addressing climate change concerns.

Instead, please consider focusing this effort on improving public transportation, adding more protected bike lanes, and creating more walkable areas in Portland.

The projects we take on will shape the city we become. Portland is not, and should not be, a "car city"; we're a green city, with a proud cultural focus on biking, public transportation, and decreasing our environmental impact.

We have an opportunity to set the example for the rest of the country and pull the best ideas from cities in Europe that have significantly decreased their traffic through improving the bike- and walk-friendliness of their cities.

Let's be the example of what cities should be.

Please stop the freeway expansion.

Attachments: [2019 0331 Jason Lengstorf ATT](#)



2019 0327 Jason Markantes

Comment: I am opposed to this misguided boondoggle of the Rose Quarter freeway project. There are so many things wrong with the project itself, in addition to the management of the project bordering on criminal.

Does odot support increasing pollution exposure to school kids? Because that's a choice they're pushing with this project.

Why is odot hiding so much data? Is it incompetence or maliciousness? Those are the only two options possible here, and neither one inspires trust in an organization to spend \$600 million dollars.

Why isn't there an environmental impact study? The increase in air pollution was not fully explored in the limited assessment, and there's not mention of the potential impact to the river where some construction will take place.

The handout to improved infrastructure to pedestrians and other people not driving in the area is not worth the increased damage the highway will bring to the city. A fraction of the cost could be spent on improvements to people using active transportation.

The project needs a radical overhaul.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Jason Monk

Comment: I am writing to submit my comment opposing the proposed freeway expansion in the area north of the Rose Quarter.

This project directly impacts me because I ride a bike delivering food and services to people in the community impacted by the expansion proposal. The Flint bridge crossing is very important to my routes.

The freeway expansion does not serve me or the interests of Portland at large. The city has set a goal for 80% reduction in carbon emissions by 2050 and this expansion proposal would increase vehicle emissions by allowing more traffic to flow through. At the same time, independent studies tell me that the freeway expansion would increase congestion as a result of induced demand.

As a global citizen and citizen of Oregon, I am deeply concerned about the condition of our climate and the crisis already unfurling in our biosphere. I think that the proposal to expand our freeway at this time is insane, and the proposed budget is out of proportion to what the priorities of Oregon should be.

Our transportation infrastructure should focus on cultivating efficient public transit and low energy transportation options, favoring carpooling, bicycle and walking options over increased private vehicle traffic. Our culture needs a revolution, and I hope that your department sees that



and will support the community transformation to a post carbon future. Thanks for your consideration,

Attachments: N/A

2019 0000 Jason Nolin

Comment: The environmental assessment is dramatically misleading and lacks important information. Stating that adding lanes so more cars can travel at faster speeds does not add capacity is a flat lie. Yet, this assessment is fully based on this lie-projecting no new traffic from induced demand. Not only is this misleading, it makes the assessment worthless.

Further, the assessment ignores reasonably foreseeable future actions including congestion pricing, which may render the project useless. Why is this snot considered in the E>A.? The E.A. finds that air pollution including carbon emissions will reduce due to future changes in car technology. This is embarrassingly misleading. And there is no data available to back up the assumptions made in the E.A. This project is deeply flawed, as is this E.A. Before moving forward, a full E.I.S. must be made.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Jason Nolin

Comment: I live in North Portland on Rosa Parks Way near I-5. I have lived in Portland for nearly 15 years. I travel through the Rose Quarter every day. These comments are my own.

I am commenting on the I-5 Rose Quarter Project (I5RQP) because I am alarmed by how the Environmental Assessment (EA) fails to capture the many ways the I5RQP will negatively impact my neighborhood and the Rose Quarter, our city, and our State. By allowing for and encouraging more cars on the road, local residents will have to breathe more polluted air, suffer more injurious crashes, and tolerate a less hospitable city. This will contribute even more CO2 to the atmosphere, in direct opposition to the City's climate goals (City of Portland 2015). Through a set of dubious assumptions -- assumptions that are not explicitly defined in the EA -- these negative impacts are not documented. This calls into question the trustworthiness of ODOT and the integrity of the entire EA. This is either an egregious error or a deliberate attempt to mislead the public. Neither is acceptable.

The I5RQP EA fails its primary purpose, as defined by A Citizen's Guide to NEPA: to determine "the significance of the environmental effects and to look at alternative means to achieve the agency's objectives"(Council on Environmental Quality 2007, 11). The EA fails in multiple and spectacular ways. First, the EA does not acknowledge that the wider freeway will carry more motor vehicles. This is an absurd assertion. In so doing, the EA avoids considering the negative environmental effects that come from more vehicle miles traveled. It does not evaluate the significance of these effects because it does not acknowledge they exist. It also does not



consider reasonably foreseeable outcomes. And it fails to consider other alternatives that will likely achieve the agency's objectives.

The EA declares that this project is needed to improve: "I-5 Safety," "I-5 Operations," and "Travel Reliability."

The EA fails to consider the true safety impacts of this project. There have been few injurious crashes in the project area. Three people have died from crashes in the project area since 2007 (PBOT 2019). Two were pedestrians who had found their way onto the freeway. One was a driver, confirmed to be speeding. The EA does not address any of these deaths or how this project will avoid similar deaths in the future.

By "improving" travel times on I-5 with faster speeds, the project will make the area less safe. Increased speeds are linked to more severe crashes (Wilmot and Khanal 1999). Adding capacity to the road brings more drivers and more complex traffic negotiation, which also brings more crashes. This was seen on 2010's nearly-identical Delta Park I-5 widening project just north of the I5RQP, where the crash rate has been consistently higher since the project finished compared with the years before the project. This was not mentioned in the EA. A full EIS must include factual safety impacts based on historical and academic evidence to demonstrate that this project will improve conditions for all users.

This EA assumes the I5RQP's project needs are priorities. While it is noble to improve safety anywhere, the safety concerns on this section of I-5 are relatively minor. ODOT manages roads in Portland that are much more dangerous. The number of injurious and deadly crashes on Powell Boulevard and 82nd Avenue are vastly higher than any in the I5RQP project area. Upgrading either or both of these roads to City of Portland would cost less than this project and have a much stronger positive impact for the region. The EA does not make the case for why we should invest in this project while larger concerns are ignored elsewhere.

The EA predicts that the I5RQP will make traffic flow better by adding another lane, reducing merging, and providing wide shoulders for vehicles to move to after an incident. The EA fails to consider what happens when this higher capacity fills with traffic, as it inevitably will. In a dense central city location like this, there is a large volume of latent demand that is currently avoiding the highway because of congestion (O'Sullivan 2012, 275). If latent demand does not immediately fill the highway to current congestion levels, induced demand will. This additional traffic will create bottlenecks at other points in the system, further up and down I-5 and on adjacent surface streets. This creates even more safety and operational problems, and it decreases reliability. This is not only reasonably foreseeable, this is the well-documented result of adding capacity to urban highways (Duranton and Turner 2011; Ladd 2012).

The EA does not consider any of this. It does not acknowledge that additional lanes of traffic will allow for more vehicles on the road. This allows ODOT to assume future traffic levels will remain unchanged between the build and no-build alternatives -- a deeply misleading assumption that calls into question the trustworthiness of ODOT and the integrity of the entire EA.



Because of this assumption, the EA can ignore other problems the project causes, particularly worsening air pollution and increasing carbon emissions. This is especially troubling because areas near the freeway are home to historically African American communities. These people have been repeatedly lied to and oppressed by the government for generations. First was redlining, which forced them to live in this area while also devaluing their properties. Then came displacement from urban renewal, pushing out hundreds of people to build Memorial Coliseum and, yes, Interstate-5. The remaining community is now working through the pressures of gentrification. This project will further pollute their air and make their streets less safe. ODOT fails to show these communities the respect they deserve by refusing to acknowledge the negative impacts that this project will create. The project describes new bridges to entice the public into ignoring the wider freeway. These bridges are not nearly enough to reconnect this neighborhood and will not overcome the negative consequences of the wider freeway. This is clearly an environmental justice problem that must be resolved in an EIS.

The EA does not acknowledge the most promising alternative for achieving project goals: congestion pricing. It is a proven way to reduce congestion and improve traffic operations and reliability (FHWA 2006). Congestion pricing will very likely realize the goals of the I5RQP without the negative impacts of the I5RQP. This omission is baffling because ODOT is moving forward with plans to implement congestion pricing. An EIS must include an alternative with congestion pricing, as recommended by ODOT's report.

The EA also does not consider any alternatives beyond freeway expansion to achieve the project's goals. \$500 million is a very large project budget, especially for Oregon. This money could be spent in other ways that would be more effective than the proposed alternative with fewer negative impacts. Transit and bicycle facility enhancements coupled with encouraging marketing campaign, for example, would reduce congestion on the highway by giving travelers better transportation options. Other alternatives to achieve project goals by reducing the number of automobiles on the highway must be included in an EIS.

The EA assumes that all projects in Metro's 2035 Transportation System Plan will be constructed for horizon conditions of both the build and no-build scenarios. This includes the Columbia River Crossing project (CRC), which has since died and is unlikely to ever be built as originally designed. The CRC increases capacity of I-5 just north of the I5RQP project area, also increasing the amount of traffic in the project area. It is misleading for ODOT to use these traffic levels for their analysis without an explanation and without including a true no-build alternative that does not include projects unlikely to be built, like the CRC. This true no-build scenario will have dramatically lower traffic levels and reduce the need for the I5RQP. An EIS is necessary to compare the build and no-build scenarios that also do not include the CRC and other relevant projects that are unlikely to be built.

I am currently a graduate student studying urban and regional planning at Portland State University (PSU). Through my studies, I have learned best practices for meaningful public involvement. Agencies must be transparent and encourage public participation. They should offer ways for the public to meaningfully influence the project. Agencies must also honor equity by providing the most benefit to people with the least opportunity and to people who have been historically marginalized. ODOT's handling of this project fails these measures. The EA is not



transparent or forthcoming. The public has not been given opportunities to meaningfully influence this project. This is a highly inequitable project, continuing to favor sprawling suburbanites by subsidizing freeway travel at the expense of the central city populations -- populations who have been repeatedly oppressed for generations. As evidenced by the strong opposition from many community groups across the city, the I5RQP is clearly being driven by outside interests and not the local community. This is a textbook example of how not to plan a big project.

Because a true health impact assessment (HIA) is unlikely to be completed and because the EA fails to do so, I wrote a qualitative analysis of the expected public health effects of the I5RQP. This was for the course Transportation and Health through PSU's school of Civil and Environmental Engineering. Through the analysis, it is clear that the negative health impacts of continuing to invest in urban freeways far outweigh any positive health effects that this project offers. From a public health perspective, the I5RQP should be halted and reevaluated. This health analysis is attached. I strongly recommend performing a true HIA to fully quantify the health impacts of the I5RQP.

The Environmental Assessment for the Rose Quarter Project is severely lacking, due to either severe negligence or a deliberate effort to mislead. This calls into question the need for the project, whether this project is the best way to meet the need, and the actual expected impacts from this project if implemented. Because the Environmental Assessment is inherently flawed and because this is a large project with substantial impacts, a full Environmental Impact Statement must be prepared if this project is to move forward.

Thank you for allowing me to submit this comment and for taking the time to consider it. If you decide the I5RQP must move forward, I trust you will find that the serious flaws in the EA warrant a full EIS before doing so. I hope the project team will also see the value of a Health Impact Statement and will produce one along with the EIS. I will be following this project closely.

Attached: Health Effects of the Proposed I-5 Rose Quarter Project

I5RQP-HealthAssessment.pdf

Sources

City of Portland. 2015. "Climate Action Plan." Portland, Oregon.
<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/531984>.

Council on Environmental Quality. 2007. "A Citizen's Guide to the NEPA."

Duranton, Gilles, and Matthew A. Turner. 2011. "The Fundamental Law of Road Congestion: Evidence from US Cities." *The American Economic Review* 101 (6):2616-52.

FHWA (Federal Highway Administration). 2006. "Congestion Pricing: A Primer." Washington, DC. <https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/congestionpricing/congestionpricing.pdf>.

Ladd, Brian. 2012. "You Can't Build Your Way out of Congestion. - Or Can You? A Century of Highway Plans and Induced Traffic." *Disp* 48 (3):16-23.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02513625.2012.759342>.



O' Sullivan, Arthur. 2012. Urban Economics. Eighth Edi. Portland, Oregon: McGraw-Hill.

PBOT (Portland Bureau of Transportation). 2019. "Portland Traffic Deaths and Injuries Since 2007." 2019.

<https://pdx.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=5385b143768c445db915a9c7fad32ebe>

Wilmot, Chester G., and Mandar Khanal. 1999. "Effect of Speed Limits on Speed and Safety: A Review." Transport Reviews 19 (4):315-29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/014416499295420>.

Attachments: [2019 0402 Jason Nolin ATT](#); [2019 0402 Jason Nolin ATT 2](#); [2019 0402 Jason Nolin ATT 3](#); [2019 0402 Jason Nolin ATT 4](#) (hyperlinked); [2019 0402 Jason Nolin ATT 5](#)

2019 0329 Jason Parasco

Comment: No more freeway expansions. Portland cannot reverse course and return to a car-centric transportation landscape. We need to promote public transit, bikes, and walking. Climate change is real and we have little time to act. This project is ill-conceived, deceptively presented to the public, and would permanently shove our city in the wrong direction. Now is the time for Portland and Oregon to be leaders in green, progressive transportation planning and infrastructure.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Jason Powers

Comment: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the I5 Rose Quarter Expansion. History has taught us that expanding freeways never solves anything. It increases air pollution and the short-term vehicle congestion relief isn't worth the induced demand that follows. I encourage the budget allocating powers-that-be to instead spend money on alternatives to car-centric transportation - more sidewalks, marked crosswalks, better bicycle infrastructure, better public transportation infrastructure. Make driving more inconvenient, while making it easier to choose not to drive - make people feel safer when NOT traveling in cars, and make the alternatives to automobiles more convenient, robust and user-friendly. We live in environmentally desperate times. Please act accordingly.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0225 Jason Starman

Comment: To the Old Department Of Tired ideas,

Ignore the old ODOT lifers that are a year from retirement. Ignore the politicians who know next to nothing about solving congestion, but happen to be interested because of a fat donation from



some commercial trucking outfit. Listen to what the latest statistics and analysis have to say about additional lanes. Your answer will become clear.

I live in North Portland and use I-5. I would support these proven solutions to congestion:

- Tolling
- Congestion pricing

That's it.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Jasper Alt

Comment: I have had a few experiences in my life which make me strongly opposed to all freeway expansions.

During the drought that recently ended in California, I drove up the central valley and saw all the signs put out by farmers, some of whom had been there for generations, who could no longer afford to live and work. Some signs were just expressions of despair, others cursed congress and the president for failing to act. When people are affected by climate change, they quickly determine who is responsible. When we build any kind of motorway, we invite and deserve that hate.

I have watched the fires in California with intense interest for the last few years. Under climate projections for a business-as-usual scenario, the climate of San Francisco by the end of the century will be near what the climate of Los Angeles is today. This is to say that all of the forests will burn away. The redwoods will be gone, and it will happen here too as our climate becomes like that of San Jose. When we build any kind of motorway, we have decided in favor of a holocaust of the natural world.

I have observed the global scientific consensus that air pollution is a leading cause of lung and bladder cancer. Cars themselves cause air pollution, and cause wildfires which cause much more air pollution; wildland firefighters have are known highly elevated rates of cancer; the details are unknown because agencies and legislatures suppress scientific investigation [1]. The people most vulnerable to air pollution are the same people most vulnerable to rising temperatures - children, the elderly, and manual laborers. When we build any kind of motorway, we have decided these people do not deserve healthy lives.

I have heard a man with his limbs crushed by a vehicle collision screaming for his mother while medics attempted to extract him, as his relatively unharmed friends who were in the backseat looked on. They were all taken to the hospital in a pair of ambulances and I do not know what the outcome was. When we build any kind of motorway, we have decided that it is right and good for this to happen over and over.

For any perceptive and forward thinking young person, a freeway expansion means fire, drought, famine, cancer, and more gore on the pavement. Be honest to yourself about what you



are saying, and who you are saying it to, and who you are saying it for. Then do what you think is right.

[1] <https://wildfiretoday.com/2017/10/23/nbc-news-cancer-among-firefighters/>

Attachments: [2019 0327 Jasper Alt ATT](#)

2019 0331 Jay Cosnett

Comment: Greetings,

As a current resident of Portland, dating back to the 1970s, let me start by reminding you of some history that you appear to have forgotten:

It was proposed during that decade that we bulldoze hundreds of homes in SE Portland to make way for the Mt. Hood Freeway. Portland was not unique, we were doing what every American city was doing, had been doing since the 1940s, and would continue doing well into the 21st Century: As more and more people drove more and more for trips that had previously been taken by other means (primarily walking or transit), we built more and more lanes, so that more and more cars could replace more and more non-auto trips with car travel.

The disastrous results of that strategy are now all around us, in the dangerous streets we walk (NOT the Rose Quarter section of I-5, where NO ONE had DIED, but the wide, auto-centric boulevards in "the numbers"--where the African-American residents of historic Albina, displaced once by Memorial Coliseum, twice by I-5--THIS SAME FREEWAY, thrice by Emmanuel Hospital, and now a FOURTH TIME by gentrification and real estate speculation), the poisonous air we breath, and the unravelling climate disaster that will cost hundreds of millions of lives and trillions of dollars, in our children's lifetimes alone. We managed to stop that freeway and build the first MAX line instead, but somehow, 40 years later, we're fighting the same battle all over again.

In case you have short attention spans, here are the bullets:

- Increased capacity NEVER reduces congestion. It's called "Induced Demand." Look it up. We'll end up with more cars, emitting more carbon, stuck in the same traffic. From bad to worse.
- Cars and trucks account for a huge percentage of Oregon's greenhouse gas emissions. We need to REDUCE VEHICLE MILES TRAVELLED. "Making traffic move more smoothly" will do the OPPOSITE.
- We should spend exactly ZERO DOLLARS on high-carbon modes of transportation. As the recent reports have made clear, we don't have a lot of time. We have to reduce emissions DRASTICALLY and FAST. Playing business as usual with transportation is literally going to kill us. I, for one, do not want MY tax dollars spent on KILLING ME AND MY NEIGHBORS. NO!!!
- Portland Public Schools opposes the project because of the adverse impacts on school children. Shouldn't that be enough right there?



- You assume the REJECTED Columbia River Crossing freeway expansion will be built, even though it was rejected FIVE YEARS AGO. That's against the law, by the way.
- Half-a-BILLION dollars could fund IMMENSE amounts of transit, pedestrian improvements, bike lanes, and other infrastructure we ACTUALLY NEED to get people OUT of cars and into carbon-free modes of transport and to make those modes SAFER and more useful. This is the EXACT WRONG THING to spend transportation dollars on.
- You're basically saying Oregon taxpayers should spend OUR money to poison and further displace already victimized Oregonians in NE Portland so that tax-avoiding and climate-denying commuters from Washington can have a smoother drive. No, no, no.

Citizens around the region are REJECTING this absurd, 1970s-mindset boondoggle. ODOT needs to toss it out completely. In the absurd event that you don't, we need a FULL Environmental Impact Statement to uncover ALL of your biases and assumptions that would allow you to even consider this nightmare in the first place. That will make it clear what is already crystal clear to anyone with any sense. THIS PROJECT IS NOT IN THE INTERESTS OF OREGONIANS AND MUST BE STOPPED.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Jay Thatcher

League Cycling Instructor

Comment: Don't build on and off ramps in the Rose Quarter. Freeway congestion only happens a few hours a day. Instead, make solid efforts to manage that demand so it spreads out over time, space and to different transport modes:

- * Provide incentives to deliver goods at hours other than people's commute times.
- * Provide incentives to employers and schools to stagger their shift times.
- * Offer free use of carpool vans, fareless transit systems and convenient cycling and walking facilities.
- * Continue to build housing near to employment.

The proposed expansion could affect all of the state as we visit the area and as the effects spread to our communities. We would help pay for it and we would suffer the consequences in a degraded visual environment, more noise pollution and poorer air quality. At the least, let's find out what those consequences truly would be with a full environmental impact study and plans based on dynamic modeling of transportation demand.

--

Jay Thatcher



Sport Official, Mid-Valley Softball Umpires Association and Mid-Valley Soccer Referees Association

SmartCyclingCorvallis.com League Cycling Instructor #4023 with the League of American Bicyclists

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Jean Beacher Brown 2

Comment: I am concerned over the plans to expand I-5 through the Rose Quarter area of Portland. It sounds like a costly project that has not been fully studied and communicated to the public. I am concerned that it will encourage more traffic congestion (resulting in even more air pollution that poses a greater risk to environmental and human health). In a time when climate health is at the forefront, it seems we need to encourage reducing traffic through in the area by other means. Please reconsider this project and work more closely with the public to find solutions to the problem. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Jean Beacher Brown

Comment: NO COMMENT PROVIDED

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Jed Hafner

Comment: I oppose the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project. The project does not support the city and state's goals regarding transportation safety and climate change mitigation in an efficient way. The funds could be much better used on other projects in the region, and continuing with the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion would be a missed opportunity for leadership on these larger, urgent issues of transportation safety and environmental crisis.

Please re-consider using the allotted funding to pursue other projects that would address the PBOT-identified High-crash corridors where people are injured and killed regularly, rather than focusing on fender benders on I-5.

Please focus on addressing traffic congestion using the only proven method, congestion pricing.

Please do not build a pedestrian/bike ramp at more than 5% grade. That is way too steep! It is not friendly to the users for which such a project is intended. As such, claiming that the overall project is beneficial to the community seems naive at best, and comes off as deceptive and dismissive.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0331 Jeff Beyer

Comment: As a resident of the Arbor Lodge neighborhood in North Portland, I am strongly against the proposed expansion of the I-5 freeway through the Rose Quarter.

I oppose this project because if ODOT were really interested in improving the safety of our roads there are plenty of other areas (where traffic-related deaths are much more likely to occur) to invest in first.

I oppose this project because the I-5 freeway is a scar symbolizing the dissection of a community to which building a few "lids" would do little to reconnect.

I oppose this project because it is well studied that building more lanes of a highway is not a proven solution to reducing congestion.

I oppose this project because subsidizing additional space for vehicular traffic at the expense of the health of the lungs of children at Harriet Tubman Middle School is not a compromise I want to support.

I oppose this project because decongestion pricing (proven to help with congestion reduction!) should be implemented first.

I oppose this project because, while it is touted to cater to improving walking / biking / transit through the area, I don't believe the design reflects that. Slower transit times, a way too steep bridge, larger turn radii for cars, ... this project is clearly focused on prioritizing vehicular mobility, while sprinkling in some green paint and sidewalks-to-nowhere as some "lipstick on the pig".

All that being said, let's get to the two fundamental reasons why I am against this project.

First, I believe this project represents an antiquated attempt to solve the problem of moving humans from point A to point B. It is a band-aid fix to a method of transportation that we continually subsidize at the expense of our planet. Climate change is real and gasoline propelled transportation is a major contributor to that. I recognize that auto-dependency is integrated into American life, but the only way to move forward in our approach to transportation is to fully commit to alternative solutions to moving people, NOT by continuing to do what we've always done: building/expanding roads that prioritize cars/trucks. I'm tired of the thinking that, "this project is okay, and we'll just make sure the next is different." THIS IS OUR OPPORTUNITY TO DO SOMETHING DIFFERENT. People don't believe there are alternatives to driving because we don't invest in them to the level we invest in car travel. That will only change when a bold move is made - induced demand works both ways!

Secondly, I have found it difficult to trust ODOT and their plans as this project has evolved. It's quite despicable how unwilling ODOT was to share the data used to plan this project. Once it became available, it's easy to see their hesitation. Much of what is proposed will affect people in ways that haven't been publicly highlighted. And the analysis was built assuming the CRC existed! (side note: it does not).



I sincerely distrust what is proposed right now is what will be built and not in a good way. Based on how this project has proceeded so far, I would fully expect the final outcome (if built) will favor cars over vulnerable road users even more so than it does now. Furthermore, while THIS incarnation of the project doesn't "expand lanes" in ODOT's mind, based on the new footprint of the highway, the NEXT one is only a paint job away from doing so. And once that situation comes to light, it will be much harder to say no, because it will be phrased as, "reconfiguring already available space". So it seems building this project is already setting up for the next one, and we need to end that cycle now.

I believe the great philosopher Ian Malcolm once said something to the effect of, "ODOT is so preoccupied with whether or not they could expand I-5 through the Rose Quarter, they didn't stop to think if they should." I think we need to step back and think about if we should build this project, rather than just how it will be built - and I strongly believe that we should not!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Jeff Dill

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

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Jeff Lynott

Comment: In a time where climate change is forcing societies to rethink their dependence on cars....

At the same time urban congestion is forcing us to instead look to more sustainable methods of transportation, such as public transit, biking, and making walking more safe...

And while studies have shown freeway expansion will not solve our transportation woes, and only increase the pollution of our planet...

When disadvantaged communities are at risk of increased levels of toxic air...

And while other forward-thinking societies are closing off access to cars in the urban core, leading to vibrant, sustainable and healthier cities...

And whereas a half billion dollars could significantly make our city/state better if spent on a whole host of other projects that served the people and environment and public realm so much better and more efficiently...

Portland, once the envy of cities seeking to adopt sustainable planning practices, should not be spending \$500 million on freeway expansion in the heart of the city.



I urge you to reconsider this absolute waste of money and show the world that Portland, OR is serious about fighting climate change, implementing smart planning practices, and spending money wisely and efficiently for the betterment of our people and environment!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Jeff Macey

Comment: Why do NONE of these proposals include adding lanes to I-5 ? This is what is needed more than anything. The congestion in this city is getting unbearable. ADD LANES NOW.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Jeff Markey

Comment: I'd like to talk about some of the arguments here that are both pro and con in the context of we are in the beginning of big change in how people get around cities, and that's electric autonomous vehicles. The biggest corporations on the planet right now are all working, racing to bring these products to market, right? And how quickly will this change? If we look at the past, in 1900, the United States had 9,000 vehicles. In 1930, 30 years later, it was 26 million. So I would expect with this technology people are going to want to use it, and you'll see a really fast change and it will affect how a lot of these expressways are used. So you're going to get more improvements through ridesharing. If you look at the economics, today I spend 300 for a car payment, 200 for gas, 100 for insurance, that's 600 month. The timeless ridesharing comes in at around a dollar a mile. So if I have a 30-mile commute, 15 each way, 20 days a month, that's 600. It's about the same. But if I do a rideshare, if I share with three other people, I increase the number of people in a car, it goes down to about 150 a month, or about the same cost as a pass on TriMet. Now, what is my commute going to look like in the future? I'm going to get up, I'm going to walk out my front door to my curb, there's going to be a car. There may be some people in it or I'll use the local streets to pick up a couple more. We're going to get on the expressway. The car is going to take us to the area where we work, drop us off in that area. All right. And then that is going to be basically how people travel in 30 years.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Jeff Mills

Comment: I live in inner NE Portland.

I use I5 sometimes. My wife uses it for her commute to NW.

We need to find better ways to move people around.



The recent addition of the 24 bus over the Fremont bridge is a good example of what we could expand on.

Mass transit over the Columbia is another.

More cars is just not the answer.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Jeff Wright

Comment: Having moved here from Orlando, I can say that all the attempts there to expand or add highways, even those with lights and other control devices, did nothing for traffic. Every single effort made things worse, and not just during construction.

Traffic will always ALWAYS act like a gas. It will fill the available space. It will take over and then you'll be looking at this again in a few years, wondering how the heck you'll fix this same/new mess.

The fix will be found in increasing transit options (including increased frequency during peak times, later late-night and earlier early-morning trips if not 24 hour ops, and DEDICATED TRANSIT LANES/ROADS... not sure how y'all missed that over the years and don't pat yourselves on the backs for the downtown transit corridor... that needs to be throughout the UGB) and safety on buses, trams, and trains. The fix will be found in increasing benefits for carpooling and HOV traffic instead of single-rider vehicles. The fix will be found in a phased 'sin' tax (hint: vehicle registrations) to encourage people to use their vehicles less.

Expanding and adding freeways will only encourage people to drive more. It's evident across the country in nearly every major city that's tried it. Through due diligence, your research should also include where cities increased transit instead of traffic. Maybe act surprised at this, and stop stuffing your buddies' pockets with taxpayer cash.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0302 Jeffrey A Hayes

Comment: I am opposed to this freeway expansion. Not only will it likely take out housing (at a time when there's a shortage of such), but it will definitely encourage more automobile traffic, which is still largely fossil fuel-dependent. Considering that the current national administration is unwilling to tackle climate change, it is up to state and local governments to do what is necessary to mitigate environmental damage. This expansion will only cause further harm to the environment, and help hasten catastrophic climate change.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0329 Jeffrey Kaufman

Comment: This is a massive money grab. Any other reason offered is nonsense. This situation is being (supposedly/finally, pick your own) handled "once and for all" now, approximately 10 years too late. Unfortunately, this is the level of performance that is currently equated with "normal" and IS the issue to be dealt with if this is ever to be resolved. Comprehensive measurements and projections have to be examined, discussed and a workable, forwardlooking plan can even be discussed. It may take a bit of time, but if the ultimate objective of improving transport through this or any alternative corridor is to be achieved, a thoughtful, organized, measurable solution can be achieved only through communication to and from all parties involved. In other words, government must return to its proper place in this hierarchy of values, adherent to the will of the people. If and when that takes place, we will all enjoy the fruits of democracy. God bless us, everyone.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Jeffrey Markovics

Comment: I am writing to express my opinion against the expansion of the I5 freeway in the Rose Quarter area. Expanding roads is not the answer to our growing traffic problem in Portland. We need to focus our efforts and resources on finding ethically sustainable, affordable, and environmentally conscious alternatives for commuters in our community, such as more public transportation options and routes, as well as expanding bicycle greenways and routes.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Jeffrey McDowell

Comment: I would like to voice my opposition to the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project. In the face of climate change that begs urgent action, we need to be spending our transportation dollars on projects that discourage, not encourage, traditional freeway fossil fueled vehicles. I am also a frequent user of the Flint Ave crossing by bike. These transportation dollars can be used in a myriad of alternative ways to reduce our dependency on fossil fuels and meet our responsibilities to the next generations.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Jeffrey Trull

Comment: I've reviewed the online report of the project, and I remain opposed to it. It's clear to me that this project makes little improvement to the Rose Quarter at all, especially relative to the \$500 million price tag.



The main objective of relieving congestion won't work. We know from induced demand that adding more lanes does not relieve congestion but rather results in more cars that simply fill the increased capacity.

With that, my next concern is climate change. Adding more motor vehicle lanes is irresponsible given the challenges we face with climate change.

The \$500 million cost for this project is a ridiculous amount to spend on a project of this nature. I have little faith the the project can be carried out on budget, and expect that the cost would exceed \$500 million. There are far better uses of this amount of money that would aid in other transportation goals that could help reduce fossil fuel consumption.

Instead, I believe ODOT should first test and implement congestion pricing to see what impact this may have. Once we're able to measure that, then we can evaluate later if a project such as this is worthwhile.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Jeffrey Yaskin

Comment: Please do not spend \$500,000,000 to expand I-5 in the Rose Quarter.

1. Climate change is the most significant issue of my and my children's lifetimes, and making it easier to use personal automobiles on I-5 moves in the wrong direction. 40% of Oregon's carbon emissions come from transportation, and ODOT needs to be working on getting those net emissions to 0 in the next 10 years. Improving traffic flow on I-5 does not make that more likely.
2. Without value pricing on I-5, the only thing discouraging people from driving, and making housing choices that require more driving, is the congestion. That makes the EA's claim of reduced congestion in the long term implausible.
3. ODOT's public transparency through the whole EA comment period as been dismal. It should not have taken weeks to produce the engineering drawings that went into the assessment.
4. The I-5 expansion moves cars and the pollution they generate closer to a middle school with a large marginalized population.
5. The Albina Vision Trust, a representative of the black community damaged by the initial construction of I-5 through their neighborhood, does not believe the proposal adequately reconnects inner east Portland neighborhoods to the Willamette River as would be needed to remediate the original construction of I-5.

I would like ODOT to cancel the project and reallocate the funds to:

- A. Improving safety on the streets and highways that see the most injuries and fatalities, not just total collisions.



- B. Improving mass transit options, even if that requires new state legislation.
- C. Reducing demand for automobile travel in general, even if that requires new state legislation. This falls into ODOT's remit in the same way that we ask energy providers to generate "negawatts". For example, ODOT could subsidize housing construction closer to people's destinations so they wouldn't need to use I-5 and other roads as much.
- D. Other ways of reducing and offsetting carbon emissions, even if that requires new state legislation.

If ODOT is unwilling to cancel the project without more study, I would like ODOT to:

- I. Do a full Environmental Impact Statement to more accurately judge the impacts of this project.
- II. Study a no-build option that does not include a new Columbia River Crossing.
- III. Study an option that uses tolls to reduce congestion instead of new auxiliary lanes.
- IV. Study an option that builds highway covers strong enough to support 6-story buildings as requested by the Albina Vision Trust. Study this both with and without the underlying highway expansion.
- V. Study the effect on travel times for all users, not just people driving private automobiles.
- VI. Publish all of the data and analysis that goes into the EIS at or before the *start* of the public comment period, not after several FOIA requests.

Thank you for your consideration

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Jen Bruce

Comment: As a Portland resident who utilizes all methods of transportation in the city for both personal and business activities, I find this attempt at de-congestion to be, at best, short-sighted and, at worst (in reality?) willfully regressive and damaging. There are reams of data proving that adding lanes in North American freeways makes congestion worse. You will encourage the public to utilize personal vehicles rather than focusing on infrastructure for mass transit or non-auto use, which is shockingly irresponsible in light of our 10-year irreversible climate change countdown. Nevermind that ODOT's studies and, therefore, justification for this I5 expansion are predicated on the non-existent CRC. Is that even a twinkle in anyone's eye in the WA state legislature? Would a CRC build even precede the climate change deadline in any meaningful way? We have TEN YEARS. According to the Construction Phasing Concept Plan dated 17.04.04 this project isn't estimated to begin until 2023, at best. Is there nothing better we can do with half a billion dollars and four years? How about more greenways, more sidewalks, investments in rapid transit lines and/or light rails?



The Eastbank Esplanade has encouraged car-free transportation. It beautifies the city. An extended overhang will most likely encourage more homeless encampments, acting as a shelter in inclement weather and affecting public safety. Periodic closures for ODOT maintenance crews will discourage spontaneous and long-term plans for the public to utilize the Esplanade to travel. What are the plans to mitigate camping, fires, drug proliferation, etc in that space after construction ends? How will the demolition of the Flint Ave bridge, a major bike-commuter artery, improve cycling infrastructure?

Let's start with a decongestion toll for a segment of I5 through downtown Portland. We can provide economically vulnerable residents with assistance/subsidies.

I don't think I'm speaking out of turn when I say that Portland is seen as a beacon of progressive, conscientious environmentalism in this country. We have a responsibility to lead by example. Those of you in positions capable of making productive steps towards a safe, clean future in this city have a responsibility to take those steps.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0317 Jen Davis

Comment: Tubman school kids will be even more exposed to seriously extremely bad air pollution if you expand this freeway, which will just cause bottlenecks further down the road. I live in the Bullseye Arsenic zone. We ate from my huge garden daily, my kids played outside, we breathed the air. My older son, 21, now has a walker and us in constant pain. He has a birth defect that affects his collagen and a heart disorder which makes his heart race so he is often exhausted. The latter syndrome, POTS is clinically associated with heavy metals exposure. We tested our garden greens and soil when we learned about the moss. Our green had unsafe levels lead and cadmium in them. Cadmium causes birth defects. We tested our greens which self-sowed this past summer. We never eat from my garden now though. The self-sown greens were even higher in cadmium than before. Diesel fumes contain high amounts of cadmium. You are poisoning these children who are mostly lower income and kids of color with your freeway expansion. Horrible and not a solution at all.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Jen Hansen

Comment: I am strongly opposed to expanding freeway lanes which will only encourage more cars. Let's focus on getting people to use other forms of transportation to deal with our congestion problems, such as better public transportation (express buses and limited stop buses). Lets use express busses from Vancouver to Portland. Let's toll ALL drivers using interstates and offer reduced rates to car poolers and low- income folks. Other cities already have these innovative options. We do not need to reinvent the wheel. Let's focus on a long term solution Instead of being short sighted with lane expansions, which historically, do not reduce traffic.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Jenna W

Comment: I'm deeply terrified about climate change. I'm a transit enthusiast concerned about the induced demand of more driving. I bike everyday and see that and mass public transit as solutions. Not encouraging more cars and emissions to further pollute our world. There ARE better options for us and our children.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Jennifer Banatis

Comment: I live less than 2 blocks from Tubman. This is not what any resident of this neighborhood wants, it is what special interests want. Please build a toll bridge for those coming into Portland from Vancouver at least on weekends. They don't pay taxes here and shop here because of lack of sales tax. Also there are special trees in the area you'd be ruining. Keep Portland Portland. I came here 22 years ago because of the progressive values and non driver friendly approach. Keep

The proud boys in the cob don't encourage them with bigger roads

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Jennifer Bradford

Comment: The EA is not sufficient to fully evaluate impacts to the civic environment, pedestrian activity, transit and air quality. Any project affecting the central city to this extent should be designed to improve all of these elements. An EIS-level of review is necessary, and FTA and PBOT should serve as joint-lead agencies.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0318 Jennifer Lundstrom

Comment: Please, please, please involve in the community who has been repeatedly displaced in the Albina and surrounding areas over the last several decades by poor city planning and policies.

If there is anything I can do to help get the word out, I'd be happy to help. I am a Realtor and 5th generation Portlander and am interested in helping cure some of the damage that has been done to this community. I have a lot of other folks in the community wanting to help spread the word about this project so you can get as much involvement and voices of past residents as possible. I'm a volunteer with the Vanport Mosaic and am involved in helping get the word out about that too - so let me know if there's anything I can do to assist in outreach.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Jennifer Snarski

Comment: A lot of our regional traffic snarl seems to be caused by commuters driving back and forth across the Columbia River. Instead of widening our freeways, how about we make taxes in Oregon and Washington the same?

Attachments: N/A

2019 0227 Jennifer Starkey

Comment: To keep it short: I oppose freeway expansion and instead support bolstering public transportation to make it as easy as possible for people not to have to drive and clog up the freeways. The exhaust from I5 has filled nearby communities' air with toxins and I DIRECTLY OPPOSE making it easier for even more vehicles to pollute the air we breathe.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Jennifer Starr

Comment: Hello,

I am opposed to the expansion for several reasons. The highway will promote more traffic, encourage driving and increase pollution and global warming. Bad idea- this is Portland, not some backwards town like LA.

Please reconsider this proposal.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Jenny

Comment: I have lived in Piedmont for 12 years, this is not the answer to people in Washington shopping and working in portland. My family's health should not be compromised so people from Vancouver can get downtown quickly. This is a huge misallocation of funds and does not represent the needs of actual portland residents. Our city has been catering to business for too long, please start putting the people first. My children need a real and sustainable future, not a polluting tax dodge.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Jenny Ampersand

Comment: This is 2019. We have been dragging our feet to do anything about climate change. We cannot propose this type of extremely dated, dependent on fossil fuel transportation



projects. Congestion won't improve. Freeway expansion has never solved traffic congestion, in any North American city, anywhere. Ever!

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.

We are a progressive city. Let's live up to that in our transportation planning. We must move forward with more innovative and carbon zero ideas, not these dated band-aids which will only lead us further into climate catastrophe. Thank you for your time.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0220 Jenny Jacobs

Comment: I live in NE Portland and walk and bike regularly. I don't want any more expansions to local freeways, and certainly no eliminations of crossings! I want to breathe clean air. I have family in LA, and I've seen how freeways just fill up, no matter how many lanes. The money would be better spent on mass transit projects.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Jenny Mosbacher

Comment: Dear ODOT,

As a lifelong Oregonian and resident of the Portland Metro area, I am writing in opposition to the I-5 Rose Quarter Expansion project.

Growing up here, I learned about the history of environmental leadership in Oregon - with an emphasis on the strides made in the mid- to late 20th century - including the reclaiming of Harbor Drive into Tom McCall Waterfront Park and the cancellation of the Mt. Hood Freeway project. Decades later, we are still taught to swell with pride over the forward-thinking vision of our historical civic leaders, with good reason. I also learned about the sinister passages of Oregon history, too, the racism codified in everything from the state constitution to the built environment of Portland that we know today.

With this, I ask - in one, two, or three decades into the future, will we reflect on this moment in time with pride or with shame? Will our children's children study this in schools as an example of the progressive vision first advanced in the 1970s; or will they discuss this as a continuation of the brutal "urban renewal" policies that destroyed Albina's historical African-American neighborhoods?

The fact that numerous community organizations, including the Albina Vision Trust, is asking for ODOT to halt the project until more substantive impact studies can be performed points to the fact that this project is against the desires of the people who stand to be most affected by it. The



answer to my rhetorical question above, then, is that in its current proposed state, this project stands to deepen the historical scar on the Rose Quarter neighborhood and would only serve as another example of how state agencies willfully failed the citizens they're tasked to support.

If ODOT is truly interested in improving the Rose Quarter, I implore the department to decouple the lane expansion plans from other improvements (like buildable caps, intersection upgrades, etc.). It seems that these other improvements are bundled into the project to justify the community benefit. Let's make improvements to the neighborhood, and help the community, city at large, and environment at large by putting serious consideration into viable alternatives like congestion pricing that could actually create positive outcomes for all involved (including reduction in car traffic). Let's figure out a solution that will make the future citizens of Portland and Oregon proud.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Jere Fitterman

Eliot Neighborhood Association

Comment: We ask that you eliminate all funding, cease all planning work, and completely abandon the I-5 Rose Quarter Project. We additionally ask that this project be removed from all Portland and Metro Transportation System Plans. This project would be a major step in the wrong direction for our city, the climate, and our neighborhood. Other organizations are asking for a full Environmental Impact Statement from this project, but we know what the real impact of this project will be already. Further study will not substantially change the project's impacts on our city and neighborhood. Delaying the project only to kill it later is a waste of time and taxpayer resources that should be instead planning a better, greener future for our regional transportation system.

Portland has a legacy of turning down ill-advised freeway projects. We removed the Harbor Drive Freeway in 1974 and canceled the Mt. Hood Freeway in 1976. Let's add to that "ended I-5 expansion in 2019."

Environmental Justice

The construction of I-5 through the Albina district, including Eliot, is symptomatic of systemic racism in public policy that destroyed Portland's Black neighborhoods. Eliot has struggled for years and now has something to be very proud of, Harriet Tubman Middle School. However, students at Tubman have to breathe toxic exhaust from cars and diesel trucks driving through Portland. If we care about mitigating the effects of pollution for this vulnerable population, we must discuss how to make our car and truck fleet pollute much less. We must also consider the long term goal of reducing the impacts of, and ultimately the removal of I-5 and other freeways. Our neighbors in Vancouver, BC refused to construct urban freeways in the first place and they have thrived without them. No freeway expansion has ever reduced congestion. Adding



capacity to I-5 is all but guaranteed to result in increased cars and truck trips, leading to worse air quality, especially for our neighborhood and the students of Tubman.

Climate Change

According to the latest data from the International Panel on Climate Change, we have 11 years to cut carbon emissions by half in order to avoid catastrophic climate change. This necessitates a dramatic shift in how our society does everything, including moving people and goods. If we are going to have any meaningful chance of addressing climate change, we need to make dramatic moves to shift trips away from cars to more sustainable modes like public transit, biking, and walking. An investment in widening our freeways is an investment in another nail in our collective coffin. If we care about human society persisting beyond the 22nd century, we must start getting cars off the roads ASAP.

Lack of Transportation Throughput Benefits

The Rose Quarter widening project was initially conceived by highway planners to remove a bottleneck in the freeway system. This bottleneck is conveniently located in between several other bottlenecks. When traffic is at its worst in the evening peak hours, there are long lines of cars on I-5 north, on I-405 west, on I-84 east and occasionally on I-5 south of the project area. Essentially, all traffic getting stuck at the Rose Quarter is on its way to another bottleneck. These cars will not benefit substantially by being rushed through the Rose Quarter faster only to find themselves in the next bottleneck. If traffic were to improve in the area substantially, latent and induced demand would immediately increase traffic volumes through the area. There might be a few minutes or hours per day where cars and trucks were able to see travel time benefits, however we do not believe this will become not the dominant condition on the highway.

During the 2010-12 process, we were told that the highway engineers were struggling with their computer models to show that the project had any benefits at all. Recently, we have found out that the models projecting benefits from the project are due to inclusion of all projects in the Regional Transportation Plan being built. Institutional memory shows that we have never accomplished that in the past and it is an unwise assumption to make going forward. A true "no-build" analysis would show that this project on its own will not provide substantial benefits.

Safety

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

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

Many dangerous intersections in this area have had multiple bicycle and pedestrian crashes and deaths in the past. These include Broadway/I-5/Williams and Broadway/Flint intersections.



The lives that have been lost are a testament to the bad engineering decisions made in the past, and the incremental improvements made throughout the years reflect learnings on how to make the streets safer. Redesigning all of the streets in the area may place us back in a situation where we have to live with untested designs at the risk of more accidents, injuries and fatalities.

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

Fiscal Responsibility

Half a billion dollars is a substantial amount of money. America collectively and the Portland region have invested a ton of money in project after project to increase the freeway network. Locally, Portland has avoided most of these projects due to smart-minded citizens and politicians knowing that moving more traffic through an area (even if slightly faster) does not help build a stronger place. The I-5 Rose Quarter project does not offer a good return on investment. Existing infrastructure is in need of maintenance, and capital expenditure on additional infrastructure is irresponsible. This is not a correct prioritization of public funds given the State's policy goals. While improving interstate commerce is a valid goal, we are already developing a congestion pricing scheme that will be a revenue generator, rather than a net cost.

Urban Design Problems / Lack of Local Improvements

At its core, the I-5 Rose Quarter project has always been a highway widening project. All of the "local improvements" are afterthoughts that may even make the local streets worse for many road users. The pedestrian and bike infrastructure in the area has been improving incrementally over the past two decades, and while there is room for improvement, this project does not directly address existing hazards. The designs ODOT and PBOT have presented give us little faith that after this project is completed the pedestrian, transit, and bicycle setup will even be as comfortable and efficient as the current status quo.

The triangular remnants of land provided by the lids proposed appear to be the result of engineering expediency and not the result of any intentional design aimed at creating usable public space. The renderings presented by ODOT and PBOT depict glorified traffic islands isolated by high traffic rights-of-way. We would recommend visiting the triangular diverter where MLK and Grand merge at NE Hancock to see just how we can expect these spaces to be utilized.

ODOT staff have stated that they are looking for ideas for what to put on the lids - we have given you ideas. Specifically we need to see buildings and usable public open spaces on top of the freeway if we are to stitch this neighborhood back together over the freeway. Seattle's Freeway Park (Designed by Lawrence Halprin of Keller Fountain fame) and the adjacent Washington State Convention Center show that this is possible. Spaces that are not accessible and have no active programming are not going to be used and seem destined to be abandoned



and ignored by all but those with no other place to sleep (again, consider the MLK/Grand/Hancock triangle).

If we are going to make a multi-generational investment in the Rose Quarter Area, we need to do it right. This process is coming at the urban design problem from a vehicle throughput lens which will further deteriorate the street activity in the area.

Misalignment with Portland's Goals

Portland has adopted Vision Zero, a Climate Action Plan and mode-split goals. The I-5 Rose Quarter project is anathema to all of these. The project is a 20th century transportation solution in a world of 21st century problems. The net outcome will inevitably be higher regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT), which is highly correlated with traffic fatalities. More VMT also will inevitably lead to higher CO2 emissions, which undermines our climate change goals. Making it faster and easier to drive has historically always led to more driving. This violates our mode-split goals. The direct fiscal costs of the project, while high, pale before those of the externalities and the opportunity costs of this investment.

Attachments: [2019 0331 Jere Fitterman ATT](#)

2019 0401 Jeremy McCauley

Comment: I'm writing to formally express my disapproval of the proposed Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project. Studies show that freeway expansions only increase traffic over time, due to induced demand. This means the project is fatally flawed from the start and will not achieve its purported goal.

Beyond that, which really should be enough in and of itself, I strongly believe that Portland can, and should, be striving to think more creatively about urban planning. We are moving into an uncertain time - the city's population is booming, and with climate change and the Pacific NW's relative projected safety in regards to said change, the population is only going to continue to grow.

We need bold and creative action. A freeway expansion that won't even accomplish its stated goal is far from that.

Thanks for your time.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Jeremy Salmon

Comment: I'm writing to oppose the I-5 expansion. I'm a longtime resident of Northeast Portland familiar with the problems of the I-5 corridor since I've had to commute around them for years, but also lived for decades in Southeastern Michigan and am very familiar there with how the attempts to handle traffic failed.



The proposed expansion doesn't work for a couple reasons, mainly that we're at a point where we can't build more lanes out of this. The rivers and mountains are fixed barriers to deal with, but building more lanes won't improve congestion. Traffic is like data, or water; it expands to fill the container you give it if you don't change driver behavior. Driver behavior is trickier than just dumping down more concrete.

The plan is also greatly opposed by the community who'll be directly affected by it since they live there. Both disruptions to their lives by the heavy construction, but also the environmental effect of increased combustion engines motoring thru a concentrated area.

Due to these reasons and many more you've probably already heard about, this proposed plan should not be enacted. There are far better, more sustainable, more equitable, more robust, and far more scalable than this one.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Jerome Comeau

Comment: As someone who drives on I-5 nearly every day, the idea of an I-5 expansion project is anathema. It won't fix congestion, it won't help with carbon footprint reduction, and it won't make the city safer or better. Instead, it will simply attract more traffic and more problems.

Why not tolls? Why not increased taxes? Why not ANYTHING ELSE, since it's been proven again and again you cannot build out of a congestion problem? I'm fortunate enough to be someone who could afford that commute tax, and I'm sure a lot of my fellow drivers and tech workers (many of whom are from Washington) could also afford to do something about it.

Please, please, PLEASE stop this ridiculous, terrible expansion idea now, before it's too late.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Jerry Smith

Comment: Fossil fuel includes pavement; traffic increases use more fossil fuel. Let's cut back.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Jesiah Martin

Comment: Expanding freeway lanes has never helped, and it's not the solution we need in our modern world! This is the "City That Works", so why consider something that has only helped to break other cities? I lived through this mistake in Seattle. I lived through the expansion that's 10+ years on in Tacoma. It's only created a worse problem during contraction, and when it finishes it's no better. Meanwhile, funding gets moved away from the resources and services that could actually help at the real bottlenecks to city movement.



Portland is known for its transit system. As a city that is built on density, mass transit and walkability are the only real solutions. It's a proven system that is safer and more environmentally friendly than car travel. This is the time to lead by example and face the burden of climate change, not perpetuate it. The country looks to places like Portland. Let's do the right thing.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Jesse

Comment: I oppose this highway project and think the money should be instead spent to improve the overall State's pedestrian/bicycle infrastructure.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Jesse Champlin

Comment: Vast amounts of research have proven that larger freeways only lead to more traffic, more congestion and more POLLUTION. Simply look at Los Angeles. I have personal friends who are city planners, one of who works for the city of Portland. They are all opposed to this plan. I am a resident of Portland and use all of our roads. I drive a car, a pickup, ride a motorcycle and a bicycle and am a long distance runner, and I am thoroughly opposed to this plan and have no desire whatsoever to have any of my tax money applied to this expansion project. DO NOT ALLOW THIS.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Jesse Chapman

Comment: Please do not waste 500million taxpayer dollars on a boondoggle to widen the I-5. Please don't forget looking to the future of our city it's children and the adverse impact this will have on the environment and livability of the city we all love.

Thank you for your refusal to waste taxpayer money,

Attachments: N/A



2019 0402 Jesse Cooke

Comment: I get that Portland's traffic situation needs to be improved, but if the consultants advising ODOT say it won't help, then I think ODOT and any other stakeholders should press pause until another solution can at least be put up against this current plan.

I'm a huge bike proponent, but I get that biking/public transportation alone won't solve this issue. I assume there's a better compromise though, and I hope you will work on one.

This is a huge investment, please take more time to figure it out.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Jesse Lee Burgess

Comment: I'm opposed to the I-5 Rose Quarter Project because I think it's a huge waste of money that will not improve biking and pedestrian mobility in the city. I'm also concerns about the environmental impacts and climate impacts of increased car usage.

I ask that a full EIS be done for the proposed project.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Jesse Lopez

Comment: The proposed Rose Quarter project was envisioned and planned as a compromise between the desire to decrease vehicular travel times for traffic along I-5 and to improve the pedestrian and biking infrastructure at the surface level. The hope was that improved surface connections and freeway caps would repair the neighborhood destroyed by the construction of the freeway. Instead, the project as currently designed fails to accomplish any of the goals except to widen the freeway.

As has been pointed by many pedestrian, bicycle, and transit community groups, the project is not an improvement over current conditions. As has been pointed out by environmental organizations, traffic engineers, and planners, the environmental assessment is inadequately descriptive and relies on poor or false assumptions that have been hidden from the public. As pointed out by neighborhood associations and organizations, there is nothing in the plan to repair the damage the freeway has done in the past or to reconnect the neighborhood.

Beyond the fact that this project is just a highway expansion project with a veneer of improving the neighborhood or streets for pedestrians and bicyclists, the lack of transparency about methods, data, and results, the deceitful presentation of the project, and the inadequate time for public review is both shameful and worthy of investigation.

Given the severe inadequacy of the environmental assessment, this project must undergo a full environmental impact statement and must include the effects of value pricing as stipulated by HB 2017, the bill providing funding for this project.



But to accomplish the goals outlined for this project, the project must not only implement value pricing for I-5 traffic, it must also provide priority signals and dedicated lanes for busses and streetcars, build protected bicycle lanes throughout the area, widen sidewalks for event crowds and future residents, and cover I-5 with buildable lids. That is a project inline with the best of Portland's history, that is a project rising to Portland's equity, transportation, and climate goals, and that is the only acceptable vision of this project.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Jesse Merrithew

Comment: It is hard to summarize everything I see wrong with this project in the short time I have available. It is so wrongheaded in so many ways, I hope you'll forgive me if I miss something. First, and foremost, expanded a highway when our planet is melting is wrong in every sense of the word. Expanding a highway next to a middle school is wrong in every sense of the word. But that is not even the half of it. It would be wrong if it was only expanding car capacity. But it is doubly wrong because the drawings that ODOT illegally tried to hide from the public demonstrate that this project will done to the detriment of all other forms of more responsible transit. You may have hoodwinked the majority of our feckless elected officials, but you have not hoodwinked the public.

I, like thousands of other people, ride my bicycle over the Flint Avenue bridge every single day to get to and from work. ODOT does not care about us.

My children will go to Harriet Tubman Middle School, a school that has been, from the very beginning of its existence, a symbol of hope for the Black community of Albina. Is there even the slightest awareness of the history of that school in this community? No. ODOT does not care about that.

The number 4 and number 44 buses serve thousands of people every day. Thousands of people who increasingly are delayed every day due to excess traffic on North Williams Avenue. ODOT does not care about them. ODOT, from its drawings does not even appear to examine how those buses are supposed to get out of the Rose Quarter and onto Williams. The best I can tell, you're going to have that bus wait at three additional stop lights before getting on their way.

All of this appears to be done so that cars can move on and off the highway FASTER! We know what this leads to. More dead pedestrians. But ODOT does not care about that.

The solutions to our transportation delays are the same as the solutions to climate change. Public funds need to be invested in public transportation and active transportation. No more freeways; not now, not ever.

ODOT's conclusions that no EIS is required and that this project will speed the flow of traffic do not even past the laugh test. There's not a federal judge in this district that is as naive as you hope. ODOT must do a full EA. It is far past time for this agency to get serious about climate change.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Jessica Kelley

Comment: I'm deeply concerned about climate change. I'm committed to reducing my footprint and to making a healthy, livable place for my daughter to grow up in. We bike as much as possible, we walk, we take the max. I'm teaching my daughter that it's possible to navigate through this city without a car. It is backwards for us to fund the auto industry, the expansion of freeways, the increase in carbon emissions! We need to use that money to fund better solutions, bike and pedestrian friendly routes, more public transportation. PLEASE! Do not fund a freeway expansion. It's not the right thing to do.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Jessica Star Bjorge

Comment: Widening freeways does NOT help congestion. The statistics are very clear. We need to invest in public transportation and affordable housing (so people don't need to live so far from work, and commute so long). Exposing children to more pollution is not the answer.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Jessica Willey

Comment: As a resident of NE Portland who commutes to S Waterfront (and has seen my commute between exit 303 and 299A worsen dramatically over the past 5 years), I ask you to PLEASE not do this project. There are mountains of evidence that exist that point to this being a temporary fix a best - and a costly one from a dollars, environment and quality of life perspective. Please, please, invest this money into creating more public transportation options and making the city even friendlier for bike commuters. I would take public transit to my job every day that I don't ride my bike, if it didn't take 2-3x as long as driving.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0316 Jessie

Comment: There was a time when communities believed that there would be time to build a better world. And as a state transportation agency, your mandate was to build big roads—at any cost—to move the money-makers of society from home to work to holiday.

STOP. There is no more time for engineering-as-usual.

As an agency and as individuals, you have an ethical obligation to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public you serve. And you have heard from the community the myriad ways the I-5 @ the Rose Quarter harms the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood and of the city as a whole. This freeway is a public health catastrophe—with its epicenter at the former



Albina Neighborhood. Reparations for the destruction of this community and pollution of subsequent generations are yours to address.

STOP. Do not continue to squander time, money, and lives.

“In the U.S., motor vehicles create the largest share of greenhouse gases, are the leading killer of children and adolescents, and rack up trillions of dollars in direct and indirect costs annually, ranging from time lost in traffic to decreased brain function in urban children to carcinogenic particulates generated by tire and brake pad wear and road construction. Singled out are vulnerable people—including children, the poor, people with disabilities, and people of color—whom our car-first transport regime immiserates, impoverishes, and kills with uncommon frequency and precision. Cars’ convenience exacts an enormous social cost. Using the U.S. Department of Transportation’s own formula, the direct costs of the primary activity it supervises—driving—cancel out the GDP of 11 states every year.”

Shill, Gregory H., Should Law Subsidize Driving? (March 1, 2019). U Iowa Legal Studies Research Paper No. 2019-03. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3345366> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3345366>

STOP. Commit to facts and science. Leave the fantasy of freeways behind.

Effective and equitable solutions to the emission, safety, and congestion issues posed by the I-5 freeway exist, but are not found in outdated plans from times gone by. \$500 million auxiliary lanes and associated ornamental improvements are naïve and irresponsible—compounding the historic destruction of the community with the present corruption of our socio-environmental health, against the insidious theft of money and time from proactive solutions for the future.

STOP. Do not build freeway infrastructure. Do not build the I-5 auxiliary lanes through the Rose Quarter.

Build public transit. Build bike infrastructure. Build pedestrian infrastructure. Build a legacy for the future.

Attachments: [2019 0316 Jesse Maran ATT](#)

2019 0401 Jey Biddulph

Comment: I wanted to write to air my opinion on the proposed freeway expansion.

I do not believe this project is in the best interests of Portland as a liveable city, a place that provides a daily high quality of life to its inhabitants. In fact, this project will likely worsen the very things it claims to try to improve. As ODOT's own hired consultants agreed, this project will not reduce congestion. In fact, looking at evidence from other projects around the country that similarly tried to reduce congestion by "reducing bottlenecks", they simply do not work and have made traffic worse than before. This would make this not only an utter waste of taxpayer money, but also divert money away from projects it is desperately needed in such as improving public transport, bike paths and pedestrian sidewalks.



The data this project relies upon, which ODOT resisted releasing until unacceptably long in to the public comment period, has not studied alternative ways to mitigate congestion that do not involve massive construction at taxpayer expense and the worsening of pollution right in the center of our city.

I look forward to hearing that ODOT has heard the massive community opposition to this project and is returning to the drawing board, to start from scratch a new approach to managing traffic in Portland.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0322 jil

Comment: I don't think this is a well thought out long term solution. Much of the issue I see isn't the number of lanes but the ridiculous amount of on ramps immediately preceding or following an off ramp.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Jil Morby

Comment: I oppose the freeway expansion since it will just lead to more cars on the freeway , additional impact on the climate, more cars trying to park when there is difficulty with parking already.

It would be better to increase and improve mass transit options which are convenient for people to use.

Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Jill Riebesehl

Comment: If you widen lanes, they will come -- the hordes. Everybody knows that. Everybody!!!!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Jillian Detweiler

Street Trust for Portland

Comment: Good evening, Manager Windsheimer, Commissioner Eudaly. Thank you for taking time to listen tonight. My name is Jillian Detweiler. I'm the executive director of the Street2 Trust for Portland and the Street Trust is headquartered in Portland. In the six years since the



north/northeast quadrant plan was adopted, we've become much more aware of how transportation is killing the planet. The I-5 Rose Quarter project will provide bike and pedestrian facilities, but they don't rise to the level and quality that we need to really make a transition away from automobiles. We've also become aware through the Albina Vision of the impact on the African-American community by I-5, Memorial Coliseum, the Convention Center, Legacy Emanuel Hospital. Albina Vision backers want to create a socially and economically diverse community. Human scale design is critical, as is reclaiming land taken from people of color by creating buildable caps over the freeway. The caps proposed will not be buildable and may create little more than an attractive nuisance. The environmental assessment of the project demonstrates very little improvement on any measure, including auto travel times for a tremendous amount of money. We believe congestion pricing could provide many more benefits to all parties by addressing demand for driving to provide a resource to really create the kind of bike, pedestrian, and transit facilities that we need to face our future. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Jillian Detweiler

The Street Trust

Comment: I'm writing to on behalf of The Street Trust to provide comment on the I-5 Rose Quarter Environmental Assessment (EA) and to request ODOT undertake an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) so that project impacts and mitigation can be better developed and understood by the public.

The City of Portland adopted the I-5 Broadway Weidler Facility Plan in 2012 following a two-year planning process. The plan called for:

- Adding auxiliary lanes and full-width shoulders (within existing right-of-way) to reduce dangerous traffic weaves and allow disabled vehicles to move out of traffic lanes.
- Rebuilding structures at Broadway, Weidler, Vancouver and Williams and adding a lid over the freeway that will simplify construction, increase development potential and improve the urban environment.
- Moving the I-5 southbound on-ramp to Weidler to improve circulation and safety
- Improving conditions for pedestrian and bicycle travel by adding new connections over the freeway and safety pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the interchange area.

The EA indicates that the proposed project fails to achieve the objective of the Plan. In particular:

- Proposed lids are poorly conceived. There is no evidence they will increase development or improve the urban environment.
- The move of the Weidler on-ramp will not improve circulation and safety. The EA documents that project will degrade travel times for transit.



- The EA indicates no improvement in conditions or safety for bicycles and pedestrians, even though existing conditions are, in fact, quite poor. ODOT should undertake a design effort targeted to achieve meaningful benefits for bikes and pedestrians. The bike and pedestrian facilities in the EA are only conceptual. Without an explicit commitment to improvements for these modes, they may get worse, rather than better, as the design process continues.

The Street Trust is alarmed by the likely impact on walking, biking and transit during the construction period and the lack of information in the EA about how this will be mitigated. To achieve state, regional and local goals for reducing drive-alone trips, we need to significantly increase use of walking, biking and transit. Extraordinary efforts will need to be taken to mitigate the huge disruption that will be caused by the construction of the project in an area that sees 8,000 cyclists per day and is the primary portal between downtown and North and Northeast Portland. A five-year setback is not an acceptable outcome for our climate change and growth management goals nor is it acceptable to the individuals who will be impacted.

ODOT should also undertake an EIS to address the concern and opportunity presented by the Albina Vision Plan and the project impacts on children attending Harriet Tubman Middle School. The project could contribute to redress of the negative impact of transportation facilities on people of color. The EA fails to properly address these impacts and present acceptable mitigation strategies.

Attachments: [2019 0329 Jillian Detweiler ATT](#)

2019 0401 Jim Baldwin

Comment: Congestion pricing makes the user of the resource pay for it, instead of shifting costs and consequences onto the people who live near the freeway, many of whom don't even own cars. Make the users of the freeway pay for it!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Jim Baldwin 2

Comment: You lied to us. Your projections were based on a non-existent Columbia River Crossing. At the very least you need to start all over with real-world assumptions.

We need a full accounting of how else \$500 million could be spent and an honest cost-benefit analysis that takes into account ALL options, not just a freeway.

We need a full and HONEST environmental impact statement, including the environmental impact of OTHER WAYS this money could be spent.

We are at a crossroads with what kind of city we want to be. This issue was decided in the 1970s with the cancelation of the Mt. Hood Freeway and turning Harbor Drive into a park. Why are you going backwards?

Widening the freeway will not improve congestion, it will just draw more traffic.



Subjecting at-risk school children to air pollution for the convenience of privileged commuters is environmental racism.

Ripping out public spaces at low-income housing sites and replacing them with lanes of cars is not "restorative justice." It's more environmental racism.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Jim Cavin

Comment: I would like to voice my strong opposition to this project. Though I use this twice weekly while traveling to work, the cost, associated pollution, negligible effect on commute speeds, and counterproductive investment in automotive transportation makes this project a move in the absolute wrong direction.

Jim Cavin

Portland, OR

Attachments: N/A

2019 0319 Jim Clay

Comment: Hello,

I was just looking through all the information about the proposal to widen I-5 near the Rose quarter. I find it a bit overwhelming and confusing. There are a bunch of movies that I don't want to watch, and all I want to see is a map that shows the location of the widening relative to the rest of all the neighborhoods. Can you provide me a link to something that will show me such a map?

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Jim Hoff

Comment: Expanding Interstate 5 for car and commercial trucks is a bad history repeating itself. Expanding I5 to include an express train from Vancouver to the Rose Quarter and vice versa is progressive thinking in this so-called progressive city. Forget the Interstate bridge. Leave it for later and build tracks to Vancouver, ASAP. People don't love their cars that much for commuting, especially if a train eliminates their Portland I5 nightmare. The same needs to be done to the Sunset corridor in and out. People will actually walk more with trains. Once they're used to it, they'll embrace it. Brag about it.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0312 Jim Howell

Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates

Comment: My name is Jim Howell. I'm from Portland. I represent AORTA, the Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates. This environmental assessment of the I-5 Rose Quarter project ignores the traffic it will attract onto the regional highway system. The accumulative negative impacts of additional regional traffic congestion, air pollution, and greenhouse gases from this project were never evaluated. Transportation System Management, TSM it's called, which includes public transit, should have been evaluated as an alternative to freeway expansion. The concept was dropped in 2011 because staff determined that it would fail to improve the freeway operations and freight routes. They never evaluated how a robust transit alternative could meet this objective. A new eight and a half mile long rail line between -- light rail line between south waterfront and the Columbia River routed over the Tillicum crossing along the I-5 corridor could attract thousands of single-occupant vehicle commuters off of I-5 and eliminate the reason for the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project. A new rail line like this could serve Washington commuters with connection to their new Vine BRT. It'd serve 14 intermediate stations, including Rose Quarter and OMSI. It could connect 25 bus lines and four MAX lines that carry over two-thirds of TriMet's passengers. And it would run between the south waterfront and Hayden Island in 32 minutes. And it can provide seven and a half minute headways north of -- service north of the Rose Quarter at a cost, including trains, significantly less than the I-5 Rose Quarter project. AORTA has a power point on this, and if you would like to see it, you can see it on our website that will be up in a day or two. And it's aortarail.org, is our website. That's aortarail.org. Thank you.

Attachments: [2019 0312 Jim Howell ATT](#)

2019 0328 Jim Howell

Oregon Association of Rail and Transit Advocates

Comment: This Environmental Assessment of the 1-5 Rose Quarter Project ignores the traffic it will attract onto the regional highway system. The cumulative negative impacts of the additional regional traffic congestion, air pollution, sprawl and greenhouse gases from this project were not evaluated.

Transportation System Management (TSM), which includes public transit, should have been evaluated as an alternative to freeway expansion. The concept was dropped in 2011 because staff determined that it would fail to, "Improve freeway operations for freight and autos". They never evaluated how a robust transit alternative could meet this objective. (See; Appendix "A" Table 9: Summary Evaluation Matrix for Phase II Screening Step 2 July 2011 Page 37). I proposed this concept back in 2012 to the NINE Quadrant Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) (See attached) yet the only reason given by staff not to do it was, "it was beyond the scope of this project".



A new 8½ mile-long light rail line between South Waterfront and the Columbia River routed over the Tilikum Crossing and along the 1-5 Corridor could attract thousands of single occupant vehicle commuters off of 1-5 and eliminate the reason for the 1-5 Rose Quarter Project.

This New Line could:

- a) Serve Washington commuters by connecting to the "VINE", C-Tran's Bus Rapid Transit System at a state-of-the-art covered station on Hayden Island;
- b) Serve 14 intermediate stations including the Rose Quarter and OMSI as well as the Burnside, Morrison and Hawthorne Bridgeheads;
- c) Connect to 25 bus lines and 4 MAX Lines that carry over 2/3 of TriMet's passengers;
- d) Run between South Waterfront and Hayden Island in about 32-minutes, 10-minutes between South waterfront and the Rose Quarter and 22-minutes between the Rose Quarter and Hayden Island;
- e) Provide 7½ minute service, in conjunction with the Yellow Line, north of RQ;
- f) Cost {including trains} significantly less than the 1-5 Rose Quarter Project.

Attachments: [2019 0328 Jim Howell ATT](#)

2019 0328 Jim Howell

Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates

Comment: I support the No-Build Alternative for the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project and restarting the scoping process by seriously considering public transit, especially light rail in the I-5 corridor, as an alternative to expanding the I-5 freeway.

The crashes and traffic congestion at the Rose Quarter can be reduced by simply enforcing slower speeds on I-5 throughout the entire project area.

Adding lanes will not address the fundamental cause of most of the crashes and traffic backups. They are caused by the very short weave distance between the Weidler on-ramp and the I-84 off-ramp. More lanes won't lengthen this distance but slower freeway speeds will allow for safer weaves and merges. It will also slightly improve throughput capacity. A steady 35 mph has been determined by highway experts to be the most efficient speed for urban freeways. Improved signage, speed enforcement, narrowing lanes and minimizing shoulders are ways to induce slower speeds.

If desired and funded, the existing freeway from N Flint Ave to about NE Clackamas St can be covered. It would eliminate freeway noise, expel toxic exhaust gases from the neighborhood with proper ventilation and could become a linear park with a traffic-free pedestrian and bicycle pathway the full length of the park. It could also create a pleasant environment for constructing high density housing on adjacent under-utilized real estate.



Since the freeway would not have to be widened and the ramps moved, the existing overpasses would not be demolished, the existing street configuration would remain, which is far more pedestrian friendly than what is being proposed, and the taxpayers would save a lot of money.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Jim Howell 2

Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates

Comment: We sincerely urge you and our local political leaders to choose "No Build" as the preferred alternative for this extremely flawed Facility Plan for "I-5 Broadway/Weidler Interchange Improvements." As it stands, this project smacks of the outrageously defective Columbia River Crossing-badly envisioned and highly overpriced.

While local, state and federal policy all promote the highest environmental values-reduction of greenhouse gases, vehicle miles traveled, fuel consumption, air pollution, urban sprawl, and global warming-it is inconceivable that ODOT and PBOT would promote a billion-dollar freeway-widening project in the middle of Portland at the Rose Quarter.

Let's be honest. The NINE Quadrant Project has been promoted as a local street and neighborhood improvement plan when in fact it has actually been an excuse to promote a freeway-widening venture. It will require massive demolition and reconstruction of major arterial overpasses with huge disruptions to neighborhoods and local traffic patterns while providing practically no benefits. It's CRC Lite by any serious analysis.

Where is the wisdom in spending hundreds of millions of dollars to demolish, then replace, perfectly good infrastructure in order to temporarily relieve some local traffic congestion when the same money could be used to repair miles of crumbling city streets?

The City of Portland has meekly accepted Metro's and ODOT's flawed traffic demand-forecasts, which are the reason this unsustainable project has progressed so far. Now is the time to reevaluate these forecasts as well as the bigger regional transportation picture that should include a more robust public transportation component.

So far Metro has not proposed a viable public transportation alternative to I-5 through the metropolitan area. MAX provides this alternative in the east-west plane between Gresham and Hillsboro, despite the significant bottleneck in downtown Portland. On the other hand, the north-south 1-5 corridor has only the Yellow Line providing efficient high-capacity transit service north of the Rose Quarter-currently to the Expo Center and eventually to Clark County. But there is no plan to extend it southward to the edge of the metro area.

Whenever the concept of extending MAX south from the Rose Quarter has been raised at public meetings, members of the project team dismiss such comments as not germane to the prevailing local planning study. Yet widening 1-5 at the Rose Quarter is being undertaken not to fix a local traffic problem-but primarily to correct a bottleneck in an interstate freeway.

The message here flies in the face of agency environmental values, raising the idea that freeways are more important than public transport, a clear double standard.



Please put this flawed 1-5 Broadway/Weidler Interchange Improvements Project on the shelf and quit spending limited public funds for expensive consultants until Metro and TriMet get their acts together and develop a regional public transportation system with an effective north-south light rail corridor that will actually reduce traffic demand, specifically on these interchanges and systemically on all the region's freeways.

Attachments: [2019 0328 Jim Howell ATT](#)

2019 0401 Jim Howell

Comment: Much concern has been expressed recently that the EA is inadequate and a full EIS is needed. I suggest that before time and money is spent on an EIS that a closer look at the original screening, which tossed out all non-freeway concepts, as being "Beyond the scope of this project"

A public transportation alternative has never been considered, analyzed or proven to be unable to attract enough traffic off of the freeway to meet the overall project purpose to: "improve safety and operations on I-5 in the vicinity of the Broadway/Weidler interchange."

Testing this concept with a regional transportation forecast model could show that the purpose of the project can be met by developing a new frequent service light rail line along the I-5 Corridor between the Columbia River and South Waterfront.

Note: The attached slides show an example of an I-5 Corridor Light Rail Line and I request that it be included in the record.

Attachments: [2019 0401 Jim Howell ATT](#)

2019 0314 Jim McClure

Comment: Support the Build Option to reduce traffic Gridlock/congestion, improve air quality and support for the Albina Neighborhood revitalization vision. The NO Build option results in more congestion and air pollution along no support for the neighbor plan

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Jim Owens

Portland Parks Board

Comment: Good evening, Commissioner, Manager Windsheimer. Thank you for being here. I'm Jim Owens. I'm representing Portland Parks Bureau -- excuse me -- Portland Parks Board. I'm joined in the audience by Paddy Tillett, a fellow Portland board member, and he'll hopefully have an opportunity to make some additional testimony. So the Parks Board has formally adopted some comments on the project. Those comments are limited to concerns about the proposed capping of the freeway, and connectivity of the neighborhoods west of the waterfront.



There are two key concerns the Parks Board has raised. First, that we believe the City should not accept management or maintenance of the highway covers as proposed. The proposed highway covers represent fragmented pieces in our opinion, limited in utility. It will be very difficult to program and manage, and simply will not be attractive and useable. Our second concern is that we really need an analysis of an alternative capping scenarios. We understood that PBOT was going to undertake hiring an urban design consultant to do such, and we think that would benefit this project, and it should be undertaken and completed before the project moves forward. Regarding the public involvement process, a note is that Portland Parks Board has not been engaged by ODOT at any part in this process, which is unfortunate, as the advisor to Parks Bureau and City Council, Parks and Recreation of the City, and significant city-wide projects. We think that's a major oversight and we hope that you'll engage us as this moves forward.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Jim Ruppa

Comment: The LAST thing we need is an increase in automobile traffic. We need more and better public transit options not more freeways .Please shut down the expansion project and let's make Portland more livable, not less.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Jum Sjulín

Comment: Please consider include this email with other comments received regarding this project (comments due today at 5 p.m.)

Today, I was provided a graphic representation showing the impact of the widening of I-5 to the Eastbank Esplanade. Frankly, I was shocked. The existing landscaping shown in the graphic is not realistic. Even if not disturbed by construction, within a few years that landscape will not survive as shown with an overhead deck in place. And the now deafening sound of freeway traffic will only increase.

I am an active trail advocate with the 40 Mile Loop Land Trust. Our organization has not taken a position on this project, but we were unaware of the impact on the quality of the Eastbank Esplanade, a critical component of the 40 Mile Loop and the regional trail system.

As the majority of our community knows, there are many serious question to consider as each of us weighs in on whether this project should go ahead or not. I, personally, would like to voice my opposition to I-5 widening at this location.

Jim Sjulín

4028 SE Salmon Street

Portland, OR 97214

503.804.6957



Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Jim Withington

Comment: This expansion has a hidden agenda to build a giant expansion to the 1-5 bridge. It's unacceptable to couple these two things in this way, and so I oppose it.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Jingtian Yu

Comment: I am oppose to this freeway expansion. There are so many studies and historical examples that show that freeway expansion only increases traffic in the long run and certainly contributes more to environmental pollution and climate change. As someone who owes a car and routinely drives through that part of the freeway, I certainly want less congestion too, but this is not the solution. Build more trains, not freeways.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Joan B

Comment: I oppose the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion. I do not believe this is a solution to daily congestion on the freeway. I also believe it will be a danger to people who commute by bicycles, as well as contribute to increasing air pollution and noise.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Joan Meyerhoff

Comment: I oppose the proposed I5 Freeway Expansion for the simple reason that it is not in alignment with Portland's goal not to invest in fossil fuel infrastructure. We are racing against the clock to implement a shift from our fossil fuel based lifestyle to avoid the most disastrous effects of global warming. It makes no sense whatsoever to expand the freeway. Global warming presents a much greater problem to us than traffic congestion. We need leadership strong enough to face this reality and plan communities that are sustainable.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 Joan Petit

Comment: I oppose this project. The no-build option is better for my neighborhood, Eliot, and for my son's school, Harriet Tubman. The impacts during construction will be significant and post-construction infrastructure for cyclists will be worse. 9% and 5% grades for cyclists and pedestrians are unacceptable. ODOT should be starting from the Albina Vision from what this community wants.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0313 Joan Petit

Comment: I'm writing as a resident of the Eliot neighborhood, a daily bicycle commuter through the Rose Quarter, and the mother of a son who attends Harriet Tubman Middle School. I strongly oppose the I5 Freeway project in the Rose Quarter and am writing to advocate for the no-build option.

When Oregon, a state with a substantial history of legal racism, built I5 through the state's vibrant, only historically black neighborhood, and right next to Eliot Elementary School, it committed significant racial injustice and created harms that have never been remedied. Expanding I5 again through Harriet Tubman's backyard doubles down on these injustices. Harriet Tubman has one of the largest populations of black students of any school in Oregon, and many of these kids come from families that aren't wealthy or politically well-connected. Black children and other children of color in our community face disproportionately worse outcomes for health, education, and employment. The barriers they face begin at an early age, like when they attend schools with a lot of air pollution. Why must the black children in my neighborhood bear a disproportionate burden of air pollution and traffic danger for out-of-state and out-of-city commuters?

The current plan for construction (as mentioned on pages 69-70 of the Active Transportation amendment) routes southbound traffic on N Vancouver to N Flint Ave, right through the Harriet Tubman School Zone. In just the first six months of Harriet Tubman re-opening this year, two kids walking and biking to school were hit by cars. Yet ODOT proposes routing rush hour traffic even closer to the Tubman campus.

These kids in middle school already know they're at the bottom of the heap when it comes to policing, schools, and, now, transportation. This project only worsens that. This project didn't start with how to improve air quality and active transportation in my neighborhood or the city at large. That's the conversation we need to be having.

Most galling is that it's unclear that this project will achieve the goals as stated.

My bike commute right now relies on low-stress N Flint Ave. The post-construction options are steeper and will worsen my commute to work by bicycle.

Building highways--increasing fossil fuel infrastructure--is the opposite of what we need to be doing to remedy historical and environmental wrongs. I strongly oppose the I5 freeway expansion and encourage the City of Portland and Portland Bureau of Transportation to back out of this partnership before further harming some of our city's most vulnerable kids.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0307 Joanna Agee

Alora Development (Leftbank Project)

Comment: Great event, and I had in-depth conversations with several helpful staff members. Thanks for making so much dense information fairly accessible.

I understand that design on cycle/ped solution is only about 5% complete. Would have liked clearer info about how/when to contribute or follow that.

Also, great conversation regarding historic and section 106. Could I get a copy of technical reports related to Leftbank and Leftbank Annex that were done?

Attachments: N/A

2019 0305 Joanne Delmonico

Comment: I have great concern about a highway expansion in the light of increasing concerns about climate change and the devastating impacts that effect all of us. Please consider that we need to reduce the amount of fossil fuels released into the atmosphere. Please put some effort in exploring alternative modes of transportation to alleviate the need for expanded highway projects. Thank you!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0228 Jocelyn McAuley

Comment: I am a resident of NE Portland and am writing in opposition to the Rose Quarter freeway expansion project.

Several concerns have come together to bring me to understanding that this is a bad move for Portland: economically, ethically and scientifically.

Study after study supports that the expansion of highways *does not relieve* congestion of traffic. Most cities that proceed with expansion projects have already demonstrated that highway expansion only brings more cars and no reduced traffic commuting times. Increasing the capacity for freeway traffic is *expensive* and is not an investment bettering the lives of Oregonians. At a time when students in schools next to I5 already can not play outside due to the pollution levels from I5's car and truck traffic, how can expanding this area even be conscionable? Why are we not talking about mitigating the damage that is being done to this corridor?

We are in need of reduced emissions from cars, especially along this segment of inner NE neighborhoods. Expansion of Max and bus lines with Park & Ride capabilities is the best approach for bringing more people to and through inner Portland along this corridor.

The development of this corridor area in Portland is well known historically to target black families and neighborhoods with living conditions that are disruptive and unhealthy. From the location of I5 ripping through these communities, to the number of schools that are seated at the



edge of the highway, Portland development in this area has shown that the interests of Portland's Black Communities are of little concern to agencies such as ODOT. However, a shift in this development to not expand its car traffic in this area can be a step towards remediation of the harm already started.

To expand the freeway in the Rose Quarter, is to deny that we are harming the health of our residents.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Jody Bleyle

Comment: I am strongly against expanding I-5. It is not where we should be spending money right now. Any spending on fossil fuel infrastructure denies the climate crisis. Studies also show that expansion does not alleviate demand.

Please do not expand I-5.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Jody Creasman

Comment: Please consider not expanding the I-5 freeway. 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 0307 Jody Guth

Eliot Livability Team

Comment: Firstly, the information provided was over-whelming and confusing, and perhaps redundant. Too much overload. SIMPLIFY! 2ndly, I fail to see what all these expensive efforts will give us down the road when the added capacity is maxed out. Aren't we putting a band aid on a ruptured artery? How will this improve things in the long term? 3rdly, why haven't other solutions been utilized 1st. No tolls? Dedicated bus lanes. Let's try this 1st and then if no relief consider other more expensive options. Right now I'm more concerned with clean air, water, getting rid of chemicals that seep from all forms of emissions, etc.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Jody Guth

Comment: It's been said that the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again, but expecting different results.

That definition would certainly seem to apply to ODOT's desire to "widen and improve" the freeway interchange at the Rose Quarter. It was a terrible decision back in the 60's when the freeway was first built and, while there are good intentions to correct a problem from the past, today, when we know so much more about climate change, we would simply be perpetuating the insanity hypothesis with more of the same unsustainable outcomes. If you build it, yes, they will come! Although ODOT phrases their project as an improved interchange, and not a widening (other than for emergency vehicles) this will, in fact, create more access for more of the same. Why haven't we learned from other major cities who have expanded their freeways and are now looking to stop the "insanity"? Why not first attempt to institute congestion pricing and bring on more dedicated bus lines? Why not use those millions of dollars on streets such as 82nd where traffic accidents are far more deadly? Why not truly curb the incentive to accommodate more vehicles?! While I have no doubt leaders such as those spearheading ODOT, and Mayor Wheeler acknowledge climate change, and would likely stand in solidarity with environmental scientists, I wonder when they are going to start combating it effectively with a vision for the future instead of wasting a half billion dollars to promote an idea that will only create more of the same.

I moved to Portland almost 30 years ago to the day, and bought my first house in the Eliot neighborhood two years later. I have watched it's growing pains, and how we have instituted good things and bad. One thing I'll never forget is standing at the corner of Flint and Russell about 7 or 8 years ago, and marveling at the parade of bike commuters making their way to their jobs downtown. This had not been the case when I first arrived. It took a dedicated city and it's people to make this a bike town with proper lanes and routes, and markings for safe biking. Our beloved Flint street will be razed and re-routed with much more extreme grading with a myriad of "caps" that do nothing to foster a sense of community as part of this project.



No less an authority than the Albina Vision Trust has indicated where the environmental assessment is sorely lacking. I read the thoughtful comments from Rukiyah Adams echoing mine and others' concern regarding Flint street. This should be heeded and given proper consideration.

The Oregonian recently reported on the lack of environmental success's in a state that likes to trumpet its green cred. Our air and water quality have slipped and the agencies tasked to monitor them have been negligent and more concerned with corporate profits than in regulations. California is sending us their dirty diesel trucks where the political will is not up to the task of challenging industry groups, and our transportation division would like to hoodwink us into believing this boondoggle of a freeway expansion will actually further our environmental stewardship.

My son attended Harriett Tubman Middle School 28 years ago. I always wondered about that freeway only a soccer ball kick away from his playground. I now know the combined VOC's, soot, particles and CO2 that children breathe today is far worse than when my son attended. Concessions have been made to the tune of several millions for an H-Vac system that perches above the building to keep those mainly young lungs pollution-free. They are still advised, however, to limit their time out of doors. Really? This is a playground! The disconnect boggles the mind when one considers moving that freeway an additional number of feet towards the school with the additional pollutants to come.

Who will really win when that ability to move even more cars through that interchange happens? My guess is the wealthy suburbanites who use the freeway to get from their homes in Vancouver and surrounding areas who have no desire to use public transport, or carpool, or entertain the idea of a toll. Not those of us living within blocks of it, nor the city, state or planet as a whole. These are the ideas that need to be talked about.... first! I love my adopted hometown. I love Oregon. I want to be proud of who we are and what we represent. We are not fulfilling the bold, environmental leadership ideals of those like Tom McCall. With Earth Day right around the corner, please, those of you in positions to move this ill-conceived idea forward, I ask you to ponder those wise words from Albert Einstein, and his thoughts on insanity.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Joe Cortright

City Observatory

Comment: For the record, Joe Cortright. I'm an economist with City Observatory. I've written a complete set of all the objections I have to this project and submitted them for the record. I won't bore you with most of them now. I am extremely proud to be here with this group of activists who have made many of the technical points far better than I possibly could. I'll just reiterate a couple of them.



One is this project -- the claims that are made in the environmental assessment of this project are directly countered by all of the scientific literature that we have about traffic and that we have about carbon pollution. The modeling that they have produces results that are not consistent in any way with that. And as several speakers have noted, they simply haven't presented the information.

I'll add one fact to that. ODOT has widened I-5 in the past. And what happened? It widened it between Lombard and Victory Boulevards. It did that 10 years ago. And after it did, crashes went up. They're claiming that they'll go down here, but it's not based on actual scientific data.

I've got about a minute left so what I want to say to you, Commissioner Eudaly, is this: You're witnessing Portland at its best. 40 years ago Portland citizens rose up and spoke out against freeway building because we knew it was the wrong path for our city and for our planet. And the leaders of our city, the members of the City Council like yourself, in the face of a system that said this money can only be used to build freeways, marshaled the energy to go against the freeway building establishment, to go to Washington D.C. and change the law. And, yes, this is money that is right now appropriated to ODOT, but there's nothing that prevents the state legislature from reallocating this for other projects in Portland, in the Portland metropolitan area, in the right-of-way for the things that we desperately need. Including the safety that ODOT claims to be supportive of but is investing its money in a project that will do nothing to improve safety. You can be the kind of leader that we've had in the city in the past and listen to the citizenry and move forward, and I certainly hope you'll do so.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Joe Cortright

No More Freeways

Comment: Here are the comments of the Technical Advisory Committee of No More Freeways, submitted in response to the Rose Quarter Environmental Assessment.

A companion electronic submittal (described in the document "NMF_Transmittal.docx") will be hand-delivered to ODOT offices today, before 5pm.

Attachments: [2019 0401 Joe Cortright ATT](#)

2019 0401 Joe Cortright 2

Impresa

Comment: *Comment Too Large to Upload to This Form - Stored Separately

Attachments: [2019 0401 Joe Cortright 2 ATT](#); [Additional attachments](#)



2019 0401 Joe Hand

Comment: I am commenting to ask for a full Environmental Impact Statement. The current Environmental Assessment does not currently show no impact. In fact, the No Build scenario does not even properly demonstrate current conditions, given that the underlying assumptions of other projects included a the \$1 billion dollar CRC that is many years overdue with no timeline. Of course ODOT would find that a build situation increases travel time for a massive amount of cars that do not exist. Beyond this bad faith effort by ODOT, which rots the project from its roots, I have many concerns about this project.

As a resident of NE Portland, I regularly move through the Rose Quarter via walking, biking, BikeTown, driving, and bus/light rail. I fully agree that conditions need to improve for all users, but especially for buses, people walking, and people biking. In order to address climate change, we need to make it safer and more appealing to user methods of transportation that are more efficient than single occupancy vehicles. This project does not do that. Bus times increase, bike times and walk times likely increase. And all mods of transportation (including car) become less safe with this project. This project will contribute to the collapse of our planet and our species. But perhaps the highway will outlive all humans and then ODOT will have the last laugh.

Through the work of Robert Moses, Portland succumbed to his dream of improving commuting for white people in the suburbs by destroying the lives of black families. The entire history of this area is driven by racist thinking and bias against the families in the neighborhood. This project continues that terrible and misguided thinking, but the tenets of this proposal are perhaps more racist than Robert Moses could dream of. One needs to look no further than 20ft from the proposed widened highway to Harriet Tubman Middle School. Would anyone advocating for this project want to send their kids to this school? Or even go and play in the areas outside the school? I doubt it.

This project continues to diminish the historic black neighborhood of Albina, already knowing the history of this area. This is a racist act. ODOT is clearly values people moving through this area more than anyone in the surrounding neighborhood. The pointless highway caps will make it harder to rebuild this neighborhood later, further cementing Portland racist history driven by our transportation departments. Rather than support the rebuilding of this neighborhood, and offering restitution for its previous destruction, ODOT plans to put a band-aid on it before taking the knife to the neighborhood again.

So far in this short 45 day period, we've seen ODOT: hiding data and road designs, lying to the public by selling this as "not a widening project", minimizing the public's ability to understand the project, selling the project as a forgone conclusion instead of listening to concerns, lying about the safety record of this area, and much much more. It is clear ODOT wants to continue Mose's legacy and bulldoze lives of Portland marginalized groups with the single aim of accommodating giving people in cars a few minutes on their day (if any). Already, people are giving their lives for others to save a few seconds, many of these happen on ODOT-owned roads.

This project is a disgrace to Portland. It is a disgrace to modern city planning. It is a disgrace to our planet. And the people for whom ODOT is proposing this project should be ashamed.



Everyone involved is denying our children a future with a healthy planet, denying safe streets, and denying Portland's racist past by continuing to cause more harm.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Joe Kadera

Comment: As someone who drives on this stretch of freeway somewhat frequently, the cost of the freeway expansion and its likelihood to cause more traffic and completely mess up what is currently a pretty decent walkable/bikeable neighborhood makes it unacceptable. I'm not sure why this money couldn't be better spent on improving transit options other than a freeway like making a more bikeable/walkable area.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Joe Munsinger

Comment: As a bike commuter, I cannot back this expansion of the I5 freeway through inner Portland. I feel that these concrete monstrosities have done enough damage to our beautiful city. From my office downtown, I constantly stare at all the people, strapped into their cars, sitting still on the freeway, and think to myself, there has got to be a better way! In fact, there is! I know, because I am sitting astride a bicycle, a carefree, CAR-free commute. And most people can do it! And we can spend these billions on something that can make life better! Free housing, or maybe giving Portland back it's East Bank! Please stop this madness, for our future! Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 Joe Rowe

Comment: P45: Appendix B – Traffic Analysis Tech Report Table of Existing Conditions

Page 64 VISSIM – Data File – Future Nobuild + Build table

I would like the data sources and how was data collected and on what days was data collected?

I would like the source VISSIM data files and the raw data prior to import into VISSIM

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 Joe Rowe 2

Comment: The assessment is near useless because there are no measurable outcomes for the project. ODOT Spokesperson Don Hamilton said he does not know when the measurable goals will be released. He estimated goals might be made public in 2022 to 2026. Construction starts July 2022 Appendix B to D are empty! Extend comments 45 days after I get them.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Joe Rowe

Comment: Dear DOT staff

I don't support adding aux lanes to interstate 5 next to Harriet Tubman school, Portland. Don't spend \$500M. Focus on public transit and public spaces. Focus on slowing drivers where deaths are happening.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Joel

Comment: If the money is stuck going to a freeway expansion, this is probably the most needed place for it, but really it would need to be done from 405 all the way to the I-5 South/HWY 26 merger on the bridge for full effect. Or at least through the Morrison Bridge/City Center Exit.

Really though the money would do a lot more to reduce traffic if Trimet was expanded more appropriately throughout the Metro Area.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0304 Joel Statz

Comment: I'm writing to express my opposition to the expansion of the Rose Quarter section of I-5. It will increase greenhouse emissions at a time when we should be desperately trying to curb these emissions. Studies have also shown that freeway expansions lead to "induced demand", which ultimately puts more cars on the road where more roadway is built.

For these reasons, I oppose this freeway expansion project.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Johann Hannesson

Comment: To those in charge of the I5 Rose Quarter freeway expansion project,

This project should not move forward as planned.

The addition of additional freeway capacity will only induce further demand, countless traffic studies prove out the same thing, no matter where freeways are expanded.



The current traffic studies are built under the extremely misleading assumption that a new Columbia river crossing project and its related roadway expansions has already been completed.

This project will actually increase travel time for busses, cut down the width of sidewalks, and create bike lanes that do not PBOTs recommended standards for width. The drawings/designs generally prioritize car traffic over buses and bikes in one of the busiest bike corridors in all of Portland.

This project contributes to furthering Oregon's greenhouse emissions in a time when the alarm is blaring for the effects of human driven climate change.

This 500 Million can be spent to massively reduce travel times on surface streets in Portland by building transit lanes, bike lanes, better sidewalks, creating priority for buses and bikes at intersections and generally shifting traffic mode share away from cars. Or if traffic on I-5 must be a priority let us use this money to massively increase the reliability/speed/frequency of Amtrak buses and trains down the corridor to shift traffic away from the freeway.

This project is not aligned with Portland's or Oregon's values and goals and leans heavily on outdated and dis-proven models of thinking around transportation.

Let's use this money for something that moves Portland and Oregon towards a more sustainable, faster, and more efficient transportation network for all and not just single occupant automobiles

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 John

Comment: This project is an example of going backwards in time, a complete governmental and environmental folly. The environmental cost to a non- solution is staggering--and the decades-long delays this massive mess-up will create only exasperates the problem. Congestion pricing and investment in alternative, more sustainable transport methods is the answer, not more lanes. This is calamity in the making; please stop this development.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 John A Reesman

Comment: I am writing in opposition to ODOT's proposed I-5 freeway expansion through Portland's Rose Quarter. ODOT believes that spending \$500 million to widen approximately 1.8 miles of freeway in North Portland will 1) reduce congestion, 2) improve air quality and 3) "re-unite" the Albina neighborhood after it was split asunder by the original freeway construction.

It is a near certainty that none of these benefits will actually accrue once the project is complete.



Speaking from my own experience as someone who for over 30 years watched repeated freeway expansion projects in South Texas consume endless streams of money and land, I can testify that adding lanes always leads to more traffic. Congestion may be alleviated in short run, but never permanently. The endless rebuilding and expansion of the I-10 corridors in Northwest San Antonio and on the westside of Houston are monuments to the futility of freeway expansion as solutions to congestion. The only decongestion strategy proven to work has been congestion pricing. Increasing the user cost of using I-5 during high volume times will cause traffic to be delayed, rerouted or shifted to other modes.

ODOT's claim that expanded freeways lessen air pollution is laughable. Air quality along urban freeways is always noxious and it's a scandal that air quality at the Harriet Tubman middle school is already so bad that researchers don't recommend students take recess outdoors. ODOT is whistling in the wind if it really believes adding new lanes will improve Tubman's air quality.

ODOT has also proposed a series of street-level changes they claim will improve the transportation infrastructure on adjacent streets. These include putting "caps" over parts of the expanded freeway that are supposed to reconnect the neighborhood. In drawings, these caps appear park-like with vegetation and trees. I'm skeptical. These "caps" will be automobile overpasses. Cities across the country are littered with these "doo-dads" that traffic engineers use to mollify opponents. In San Antonio, hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent over the years to dress-up overpasses with side walks and ADA ramps. They're never used. Freeways, to work well, have to privilege cars and trucks over everything else and with cars and trucks comes noise, pollution and danger to anyone who is on foot. Communities don't adopt these spaces because they are the antithesis of places you'd want to walk or linger -- unless you're in a car zipping past at 60 miles an hour.

Finally, no one, except ODOT and the concrete lobby wants this project. The Portland Public Schools has requested a full EIS on the freeway's health impact on students at Tubman Middle School. The City's bicycling advisory committee rejects the plan. The Albina Vision project rejects the plan. \$500 million could be much better spent on Eastside street improvements, rebuilding bridges and improving alternative transit. We can do better as city than waste half a billion dollars on project that won't work and that no one wants.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 John Ammondson

Comment: ODOT's proposed freeway expansion in the Rose Quarter flies in the face of troves of existing research, the lessons of past freeway expansions, Oregon and Multnomah County's professed commitment to address climate change, and the already-marginalized groups that will be impacted by increased air pollution along the freeway. Freeway expansions don't reduce congestion, they simply induce more demand. Given that 40% of Oregon's carbon emissions come from transportation, investing hundreds of millions of dollars in a project that would



dramatically increase car trips and thus emissions in Portland is tantamount to climate denialism. In addition, increasing air pollution for the students of Harriet Tubman Middle School from the already-untenable amount they have to deal with is unconscionable. ODOT should conduct a full Environmental Impact Statement and seriously look into alternatives, like (de)congestion pricing and encouraging non-single-occupancy-car transit options. At a time when Oregon has an opportunity to innovate and provide a model for the rest of the country, please reconsider investing in such a backward-looking and maladaptive strategy for Portland's congestion problems.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 John Carter

Comment: Hi, my name is John Carter. I live in southeast Portland. You know, I think when I break this project down simply and I also pair it with the southwest corridor project, I see \$3 billion combined as a tremendous investment into a suburban model. And this whole issue that we're talking about right now is a consequence of a huge investment over the past 50 years into that suburban model. I mean, Portland does amazing work in the past to mitigate what we've seen as disastrous around the rest of the country, but it needs to be doing more today. We need to have that kind of innovative thinking. I mean, I look at the whole building of I-5 to begin with was just a complete and utter disregard for the community and humanity of Portland's black community. And then what are we doing today? Well, we're poisoning the air further of a historically black middle school. It just doesn't make sense. We're investing into wealthy suburban communities. We're continuing to pollute through this model. We're not giving them options to not drive. Instead we're saying, hey, let's widen the freeway, invite more cars into the mix. Given the climate change, denialism that we've been facing for the past 40 years, and the consequences that we're about to face immediately now, we really have to be thinking differently. We need innovative projects. We need Portland to think beyond. And I know, Commissioner Eudaly, you said that this money has been earmarked. Well, that's just a matter of political will. I mean, at the end of the day, this is the taxpayers' money and should be spent on things that are going to benefit us for today and over the next 50 years.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 John Carter

Comment: Why does ODOT feel the need to greenwash this project (the whole presentation feels like "brand" marketing propaganda) and offer assumptions that don't exist? (I'm citing recent findings that ODOT snuck in the aborted Columbia River Crossing into the traffic modeling) Why can't ODOT wrap its head around induced demand? Or is it that accepting this proven outcome would propel the organization into existential crisis? With the I5 expansion (which as pointed out in the EA requires the Columbia River Crossing 12 lane bridge!) + SW corridor light rail project we are looking at the region investing \$6B (i5 \$500m,



CRC \$3B, SW \$2.5B) into preserving an automobile dependent suburban paradigm. How about instead we use the money to invest in public transportation, walkable communities, reinvesting in the Albina and the black community that ODOT destroyed in the 60s, remote co-working spaces (so corporate workers don't have to shuttle day-in-and-day-out like a bunch of drones) - we could do a whole lot with \$6B. Pushing for highway expansion in 2019 is like increasing the amount of cigarettes smoked after the cancer diagnosis. At the public hearing I often heard "well, we can't use the money for anything other than highways, the money comes from the highway trust" - this is the very root of the problem. It is proof a system that is rigged for cars. Until ODOT gets the political will to embrace active transportation we are going to be expanding highways until the region is flat broke and choked in smog. It'll never end. Never, ever. Is this what you want your legacy to be?

Attachments: N/A

2019 0314 John D Berry

Comment: Comment: I support the I-5 Rose Quarter improvement project, Key project objectives that I support are: adding a lane to get rid of the I-5 hour glass bottle-neck; capping the freeway re-establishing neighborhood connections, making walking and biking easier; and capping to eliminate the unsightly freeway. I encourage engineers and planners to include capping the freeway adjacent to Harriet Tubman Middle School, reconnecting it to the surrounding community.

Thank you

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 John Dwyer

Comment: Hi there. My name is John Dwyer. I live in northeast Portland. This is my first time going to sort of a public hearing ever. I'm a private person but I figure this is a big enough project that I should give my input. I've driven on I-5 and I've been stuck in traffic on the Rose Quarter. You can see it goes from three lanes to two lanes so, you know, I think this project makes sense. You build an extra lane and get things flowing through. But I start to learn more about the project. I learned the cost. I learned it was about \$500 million. That's a lot of money for two miles of extra lane. I learned more about the construction that would be five years or so in the making, and it would tear apart the area while it's doing that. I bike through that area every day. I bike across Tillamook and across to the Broadway Bridge and go over the Broadway Bridge. And I have a young daughter and another one on the way, and it just seems kind of like a wild project to change that, to do such a big change to this area. And to think about, like, the alternatives that I know you pointed out, Commissioner Eudaly, that we can't use this money for PBOT projects, but I urge Manager Windsheimer to consider alternatives for the \$500 million. Think about other streets that would be consistent with the Zero Vision initiative as well as other projects that would have a bigger impact than this one. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0329 John Dwyer

Comment: As a Northeast Portland resident, I'm deeply troubled by the proposed freeways widening project. At \$500 million the project comes at great cost and I'm having trouble seeing how the benefits of this project could justify this expense. I'm especially disappointed that the Flint Ave bridge will be removed. I committed over that bridge daily and appreciate the minimal car traffic on that route. From what I can see on the renderings and from what I've read, the new route will be less bicycle friendly, especially for bicycles with trailers, which I use to take my daughter to day care.

I'm also skeptical about ODOT's claims that the bridge will be as much of a net positive for freeway traffic as claimed. For instance, I've read that ODOT included a proposed new I-5 bridge over the Columbia River in the "no build" alternative to justify this project. And yet ODOT did not include congestion pricing as a "no build" alternative despite the latter being much closer to reality. If there were such a clear case for this project why does ODOT need to be so selective in choosing what data to present? I'd suggest that ODOT be clear about all alternatives and the benefit of this project for a realistic "no build" alternative.

Finally the project seems like a misuse of resources given that the project will lead to increased greenhouse gases. I'm very dubious of ODOT's claims that the project would reduce greenhouse gas emissions, especially in light of ODOT being misleading with data. We are on the verge of a climate catastrophe and locking us into more greenhouse gas emissions seems like a very misguided use of resources.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0320 John Freudenthal

Comment: Do not expand freeways. Your studies, other studies, everyone's studies show that expanding a freeway only generates more traffic, more pollution and more problems. Do not expand the Portland freeways. Spends money on mass transit or anything that doesn't make the problem worse.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 John Hetrick

Brooklyn Action Corps Neighborhood Association

Comment: My name is John Hetrick. I live in Portland. I'm with the Brooklyn Action Corps Neighborhood Association. I'm the land use and transportation chair, although tonight my comments are my own. But I'll note that in the past, the BAC has voted to oppose this project as it stands. There are many concerns and flaws that have come up tonight and in the interest of time, I'll just say that I share those concerns. Since this is ostensibly about the environmental



assessment, I'm going to limit my comments specifically to that. One, I will say that the missing data, it is an enormous concern. I learned in high school that you don't get credit if you don't show your work. I don't know how we're at this point in the process without having fundamental data to simply explain how we've arrived at a conclusion. The other thing, and this is very significant for the neighborhood, is the air quality. I've seen the environmental assessments in its own words describes part of these potential covers as wide bridges. If we're talking about building public spaces, I know if I'm thinking of spending time with my neighbors or nieces, I don't look to the nearest wide bridge to have a picnic. We know that all these spaces are going to be within approximately 300 feet or less of the highway. We know from PSU studies recently done that that's in the danger zone. And we heard at the diesel townhall we hosted in our neighborhood that one of the things that you need to do to mitigate pollution is personally to get further away from it. We know that these are all within that range where it's known to be dangerous. This report does not have any location specific analysis for those locations. So at this time we have no idea if these spaces we are considering building are even going to be safe to exist in. We don't know exactly what they're going to look like or exactly what we're going to do, but at the very least, I hope we're making a place where we can simply be and breathe. And any claims of restorative and environmental justice can't be taken seriously if we can't be bothered to look for that first.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 John Irwin

Comment: This plan will be expensive and cause short-term traffic headaches with an expected increase in fossil fuel use and pollution. I'd like Portland to be more forward thinking when it comes to mass transit and pollution reduction.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 John L

Comment: It's very discouraging to see the mayor and city council, who have pledged to enact legislation that reduces our contribution to climate change, promoting a \$500 million dollar freeway widening project that will only worsen our air quality and is expected to increase congestion downtown. Please reallocate any transferable public funds toward transportation projects that align with our climate commitments and VisionZero goals, such as dedicated bus lanes and protected bike lanes.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 John Lee

Comment: John Lee, Camas. Safety is supposedly the number one priority of transportation officials. We're discussing the most unsafe site to drive in Oregon. The two-mile, two-lane



section of I-5 at the Rose Quarter has three times the accident rate as the Terwilliger curves. ODOT says it's also the region's number one bottleneck. Yet half the transportation money proposed for the Rose Quarter project has absolutely nothing to do with improving safety. It has nothing to do with adding new thru-lanes to reduce traffic congestion, nothing to do with adding shoulders for safety. After spending half a billion transportation dollars, supposedly the Rose Quarter will still have the highest accident rate in Oregon. Rose Quarter accidents are three times, 300 percent of the Terwilliger curves. ODOT experts hope the improvement provides a 30 to 50 percent reduction in crashes. Even if they achieve the 50 percent reduction, the Rose Quarter will still have 150 percent of the crashes and accidents than the Terwilliger curves. Why spend half a billion dollars if you're not going to fix the safety problem? Why aren't new thru-lanes being added to I-5? The Oregon Trucking Association was promised new thru-lanes to I-5 if they supported HB 2017. That's the only thing that will truly reduce traffic congestion and improve freight mobility at the site of Oregon's number one bottleneck. Question: After spending 500 million on the proposed improvements, will the Rose Quarter no longer be the number one bottleneck in Oregon? ODOT reports auxiliary lanes will not provide longer-term capacity relief to congestion problems. Furthermore, they say the northbound direction, there are four recurring bottlenecks. Will any of those four northbound bottlenecks be eliminated after spending half a billion dollars. Stop this wasteful spending of scarce transportation dollars until a proper expansion of I-5 actually reduces congestion and the safety problems are truly fixed. Stop wasting transportation dollars on community redevelopment.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0000 John Ley

Comment: I think it's absurd that the content of the study has not been shared in full with the public. Also to have experts look at the available data and deduce it's based on the faulty premise that the demand will stay the same, further decreases my belief in the project.

Widening freeways has yet to work in the long term anywhere else, so why is Portland different? If we want to reduce congestion we need fewer cars on the road. This plan will not accomplish that. The induced demand it will create will increase cars driving on it and will increase emissions. We need better alternatives. NOT THIS PLAN!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 John Ley

Comment: My thanks to Andy Johnson for all the details and in-depth explanations.

- 1) I wish the project added new through lanes to I-5 in addition to the auxiliary lanes. That would truly improve the vehicle congestion and movement of freight.
- 2) Whomever picked this location on a night the Blazers were playing needs 100 lashes! It was a nightmare fighting game traffic.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0307 John Ley 2

Comment: According to an OPB reporter, fully HALF the money spent on the Rose Quarter project will have nothing to do with improving vehicle safety or reducing traffic congestion. Instead it will be used to create real estate -- building the two concrete lids over I-5, and building the bike/pedestrian bridge. That's an abuse of the public trust, and the use of transportation dollars paid by vehicle owners and freight haulers.

The Rose Quarter has the HIGHEST accident rate of any section of road -- THREE TIMES the accident rate of the Terwilliger Curves, according to a 2012 City of Portland document.

After spending \$450 million to \$500 million, I-5 at the Rose Quarter will STILL have the HIGHEST accident rate of any section of road in Oregon. So why spend the money if you're not fixing the "highest accident rate" in Oregon?

ODOT reports this is the #1 bottleneck in Oregon. Why aren't you adding new THROUGH LANES to Interstate 5? That is the ONLY thing that will truly reduce traffic congestion and improve freight mobility at the site of Oregon's #1 bottleneck.

Out of the 10 items listed on ODOT's website describing the Rose Quarter project, only 3 of them relate to improvements on I-5 for traffic and traffic safety. That demonstrates this is NOT about improving traffic safety and reducing vehicle congestion. As Portland City Commissioner Dan Saltzman told citizens two years ago, they're doing "community redevelopment" with the money at the Rose Quarter.

"But Saltzman also said the project is far more than simply a freeway expansion, as the critics claim. As refined and approved by the council in the N/NE Quadrant Plan, Saltzman argues it is a safety improvement and redevelopment project that will help unite the area by adding pedestrian and bike connections, too."

<https://portlandtribune.com/pt/9-news/371589-255336-despite-opposition-saltzman-still-backs-rose-quarter-freeway-improvements>

Spending scarce transportation dollars on community redevelopment is outrageous.

While the auxiliary lane extensions will reduce accidents and slightly improve traffic speeds, it won't be as effective as adding new through lanes to I-5. The Rose Quarter remains the ONLY section of I-5 in an urban area with only 2 through lanes in each direction.

Question. After spending the \$500 million on the proposed improvements, will the Rose Quarter section of I-5 no longer be the "#1 bottleneck in Oregon"?

Unless you can answer "yes", then this project is a HUGE WASTE of taxpayer transportation dollars.

According to an Oregonian report, this section of road is the #2 bottleneck in the region, behind US 26 from the Vista Ridge Tunnel to Hwy 217. Has that fact changed since ODOT made their report via the Oregonian? Or is the ODOT website misleading citizens on their website, saying the Rose Quarter is the #1 bottleneck?



https://www.oregonlive.com/commuting/2017/08/portlands_9_worst_highway_bott.html

With regards to the environment, cars sitting idle in traffic jam 12 hours a day makes air quality worse in north/northeast Portland. This project should be rejected because vehicle speeds will only improve marginally, and therefore do little to improve air quality.

Finally, transportation architect Kevin Peterson scrutinized all the traffic data and projections in the CRC data. Kevin Peterson's graphic, shows the need for SIX lanes in each direction on I-5 at the Interstate Bridge location by 2030, and NINE lanes by 2060. Furthermore, there are 3-4 additional lanes needed at the Rose Quarter in the footnote.

<http://johnley.us/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/West-County-corridor-transportation-needs-v2.jpg>

We need to stop this wasteful spending of scarce transportation dollars until a proper expansion of through lanes on I-5 at the Rose Quarter can be agreed upon.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 John Miller

Comment: Please consider that widening an existing poorly-functioning freeway is only a solution in some kind of perfect world with unlimited land to pave over.

It would be better to ELIMINATE I-5 on the east side of Portland and allow that Bank of our River City heal... not to spend millions to widen the freeway.

Are you aware of several design studies underway now to improve the Eastside Coliseum - OMSI area? Such as capping the freeway? I heard about it last year at DesignWeek, and now I see this engineering project.

I know that you won't be able to incorporate this kind of opinion. It seems that no one EVER does any comprehensive long term planning. Only Hack Hack Hack..

It really is hopeless.

Thanks for your time.

Addendum

I live in Southwest just off Terwilliger, and I am just now hearing about the project! I-5 south of Portland was poorly designed and rammed through. You know that. It's very often a congested mess.

To me, an interstate freeway system should connect states and cities, but should not CUT THROUGH THE HEART OF A CITY ON THE SURFACE. This is obscene for many reasons. (Health of the citizens, creating a literal WALL, and so on.)

Use I-205 to go around the city for interstate traffic..

Use I-405 bridge, but little else.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 John Moriarty

USCG

Comment: Please ensure the USCG D13 Waterways Management and Bridge Offices are given at least 30 days notice of any in-water work over the Willamette River. We will ensure the work is included in our notice to mariners and coordinate w/ the project and contractor to minimize any impact on navigation. I think the most likely location is the SB off ramp from 5 to 84... It comes very close to the Kevin J Duckworth Memorial Dock.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 John Nickel

Comment: ODOT Rose Quarter Freeway expansion:

What is the cost of the proposed Rose Quarter Freeway expansion? In dollars, what will be the final cost, maybe 600 million dollars and probably more for a one mile stretch of roadway? In air pollution, in noise pollution with more cars creating more of each.

Has increasing road capacity ever decreased road use? Create more roads and more cars will use them. Is that what Portland needs?

I vote no on this project. There are better ways. Lets try tolling first. If a new bridge crossing the Columbia is built, then maybe a Rose Quarter freeway expansion??

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 John Nurse-Mayes

Comment: This is a bad idea. There is no history of adding more lanes for cars diminishes traffic. That is a very antiquated way of thinking. Your plan doesn't really do anything to encourage people to bike or use mass transit. More car lanes is no the answer. More lanes + more traffic = more pollution. How do you not see this? It is so easy my children recognize the poor planning going into this project.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 John Paisley

Comment: The money for expanding the freeway system is like throwing it down a bottomless hole. An infinitely wiser solution is to put it into the public transit system.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0330 John Peterson

Comment: Please do not expand the freeway system in the Rose Quarter area of Portland. We should spend our money on reducing carbon emissions and reducing single occupancy vehicle traffic. At the very least, please delay the project until a full environmental impact is completed and all options to solve the congestion and pollution problems are addressed. I am also concerned that the project will negatively impact the Eastside Esplanade and Harriet Tubman Middle School.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 John Reeves

Comment: Please do not expand I-5 at the Rose Quarter, or anywhere else for that matter. It sounds good to some people, but it won't do what we want.

We have looming climate change. It's a serious thing to worry about, like now. Oregon, and Portland specifically, can be a leader in actually doing something about it. The number one thing that we can do is have fewer cars on the road. A wider and still congested I-5 is just going to make things worse. This is 1950s era thinking when wider roads and more cars was the solution to everything. We know about climate change and how dire it is, widening I-5 is just denying the existence of climate change.

Lets be just a little more forward thinking. Spend that money more wisely on something like improving public transit. Anything but this.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 John Schuberg

Comment: No more freeway expansions!!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 John Somdecerrff

Comment: Gentlemen,

I'm writing to express my concerns about the planned I-5 Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion. I believe it is a waste of our money for a few reasons. These include the necessity to greatly reduce our carbon emissions, the effect of the planned congestion pricing, and the urgent need to spend the money elsewhere.

I'm sure that you know that we must greatly reduce our greenhouse gas emissions within the next eleven years to avoid a climate catastrophe. Almost forty percent of Oregon's carbon



emissions come from transportation. As a recent Oregonian article points out, we cannot reduce our transportation section emissions without driving less, a lot less. Spending half a billion dollars on infrastructure that we, by necessity, don't need is a waste of our money. We need to be spending this money on reducing the need for the private automobile - such as by improving public transportation and building communities designed for humans instead of cars.

Also it is my understanding the the ODOT traffic models do not reflect the effects of the congestion pricing that is being implemented. Again, as demand is reduced, so is the need for this highway expansion. Building roads we don't need is a huge waste of taxpayer money. I know I work very hard for my pay - I don't want it being siphoned off and wasted on this project.

The half a billion dollars this project is projected to cost could be used much more effectively elsewhere. It could replace almost the entire fleet of Portland buses with electric ones. This would allow them to run on renewable electricity while reducing our bad air pollution. It could build a very nice electric street car system for the east side, where it is so badly needed. Other ODOT roads, such as 82nd Avenue, are much more dangerous and need to be upgraded to be in line with our Vision Zero Streets goals.

And there are many reasons to put this project on hold and to go "back to the drawing boards". It is my understanding that the ODOT traffic models are flawed (such as pretending that the new proposed 12 lane bridge across the river had been built, but it has not been), neglecting to account for "induced traffic" in the environmental assessment, etc. Until we have good models and data, how can we fairly evaluate this project?

In summary, I am opposed to this freeway expansion because we must greatly reduce our carbon emissions, because the planned congestion pricing makes any expansion unnecessary, and because we urgently need the money elsewhere. I moved to Portland, and am selling my (electric) car, because I believe in living "car free", and that cities should be designed for people instead of cars. This project makes me feel like I'm back in Texas or Oklahoma - please don't follow their dead end path. ODOT should, and can, do better.

Thank you for your consideration,

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 John T Westerman

Comment: We should be discussing freeway removal not freeway expansion.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0304 John Watt

Comment: I support freeway expansion in Portland.

The congestion cannot be solved via public transportation or tolling. Those are weak ideas and do not address the basic fact that more people are coming to Portland.



Please bring more freeway lanes throughout the metro area. I'm sick of the traffic and congestion.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 John Yohe

Comment: No on I-5 expansion. Spend the money on public Transpo. Like FREE public transpo !

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Jon Adams

Comment: HI,

Thanks for providing the opportunity to comment. I attended the open house at Billy Webb Hall last fall, and am in favor of the changes proposed to the Rose Quarter interchange. I think this is an important first step in covering I-5 and rejoining neighborhoods in North Portland.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0224 Jon Agee

Comment: That's a no from me dawg... lanes aren't our problem, cars are. We have to reduce the number of vehicles on the road. As long as you are expanding lanes and growing freeways, we'll never convince folks they should be on mass transit, ESPECIALLY around the Rose Quarter.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Jon Jensen

IBEW Local 48

Comment: I live work and play in Portland. When I moved to Portland 12 years ago I was stunned by the logistic nightmare and choke point that exists between I5 and I 84. I am gobsmacked to discover that anyone thinks we shouldn't improve that situation. Of course it must be done in a way that facilitates the Albina vision (the cap?), but please support this project and fix this giant problem that cripples our city.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0307 Jon Meersman

Comment: I do not support the I-5 freeway expansion through Portland. I believe there are more effective ways of spending \$500,000 to curb congestion and increase safety, such as expanding public transportation options or building better infrastructure for walking and biking. I also believe that the proposed plan for freeway tolling will solve nearly all the problems cited by ODOT far cheaper and more effectively and should serve as an alternative in it's own right.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0217 Jon Steinberg

Comment: Hey - read through the overview of the environmental impact study for the build. Also -we're a one car family and I'm a 6 day a week cyclist. I say we build it - not even for the effects on traffic at rush hour but for safety and to help trade in the west coast. I think it's money well spent. Go build!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0219 Jon Wood

Comment: I oppose the expansion of freeways, particularly 15.

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

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.

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.

Even *if* ODOT can manage to keep this project under \$500,000,000, it's an enormously expensive undertaking whereas the revenues could be spent on a litany of other projects and needs across the region. \$500 million could build 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.

Community Opposition: Despite ODOT's claims that this project "reconnects the community," there are numerous concerns about the surface-level bicycle and pedestrian facilities currently proposed. ODOT intends to remove the Flint Avenue crossing (one of the city's most popular



bike commuting routes), the proposed "lids" over the freeway won't be strong enough to support buildings like the Albina Vision is proposing.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0305 Jon Worley

Comment: The environmental assessment is severely flawed and does not take into account the induced demand that will greatly increase the number of cars polluting in the Rose Quarter.

Please do not add more road through the center of our beautiful city. Instead only focus on capping existing road to improve on livability in that neighborhood. New accessibility, parks, and development plans are great.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Jonathan Halsey

Comment: To whom it may concern,

I have lived in Portland my whole life, and I'm saddened to see that the state's history of overt racial discrimination and environmental injustices have not changed. Anyone who lives, works, plays, prays, or commutes in Portland understands the issue of worsening traffic congestion. But adding new highway lanes will worsen, not fix the issue. Yes, transit designers still debate the merits of freeway expansion. But even if this project were to improve traffic flow, I don't believe it aligns with the values of our community. There are two major environmental justice issues with this plan.

1. Climate Change. This project may encourage car users to drive more frequently, and bring new drivers onto the road. The carbon impacts of increased transportation emissions will make reaching Oregon's carbon reduction goals more difficult. Climate change caused by greenhouse gas emissions disproportionately impacts communities of color and low-income communities on a global scale (this is common knowledge in the scientific community but contact me if you'd like me to cite my sources).

2. Local point source air pollution. Increased highway traffic will disproportionately harm low-income communities and communities of color in the areas surrounding the proposed project site. These communities already struggle with poor air quality and unhealthy levels of airborne toxins. Increased healthcare costs, decreased the quality of life, higher risk of disease associated with air toxins, low birth weight, increased infant mortality, developmental issues in children, and high rates of asthma are all associated with local air pollution from transportation.

I am also concerned that this proposal may violate Executive Order 12898 and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I studied environmental justice extensively as a student. In my current career, I also have a heavy focus on environmental justice issues. Working with community groups and students on a daily basis, I am beginning to better understand community needs in



regards to environmental services and environmental health. I'm worried that this proposal will be extremely damaging.

Potential alternatives:

- Invest in public transit infrastructure
- Improve carpool options
- Impose tolls and/or increased gas and car taxes
- Improve bike infrastructure
- Allow electric vehicle rideshare companies like Lime, Bird, Skip etc. to return to Portland. PBOT is in an assessment period of this right now, but these programs were widely popular and diverted car traffic from the roads (I was also employed by one of these companies, which made a strong positive economic impact in Oregon).
- Improve Bike Infrastructure
- Listen to what community members think will work best in their own community! They know the needs of their neighbors, and know how projects like these will harm them.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Jonathan Hinkle

Comment: I'm writing to express my grave concerns about both the proposed I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement project itself as well as ODOT's handling of the process.

Just so you have some idea what perspective I'm writing from: I live in North Portland. I own a car that I use primarily for grocery shopping and getting out of the city to go hiking. I own a bike and use it for much of my transportation in the city. I regularly take MAX and buses. I like to walk. I live here in a city because I like cities, and because they give us the opportunity to live a life that doesn't require using a car anytime you leave home.

First, let's start with the obvious objection: it's unlikely to work. You are aiming to add these auxiliary lanes to reduce congestion caused by the Rose Quarter interchange. As you've no doubt heard hundreds of times already during this public comment period, widening roads to relieve congestion just does not work. I don't get what about the concept of induced demand is difficult, or why ODOT seems to think that it magically won't apply to this project. Sure, I guess there's a chance that this could indeed be the very first urban freeway widening project to relieve congestion, but is that worth gambling half a billion dollars on? I would strongly suggest that before undertaking a project of this magnitude with such a small likelihood of ROI, you instead try other approaches to relieving congestion at the Rose Quarter such as congestion pricing.

Second, congestion at the Rose Quarter interchange is inevitable. I am not a traffic engineer (though honestly, ODOT seems to be making a lot of ill-formed assumptions that make me



doubt whether being a traffic engineer counts for much), but it sure seems to me that congestion at a tight interchange is inevitable. When roads curve, cars slow down. When a roadful of cars slow down, congestion occurs, because each person brakes just a little bit harder than the person in front of them. In Atlanta, you see this with the perpetual traffic slowdown at the Grady Curve on I-75/I-85 despite the number of lanes remaining constant. In Colorado, you see this on I-70 heading down out of the mountains toward Denver, with a line of brake lights stretching up from every curve, even though the number of lanes remains constant. In every city in the country, you see this on the blocks surrounding freeway on-ramps at rush hour. This interchange is too geographically constrained to fix that – you’d have to raze a huge area where I-84 and I-5 meet (please don’t) to give the roads room to curve slowly enough that people don’t have to change their speed of travel. That takes a ton of room! Even in places where the room exists, like the I-84/I-90 interchange in rural Massachusetts, there’s -still- a major slowdown at the interchange any time there’s appreciable traffic.

Third, this project is unnecessary. The I-5 and I-84 corridors are well-served by public transportation (even for Clark County residents from across the river!), and there’s a strong network of bike lanes in the area. We should be aiming to nudge people toward more sustainable means of transportation than driving. If someone doesn’t want to sit in congestion on I-5, they can take a train. Or bus. Or bike. Obviously many areas in Oregon don’t have any reasonable alternatives to driving, but Portland is not one of those places. As more and more people move to the region, we need fewer and fewer of them to be in cars. If anything, ODOT should be undertaking projects to -discourage- driving instead of projects to make it less frustrating. Instead, you’re undertaking a project that manages to make public transit slower and fails to bring any substantive improvements for cyclists and pedestrians.

Fourth, this project is climate denialism. The science of climate change is undeniable at this point, with the only real debate being on quite how -fast- we’re cooking ourselves. Our transportation sector, still primarily based on dirty fossil fuels, is a major contributor to climate change. At this point, investing in infrastructure that encourages driving is either climate denialism or a giant middle finger to the generations who will have to live in the world you’re building. Oregon and Portland want to be seen as climate leaders, and this project is directly at odds with that goal.

Fifth, this project is unhealthy. You don’t even need studies to tell you this (though they’re not hard to find, should you care) -- just go stand for a few minutes on one of the bridges over I-5, like on N Rosa Parks Way. You will find breathing uncomfortable. Or go look at the underside of one of those bridges, where emissions from the endless stream of vehicles below have coated it in dark grime like the inside of a smoker’s lung. We as a culture have accepted that cigarette smoke is extremely harmful, even second hand, but we seem unwilling to recognize that the pollutants our cars spew have a similarly deleterious effect on those who spend time in close proximity to significant traffic. As you’re no doubt aware, Harriet Tubman Middle School directly abuts the stretch of I-5 “improved” by this project. There were already concerns about the poor air quality students and teachers there must endure, and that was -before- this capacity-increasing project was announced. It’s not hard to see why Portland Public Schools has major doubts about this project.



Sixth, your entire environmental assessment was predicated on the idea that the Columbia River Crossing had been built, despite the project being dead for five years. If you need the CRC to exist in order for the numbers to justify this project, you're entirely misrepresenting this project.

We need an environmental impact statement.

In addition, unrelated to the environmental assessment in particular, I've been shocked by how disrespectfully ODOT has treated the public. You scheduled no public hearing until Commissioner Eudaly requested one. You took ages to release technical documents like Synchro worksheets, and failed to extend your comment period to give the public time to through them. You denied that engineering drawings existed, then suddenly found 36 gigabytes of them when you were FOIAed. Of course you refused to extend the comment period after releasing all this data, leaving the public with less than a week to comb through that data. All this data should have been released without the public having to ask for it, at the very beginning of the comment period. You touted this as a "safety" project, when there have been no deaths on this stretch of interstate for years and when there have been multiple deaths on ODOT-administered Portland roads in recent years. It's been appalling to watch, almost as if you know this project won't past muster if people actually have access to the data necessary to evaluate it on its merits.

1. Do an EIS.
2. Try congestion pricing first.
3. Be honest with the public.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Jonathan Korman

Comment: I gather that you are calling for comment. Well.

I am a homeowner in southeast Portland.

I grew up in Los Angeles.

I lived a couple of decades in the San Francisco Bay Area.

I have lived what happens when we invest and re-invest in freeways. At best, it does nothing to help. At worst, it perversely makes things worse.

Planners know this. They demonstrate persuasively that more freeways and more lanes just create -at great expense- incentives for traffic to increase to fill capacity.

I am not alone in seeing a future ahead of more people coming to Portland, and us needing to plan and build to accommodate it. But more freeways are an expensive distraction from the many things we should do instead.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0306 Jonothan Maus

BikePortland

Comment: I'm organizing an event tonight where people can learn more about the EA and ask questions about it. It would be great to have hard copies of the EA to use.

Can I pick up some hard copies from the ODOT HQ on NW Flanders sometimes this afternoon around 4 pm or so?

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Jordan Faulds

Comment: I would like to register my opposition to the proposed Rose Quarter freeway project. My grounds are as follows:

1. There is no evidence whatsoever that widening I-5 will ease traffic congestion. As I understand it, this is the sole purpose of the proposed project, so a lack of evidence to support its success should weigh heavily against the project.
2. I support the Albina community, which has clearly stated its opposition to the project and which stands to be most directly affected by it.
3. I agree with PBOT's bicycle and pedestrian advisory committees that the proposed bicycle and pedestrian improvements included within the project scope are inadequate.
4. I oppose the increased air pollution this expansion appears likely to generate, much of which will be discharged directly into the air around Harriet Tubman school.
5. I believe ODOT should attempt to use other methods to reduce congestion (such as congestion pricing) before widening the freeway.
6. Generally, I feel that too much money, time, and attention is paid to single occupant vehicles as a transportation option in Portland. To protect our climate, our health, and our city, we must invest in public transportation, pedestrian, bicycle, and other alternative transportation modes instead of doubling down on unsustainable, inequitable, and dangerous modes like single occupant vehicles.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Jordan Washington

Comment: The cited project purpose is "to improve safety and operations on I-5 and the local network, and to enhance multimodal facilities in the Project Area". As currently proposed, the



project fails to meet the objective of improving operations and enhancing multimodal facilities in the local network. The removal of the N Flint Avenue bridge, the 10% grade on the Hancock-Dixon Crossing, and the insufficient highway covers are issues that need further refinement to fulfill the project purpose. The project proposes the removal of the N Flint Avenue bridge, a crucial bike boulevard, because of “the high volume of cut-through auto and freight traffic that currently use N Flint to access the Broadway Bridge or to avoid the Broadway/Weidler interchange.” The removal of the bridge would disproportionately effect pedestrians and cyclists that depend on the route. If the goal is to prevent cut-through auto and freight traffic, the Flint Avenue bridge should be converted to a pedestrian/bicycle bridge. The conversion would divert auto traffic while still providing crucial access for cyclists and pedestrians. The Hancock-Dixon Crossing also fails to meet the project purpose of enhancing multimodal facilities. The crossing would be a downgrade from the current N Flint Avenue connection. The crossing is largely irrelevant as an east-west route due to NE MLK preventing thoroughfare on NE Hancock Street and the existing east-west bike lanes on Broadway and Weidler. The crossing would have a 9-10% grade making the route largely inaccessible for a large portion of cyclists and pedestrians. The suggested accessible route of a multi-use path on N Flint Avenue is further cause to keep N Flint Avenue as a pedestrian/cyclist only connection instead of removing the bridge. The proposal for two separate highway covers is pitched as “reducing the physical barrier of I-5 between neighborhoods to the east and west of the highway while providing additional surface area above I-5. The added surface space would provide an opportunity for new and modern bicycle and pedestrian facilities and public spaces when construction is complete, making the area more connected, walkable, and bike friendly”. While the statement is technically true, the two separate covers provide less opportunity than one large contiguous cover. It is disingenuous to laud the highway covers as a restoration of connectivity between neighborhoods when the covers are segmented and leave a significant gap over I-5. The highway cover should extend over the I-5 section between NE Hancock street and NE Broadway Street to create a more unified and functional space. Further refinement and analysis are required for the N Flint Avenue bridge, the Hancock-Dixon crossing, and the highway covers. As currently proposed the project would increase mobility for vehicular traffic on I-5 at the cost of all other forms of transportation on the local network.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Joseph Jannuzzi

Comment: Why is it that you persist in treating the public, who are your employers, as if we were the enemy?

You know that we did not want the CRC project built and yet you kept it alive in your projections concerning future traffic problems. Do you have another source of income? Your behavior suggests that you are more responsive to the trucking industry than the general population. How many times do we need to tell you that we do not want to expand the limited access highways in Portland?



It is quite simple: impose tolls to discourage traffic during peak times and focus on alternatives. Neither of those routes would cost much, increase carbon emission or cause massive disruption of our lives over many years.

I know that many of you have worked for ODOT (does that stand for Oregon Department of Trucking?) for many years and we are grateful for your service but please try to remember whom you work for.

JDJ

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Joseph Mains

Comment: Freeways do not relieve traffic—thoughtful policies empowering and supporting public transportation, alternative transportation, and similar policies are what make traffic lighter. Let's pay attention to the facts instead of wasting our money turning into a wasteland California outpost that the selfish and monied in this city are pushing for.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Joseph Readdy

Comment: While this project is presented as a stand-alone, safety-focused project with minimal impact to a very small area, the Rose Quarter freeway expansion is actually an integral part of a much larger, automobile-centric vision of transportation in the Portland area where freeways dominate. The underlying projections for traffic depend on an assumption that the Columbia River Crossing is built to 12 lanes.

What you have done is assume that we spend \$3 billion (or more) to induce demand across a 12-lane Columbia River Crossing; which you "proactively" "solve" with the pretext of widening the freeway in the Rose Quarter. Your justification for the Rose Quarter Freeway project is to provide capacity for the increased traffic that has yet to be created by the construction of the Columbia River Crossing, but which this project depends. What kind of modeling shall we expect when you try to justify that project? This kind of modeling is dishonest. and leads endless justification for expanding freeway capacity everywhere at the expense of urbanity anywhere.

You have very purposefully concealed facts. Dressing up the project with some green freeway caps and bike lanes seems disingenuous at best. Shame.

Do not build this project.

Joseph Readdy

3845 SW Condor Avenue

Portland, Oregon 97239



Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Joseph Santos-Lyons

Comment: I write as a child born at Emmanuel Hospital, third generation North Portlander. My family, three children and I live at 831 N Watts St. While a few miles from the Rose Quarter, we are directly and disproportionately impacted by increased traffic, air pollution and the generational negative affects on our climate. I urge you to end the proposed expansion in the Rose Quarter for my families health, and the long term safety of our communities.

I have worked and been civically engaged in North and Northeast Portland for decades. I have served as a community minister with the First Unitarian Church of Portland since 2007. I worked as Executivr Director of APANO, and served on the ODOT Region 1 Advisory Committee. My kids have gone to schools in NE Portland.

We cannot make decisions by old standards in the face of new knowledge in climate change, and the true costs of car first freeways. I respect ODOT as a changing institution and this is a moment to meet the needs of our neighborhoods, our region and our world.

Sincerely,

Joseph

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Joseph Totten

Comment: This project deserves full and due diligence, considering how future tolling and growth patterns will affect traffic demand on both the surface and on I5. Consider nearby communities and actively pursue engagement with residents and neighbors.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Joseph Wartooth

Comment: Please do not expand freeways in the wonderful city of Portland, Oregon. Portland has progressive values, and ugly polluting eyesores such as cars and freeways should be an ever shrinking part of this city. Please put more money into making Portland the greatest and safest pedestrian and cyclist city in the world.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0222 Josh Berezin

Comment: Every dollar we spend on transportation needs to be examined through the lens of climate. For every expenditure, we should ask if it will make things worse or better? And if we determine it will make things better, is it the absolute best thing we can do with those resources?

The I-5 — what is it? "Expansion Project?" "Improvement Project?" I find the splash of marketing unconvincing. But sure, let's call it "Improvement Project." It's just not a climate-conscious way to spend \$500 million. If backups for cars are a problem there, let's get some people out of their cars. As we're all well aware, there are effective ways to get people out of cars without spending half a billion dollars. We know congestion pricing works. We know better transit works. We know creating safe and connected bike facilities works.

But we also know building more freeway capacity doesn't work.

Let's just... not do this! It's not too late. We don't need this project, and we don't want it.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 Josh Berezin

Comment: Transportation expenditures of this magnitude should be designed to drastically reduce vehicle miles travelled, GHGs, and other toxic emissions, and to reduce the ease of driving alone, not to encourage it.

This project clearly has no such impacts.

The bike/ped/transit accommodations might serve to mitigate the negative impact of the project slightly, but aren't the kind of transformative improvements necessary to attract more people to those modes.

Please reconsider this project from top to bottom—it is not what the community wants or needs.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Josh Frankamp

Comment: Portland should lead the way with transportation solutions for tomorrow, not shrink back to failed solutions from yesterday. If we have half a billion dollars to invest let's invested in transit and protected bike infrastructure for the entire city.

Increasing highway infrastructure will just put more single user polluting vehicles on the road by inducing demand. End this folly and let's invest in tomorrow.

Attachments: N/A



2019 3030 Josh Hetrick

Comment: The Environmental Assessment (EA) for the I-5 Rose Quarter project has many significant flaws, omissions, and troubling conclusions.

- A full release of all supporting data was not provided until almost half way through the EA public comment period. Requests to make good on the lost time were denied.
- Additional requests for supporting materials such as technical drawings were deflected and delayed. Some materials were released only a few days ago, and demonstrate substantial public impact which was previously undisclosed or obscured. For example, the EA does not clearly indicate the impact that highway widening will have on the Eastbank Esplanade multi-use path. Only because of repeated requests for technical drawings by members of the public were these details made available. This has prevented a full and honest public discourse on the project.
- The impact of the unbuilt and dormant Columbia River Crossing project was included, but not the reasonably foreseeable impact of decongestion pricing which ODOT has been tasked with studying in the project area.
- The proposed highway covers are insufficient to support the kind of large buildings expected in the central city in general, and by the Albina Vision specifically.
- No location-specific analysis was conducted for the air quality on the proposed highway covers. Given their proximity to heavy vehicle traffic on both adjacent surface streets and the highway below, this is a serious omission. In particular, there is not a single spot on these parcels which is further than 300 feet from the highway. Recent local studies have demonstrated that distance as a known danger zone with public health risks. The viability of these parcels as usable public spaces is a critical aspect of this project, and this impact must be fully understood before proceeding.
- Harriet Tubman Middle School already suffers an outsized impact from the nearby highway. The EA's proposal for pushing the highway even closer to the school fails to demonstrate a safe and equitable impact to students, staff, and families.
- The EA projects a very slight reduction (0.2%) in greenhouse gas emissions attributable to the project itself. Even if these unlikely and very modest improvements were achieved, a project of this scope must be doing more to reduce emissions. The State's climate report clearly demonstrates that we must be taking more decisive action to reduce emissions. The EA fails to demonstrate a contribution to that goal in line with the project's size and scope.
- The proposed surface street changes are not in line with our City mode-split and safety policies. Numerous aspects of the proposal prioritize the movement of private vehicles at the expense of pedestrian safety (such as large corner radii), transit trip times (including temporary delays during construction and permanent travel time increases after project completion), and bicycle trip viability (via a proposed Hancock-Dixon crossing with a grade in excess of widely-known ADA standards).



- Important details on aspects of the surface street changes are still unknown. For example, the path of the proposed Clackamas Bridge has changed multiple times and its currently proposed sweeping arc does not indicate a clear purpose. When asked what trips and connections the bridge was intended to address, project staff was not able to provide answers.
- Similar, local highway widening projects have produced results which conflict with the EA's projected improvements to safety and congestion. (For example, the widening of I-5 in the Delta Park area.) The changes proposed are as likely to introduce new safety and congestions issues as solve any existing issues. In an area with collisions predominantly caused by lane merging, adding more lanes to merge across cannot be expected to reduce collisions.
- The EA fails to demonstrate a substantial safety improvement for the project area. Namely, this is because these highway segments are already relatively safe and have seen very few serious or fatal collisions. The only fatalities in recent past, which involved pedestrians crossing the highway, will not be addressed by this proposal. The proposed surface street changes include details which are likely to introduce new issue safety issues, rather than abate them. Meanwhile, there are numerous state-controlled roads with significant safety issues which do result in serious injuries and fatalities. Given those pressing needs elsewhere, the EA does not adequately demonstrate a suitable safety cost-benefit.

Many significant stakeholders have raised these and other serious concerns about the project's process, the current proposal, and the EA specifically. This includes Albina Vision Trust, PBOT's Bicycle Advisory Committee, PBOT's Pedestrian Advisory Committee, The Street Trust, Eliot Neighborhood Association, NAACP Portland Branch, Oregon Walks, Portland Bus Lane Project, and many more.

A full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must be conducted to understand and address the full impact of this proposed project.

Regards,

Josh Hetrick

Portland, Oregon

Attachments: N/A

2019 0222 Josh Linden

Comment: Expanding the I-5 freeway is misguided, harmful to our community, and will not solve any of our largest transportation challenges. Oregon's Department of Transportation and Portland's Bureau of Transportation should reconsider this project and invest our limited resources in options that reduce private motor vehicle use and improve environmental outcomes. I strongly oppose this project for the following reasons:

- It does not address our climate goals. Multiple national and international studies confirm that we have a short period of time to prevent the worst effects of climate change. We should be mobilizing as many resources as possible to address this inter-generational challenge. However, the I-5 freeway expansion proposes to spend \$500 million to support a form of



transportation that continues to be a leading contributor to greenhouse gas emissions. This is a mistake. According to Oregon's Global Warming Commission, transportation accounts for nearly 40% of total GHG emissions in our state, and total transportation-related emissions have risen each year, per the latest state-provided data. Any investment in freeway infrastructure to support the use of private motor vehicles directly undermines Oregon's own stated climate goals, and simply reinforces auto-centric planning during a period where we need other options.

- It will not reduce congestion. Years of studies confirm that induced demand will negate any temporary improvements from added freeway capacity. An expanded I-5 will simply lead to more vehicles on the freeway with no appreciable reduction in congestion. As an alternative, ODOT and PBOT should collaborate to institute congestion pricing, a vehicle miles traveled tax, and other dynamic pricing options that actually advance ODOT and PBOT's stated goals to reduce auto mode share.

- It is an enormously wasteful and counterproductive investment. For every dollar we sink into environmentally unfriendly and dangerous forms of transportation (motor vehicles), we forgo an opportunity to support transit, active transportation, and innovative new mobility services -- all of which are needed to truly address our transportation challenges.

Interstate highways -- particularly those within urban areas -- directly contributed to many of the challenges cities face across the country. The solution, therefore, cannot be spending more money to expand interstate highways and double down on mistakes from the past. ODOT and PBOT must cancel the I-5 expansion project and re-focus on investments that actually support our community, reduce motor vehicle use, and help us pursue our climate goals.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 Josh Linden

Comment: Congestion pricing/tolling should be part of the EA analysis. It is unacceptable that a \$500 million expansion project could move forward without considering how tolling will affect travel behavior, particularly since congestion pricing could begin before the expansion even begins. ODOT should re-start or amend its EA to include these scenarios.

Expanding freeways is NOT what the community needs. We are in the middle of an environmental and climate crisis. Investing \$500 million to serve motor vehicle traffic is a betrayal of Oregon's own stated goals for climate action and the reduction of GHGs. This project is not only wasteful (since induced demand will eliminate all benefits re: volume and emissions that ODOT claims), it is actively harmful. I strongly urge ODOT to stop this freeway expansion and work with state lawmakers to reallocate the state's appropriation to transit, active transportation, and clean forms of transportation.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0314 Josh Mahar

Comment: I want to voice my strong opposition to the I-5 Rose Quarter Project. I know you've all heard the arguments against it many times, but I will reiterate key issues:

- \$500 million would go much, much farther on other safety projects in our region that are in critical need of improvements (Outer Division, Powell, 82nd) all in areas with much higher equity needs.
- Making it easier and faster to move around in single occupancy vehicles goes against nearly all of our local and regional policies of reducing our reliance on cars to improve our environment and quality of life.
- Spending this money to make it easier for people to bike, walk, and take transit would be a much better way to address transportation problems and would better achieve our city's equity goals.
- The current plan is not compatible with the Albina Vision.
- The current plan does not take into account Congestion Pricing, a major opportunity to reduce traffic congestion without increasing road capacity.

Wasting our highly limited tax dollars on such an incredibly outdated project is utterly irresponsible, and undermines our region's long history of being a pioneer in creating a transportation system that focuses on sustainability and quality of life. Please reconsider your support for this terrible project.

Sincerely

Josh Mahar

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Josh Roll

Comment: The Safety Chapter of the I5RQ's Environmental Assessment should be updated to include more up to date methods for described in the Highway Safety Manual. Currently, this project is being described as primarily a safety project due the corridors inclusion in the Safety Performance Index System (SPIS) though this method is now considered outdated and does not account for geometric and traffic conditions, or regression to the mean bias. With the adoption of Oregon Department of Transportation's 2016 Safety Action Plan, which defines fatal and severe injuries as primary crash type to mitigate, the SPIS only gives partial weight to these incidents. The application of safety performance functions and crash modification factors should be done to assess the potential in crash and injury reduction for the build alternative. This would give the public a better understanding of what an investment of this magnitude will result in for fatal and severe injury reduction. Since the I5RQ corridor has experienced one fatal injury and six severe injuries, all tragedies of course, but a small fraction of the over 5,800 fatal



and severe injuries observed in Oregon during the same time period, the public will be better positioned to understand the reasonableness of expending nearly half a billion dollars to mitigate existing conditions.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Joshua Baker

Comment: As a resident in an inner Portland neighborhood, I'm writing to express my opposition to the ODOT's I-5 expansion project in its current form, particularly as there has not been a full environmental impact assessment completed.

As a young adult who will likely live with the side effects of climate change in the coming decades, I am particularly concerned that this project will likely increase emissions in the long run. The scientific consensus is that freeway expansions have never solved traffic congestion, and ODOT has not shown that the changes they will be making to this area of the highway system will in fact reduce congestion in the long run. It is particularly worrisome that ODOT did not release numerous data sets and appendices that would allow community groups to independently verify their assertions that this project would lower carbon emissions, improve air quality or lower traffic congestion.

When already 40% of Oregon's carbon emissions come from transportation, we need to be investing more in projects that reduce driving, but instead, this project encourages more of it and will lead to more congestion and emissions in the future. If we're going to spend \$500 million, it should be going towards building a lot of sidewalks in East Portland, bus rapid transit lines across town, or be a solid down payment towards the proposed underground light rail tunnel. And unlike a freeway widening, all of those investments would be better for air quality, carbon emissions, public health, and congestion relief.

It is also concerning that this project may make worst the situation at 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, and 73% are identified by PPS as vulnerable populations. The construction of lanes over the Eastbank Esplanade and the Willamette are also alarming. A full Environmental Impact Statement is needed to address both of these concerns as the Environmental Assessment document simply isn't focused enough on the significant impacts on health and public safety this project represents.

I also strongly recommend that the ODOT should implement decongestion pricing before moving forward with this project. Road pricing is the only policy actually proven to reduce traffic congestion; it is also proven to improve air quality and reduce carbon emissions as well. I think this is particularly true since ODOT's studies of traffic patterns of the proposed freeway expansion completely ignore the reality that the state is mandated with moving forward with decongestion pricing, which will enormously impact how many people choose to drive on the corridor and greatly reduce congestion.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0304 Joshua Berger

Comment: I've lived in Portland for over thirty years. I've seen population increase and traffic congestion increase alongside it. I've also seen an increase in public transit, bicycle commuting (I am a bike commuter) and walking neighborhoods.

We DO NOT NEED to expand freeways. We need to work to reduce fossil fuel consumption. Expanding freeways is denying global warming and climate change are tied to the burning of fossil fuels. So I am opposed to expanding the freeway on this general principle. But I also recognize that there is a serious issue with traffic congestion in the metro area and that needs to be solved.

I would like to recommend the ODOT implement Decongestion Pricing before any expansion. Road pricing is the only policy actually proven to reduce traffic congestion; it's also proven to improve air quality and reduce carbon emissions as well.

Why is ODOT moving forward with a \$500 million boondoggle investment without first instituting congestion pricing to see if that mechanism wouldn't solve the traffic problems on the corridor without sinking half a billion dollars into the expansion?

ODOT's studies of traffic patterns of the proposed freeway expansion completely ignore the reality that the state is mandated with moving forward with decongestion pricing, which will enormously impact how many people choose to drive on the corridor and greatly reduce congestion.

Thank you for your consideration. Do the right thing.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Joshua Goldstein

Comment: I am writing to voice my concern with regards to this project. As someone who uses this stretch of highway regularly, I strongly disprove of the freeway expansion. As someone who drove in Los Angeles for decades, highway expansion results in induced demand. This has been proven based on other cities (405 in Los Angeles, Houston, etc.). Based on empirical evidence from those cities projects, widening the freeway will only result in more cars on the freeway. The only solution that has worked in other cities is decongestion pricing. I highly support that model, and it would be a shame to spend so much money on something that is proven to provide no relief, before trying a solution that has works and actually makes money.

Please Keep Portland Weird and stop this project!

Attachments: N/A



2019 0329 Joshua Roberts

Comment: Widening the freeway will not solve our problems, it will just give us a wider freeway. Please use congestion pricing instead and invest in more public transportation.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Josiah Dodds

Comment: Dear ODOT,

I am concerned about the proposal for the I-5 expansion. In particular, it seems to be a slap in the face to the climate concerns that I hope my city will take seriously. Spending so much money to increase emissions in the city seems like a poor choice when weighed against improvements to public transit that might have comparable effects on people's ability to get around with none of the downsides of the proposed project. Please reconsider this plan, or at the very least do some convincing research to back up your claims. Now it feels like the rhetoric around the project is downright dishonest to the people of Portland.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Joy Mamoyac

Comment: There needs to be a full and transparent environmental impact study. Do your due diligence!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 JP Perry

Comment: I have only lived in Portland for four years; the previous decade I lived in Los Angeles. I am writing to tell you that freeway expansions rarely make sense. If wide freeways helped reduce travel times, LA would have the best traffic in the country. Instead, it has the worst.

Case in point, LA recently expanded the 405 freeway through the Sepulveda Pass. After spending over \$1B, travel times did not improve.

Portland is a city known for smart, forward-thinking planning and transportation. We need to continue to live up to that reputation.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0315 Judith Arcana

Comment: As you must know by now, virtually all attempts of this sort (in the USA and elsewhere) have failed; that is, traffic simply increases when you give it more room to grow. Every study I've read in the past many months makes that quite clear. I don't know why you want to go ahead with this - in contrast to some actually good plans and ideas to help us save ourselves from the rapidly approaching awfulness - but I sure hope you'll change your minds.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Judith Arcana

Comment: I am against the proposed freeway expansion.

Evidence/history in other cities that've made such mistakes is more than persuasive.

I am a longtime rider on public transit and a walker, one who often walks both sides of our river in the city. The last thing we need is more of the worst thing we already have in the realm of transportation.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Judy Henderson

Comment: Time to stop building highway expansions and start building better alternative transportation options. Climate change is real and is here now. And what about those nearby children who can't play safely on their school playground. Disgusting!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Judy L Todd

Comment: This is backwards to where we need to be headed. Let's turn around now, save our air, our quality of care for kids in nearby classrooms, like my grandchildren, support public transit in all its flavors and make good economic sense.

Adding roadway is not going to do it anymore. The future doesn't want more congestion, more cost to spill more pollution into our neighborhoods, and less attention to mitigating the effects of climate changes and global warming. Let's get on the right 'train' please. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Judy Romano

Comment: The lungs and lives of the students at Harriet Tubman are worth more than expanding the freeway for a mile. We will just go from 3 crowded lanes to 4 crowded lanes.



Spend the \$500 million to fix potholes and other streets. There are still unpaved streets in Portland - we are not a third world country. Pave the streets, fix the potholes - PLEASE DO NOT WASTE MONEY EXPANDING A SHORT AMOUNT OF FREEWAY

Thank you

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Judy Todd

Comment: We do not truly NEED more freeways. We NEED more options for traveling, commuting and getting around our city. PUBLIC solutions for all, not just for cars and trucks and buses. THINK BIG and THINK FUTURE without the daily increase in cars on the roads as our population increases.

We must do this differently. By solving the 'problem' the same way we have here for over 25 years, we only have increased the unlivability and unsustainability of our city, and our air quality.

A different paradigm of thinking and solving this transportation crunch is needed now. Please be part of the answer.

Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Jules Boykoff

Comment: I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed freeway expansion. In light of the perils of climate change, this is the exact opposition direction we should be heading. Oregon ought to position itself as a leader at the forefront of bold plans to expand public transportation, not a regressive policy that will encourage more driving, and thus more carbon-dioxide emissions and air pollutants. Think of the positive, green programs on which we could spend this enormous sum of money!

Please do the right thing and open up a transparent process that fully encourages democratic participation. Freeway expansion involves a thicket of vital issues, and we need to do the best we can for ourselves and for future generations.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Julia Karnes

Comment: Please stop and review the plans for the highway expansion. It will be terrible for our air quality and will not alleviate traffic congestion. Please, please don't rush into this plan prematurely.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Julia Staverosky

Comment: I live in Vancouver and commute to OHSU every day. I am opposed to the I-5 expansion, even though it is, in theory, supposed to help commuters like me. The data from other highway expansions is clear (please look at LA). Expanded capacity does not decrease congestion. The funds that would be spent on this expansion would be much better used on more sustainable efforts that could help more people. It is time for Portland to return to its history of promoting transit and other means of transportation. As Portland grows and expands we must focus more on high occupancy modes and making those accessible and affordable. Stop encouraging and subsidizing single occupancy transport. I carpool every day using the Scoop app. I believe these innovative methods of matching people is the future. Please focus on biking infrastructure, expanding transit and figuring out ways to make the MAX faster.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0317 Julia Whiteford

Comment: Freeway expansion is not the way. We are running out of time to work on projects that actually improve our quality of life. We should be building a world where people don't constantly commute to Hillsboro to work in a call-center. Politicians need to dream bigger.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Julie Hammond

Comment: I know that many agencies, organizations, and individuals have shared long and detailed opposition to this project, the amount and manner in which ODOT has released information, and the failure to complete a full EIS.

As a resident and homeowner in Piedmont neighbourhood who travels regularly between North Portland and downtown, my concerns are over a mislaid emphasis on expanding capacity for car movement (in the name of safety, which does not seem to be a concern given other much more dangerous streets in Portland) rather than emphasizing quality of movement or life for people who live in the area. As a regular bike/bus commuter, I am concerned that the added freeway lanes will increase air pollution around I-5, while doing nothing - or even decreasing in the case of the Flint Bridge removal - for those who wish to travel to the city centre by bike.

I am very concerned that this project does nothing to curb or address the very real issue of greenhouse gas emissions (as we know, transportation is a massive contributor). I am not a transportation engineer, but I have read enough articles about highway boondoggles to know that making more space for cars means more cars will use that space. Oregon needs to be a



leader in shifting away from moving CARS to moving PEOPLE. We need to prioritize projects that will make it easier, safer, cheaper, and faster for people to move in and around the city by means that are not single occupancy vehicles. This project as proposed does not sufficiently address these important needs.

The Rose Quarter is at the centre of Portland, and was once a bustling neighbourhood and centre of black life. This project as proposed does not address the opportunity to reclaim this area for future development and once again make it available and affordable to people in our community. Again, I am not an engineer, but there are options and opportunities that would allow Portland to re-claim and re-build the surface street grid while minimizing the presence of the freeway. No one wants to live, go to school, or sit at a cafe with the constant presence - noise, pollution, etc - from thousands of passing cars. This project could be a first step in reviving a close-in parcel and restoring the land for primary use by humans.

It seems unwise that the first step is expansion, rather than investing in reducing the number of cars using this portion of the roads. If ODOT cares more about people, and less about cars, they would make people the priority.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. I look forward to a revision that centres moving people safely with the planet and our community in mind.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Justin Sheets

Comment: I am writing to express my strong support for this project and frankly I think that it deserves consideration to be expedited in delivery as well as construction duration. It is that critical to the community and the region.

The project is expected to have significant benefits for travelers during most hours of the day and is expected to greatly improve the reliability of the corridor, a common complaint of people driving in this area. I've attached a graph from PORTAL showing the variability in speeds at this location for all weekdays of 2019 (through March 15). I've purposely excluded the "peak hours" as everyone knows it is extremely congested. However, from 9 am to 3 pm (often considered non-peak hours in most areas), it is also common for speeds to get as low as 10 mph. I drive through here often and more frequently I will take MLK instead to eliminate the uncertainty. Sometimes, I will even use Williams and I highly doubt that the bike advocates and City of Portland would welcome more cars next to and in conflict with one of the most heavily-promoted bike facilities in the city. Let's put regional trips back on the Interstate system and keep low-speed local and bike trips on the city streets.

I fully understand the concerns and opposition of the passionate locals and interest groups. I grew up in Portland and have lived in the area most of my life. I share many of the same goals and I often question these types of things and whether we are headed in the right direction. However, my fear is that the vocal minority overwhelms the voices of hundreds of thousands of



people who would benefit greatly from this project. I'm not just talking about generic terms like "the economy"; I'm talking about people's quality of life impacted every time they sit in a traffic jam or are delayed from getting home from a long day of work to see their family. I think we often forget about the individuals and are willing to sacrifice people if they drive a single-occupancy vehicle or if they live in the suburbs or if they don't have great job opportunities or health. These are people who have no better option than to struggle in traffic every day.

I will concede that induced demand is a real thing. It's very likely that more cars (i.e. people) will travel through this area. However, despite it's reputation, induced demand is not a bad thing. People freely moving around is never a bad thing. People leaving their home to go places is not a bad thing. What we argue about is how they choose to go places. People being given no other choice than to walk or bike surely does not seem like a compassionate thing to those who struggle with their health and those who must travel 15 miles each way to get to their job.

There is always a trade-off in prioritizing modes and I'm hopeful that we can be practical and accept the limitations of this project while still recognizing the needs of the community who depend on it. It is needed now more than ever.

Attachments: [2019 0328 Justin Sheets ATT](#)

2019 0331 Justin Skolnick

Comment: I'm writing to oppose the proposed Rose Quarter Improvement Project (RQIP) in its entirety. The RQIP is inappropriate to the time and problem, its proponents consistently misrepresent its scope and details, and its occasion raises new concerns about the intentions of those elected officials best positioned to act on it.

When I first learned of the RQIP, almost two years ago, I considered it inconceivable that Oregon -- widely regarded as one of the most eco-conscious and progressive states in the nation -- would even be considering a highway building project. To my ears it sounded like the least interesting kind of conspiracy, a favors-for-favors deal between a small group of lobbyists and a small number of compromised politicians: an all-too-common exchange of federal funds for political pledges. I now see the project as a massive failure of public-sector imagination and political will in a state no purer or more laudable than any other.

With the RQIP, Oregon is outsourcing its thinking to the 1950s. The RQIP is only the latest incarnation of a decades-long desire to resolve a "bottleneck" introduced by the region's own poor planning and faulty assumptions, a deadly mix of complacency and cynicism. A "bottleneck," of course, is a consequence of too many cars attempting to merge from too many approaches onto a road without the capability to immediately receive them all. As a problem in need of a solution, a bottleneck presents three vectors of attack; at this stage, only two are being discussed. ODOT is empowered by the state to reduce the number of vehicles attempting to approach the I-5 exchange at the Rose Quarter, namely, by implementing congestion pricing



in the form of tolls. But ODOT has stated that tolling is unlikely to be implemented for many years after the freeway expansion begins. Project prioritization is a choice, and ODOT is stating its priorities with this choice.

ODOT thus appears much less interested in seeing fewer vehicles on I-5 than in increasing the road's capacity for vehicles. The RQIP is a statement of vision and purpose, and its details harken back to an era that believed in bottomless oil wells, unlimited economic growth, and the planet's unshakeable resilience to humanity's exploitation of its resources. Times have changed, and each of these beliefs has proven a fantasy. What's more, Americans increasingly seek thoughtful, honest engagement around seemingly unsolvable problems, and increasingly demonstrate a willingness to change the ways we live if our behaviors are shown to cause others harm. For its part, ODOT's vision with the RQIP shows the agency believes nothing has changed and nothing will change -- a vision radically out of step with the trajectory of American history and thought. The RQIP is not appropriate today and will not be appropriate tomorrow.

Still, ODOT stands steadfast in the face of evidence that motor vehicle emissions increase the incidence of, for instance, region-crippling wildfire. The ill effects of the combustion engine are hardly recent revelations, and ODOT's staff, even if individually skeptical of the science, can't unaware that projects promoting the use of motor vehicles are going to invite public outcry. Rather than develop a proposal that preempts criticism by accounting for likely objections, ODOT has attempted to stem objections by concealing key project details from the public. Examples include:

- withholding the data used to prepare the Environmental Assessment (EA)
- presenting as "auxiliary lanes" and "ramp to ramp connections" an expanded roadbed easily repainted for full additional lanes
- failing to disclose the use of the defeated Columbia River Crossing (CRC) in RQIP traffic modeling
- denying the existence of project drawings until the person requesting them was a lawyer capable of filing a FOIA request

Any one of these examples might be forgiven as an instance of bureaucratic ineptitude, inefficiency, or miscommunication. Taken together, they suggest a concerted effort to evade public scrutiny of a project that more and more appears to have been based on knowingly flawed thinking. Personally, I'd be willing to judge the RQIP on the merits if it seemed to me that ODOT believed there were any.

More disconcerting than ODOT's dubious marketing are the elected officials who repeat the dubious claims. I'm most disappointed by my state senator, Lew Frederick, and Portland City Commissioner Chloe Eudaly. It was Frederick's district that was targeted and destroyed by the construction of I-5. Yet he supports the highway's further incursion into the neighborhood, insisting that all alternatives have been considered, that the "bottleneck" can only be resolved by these "auxiliary lanes" not meant for normal traffic use. Likewise, Eudaly listened to hours of passionate, informed community testimony, and replied not to the substance of objections but to their sentiment, saying she heard the desperation. She went on to give an odd account of how



her child's infirmity might spare him the worst effects of the coming climate apocalypse ... "but there is a bottleneck." Now, I don't personally expect much from politicians, but I do ask them to try a little harder than Frederick and Eudaly have to sell me on the inevitability of outcomes they themselves are positioned to alter.

Even granting the reality of a "bottleneck" on I-5, even allowing that this bottleneck is a problem, I can only see the RQIP as a lazy, phoned-in solution not even its proponents seem to believe is a good idea. Further obfuscation by elected officials gives the whole project the stench of corruption. This is a bad deal for Portland, for Oregon, and for the future of human life on this planet. There is no reason to proceed with the Rose Quarter Improvement Project.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Justin Wolf

Comment: Hi There. This proposed highway expansion is a terrible idea and does not help solve any issue short or long term. What I am most alarmed about is the close proximity to the children at the school. I live next to a busy road in SE Portland and I know first hand the amounts of toxins in the air from car exhausts and how far it can travel even in smaller amounts. This will limit the students outdoor play time due to air pollution or completely eliminate their outdoor recess all together. That is wrong! Figure out other ways to clean our air and bring health into our communities instead of doing the exact opposite which is bringing more toxins into our air, more cars, more noise, more of the taxpayers dollars, hurting our public schools and all for something that will not work for anyone and especially the People of Portland.

Thank you!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Jynx Houston

Comment: ABSOLUTELY NO 1-5/ROSE QUARTER EXPANSION. A RECKLESS & DISASTROUSLY ILL-CONCEIVED PROPOSAL RE THE HEALTH OF THE RESIDENTS OF PORTLAND.

Attachments: N/A