



# Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with K

*Ordered by first name*

## Contents

2019 0224 Kai McMurtry .....	6
2019 0311 Kammy Kern-Korot .....	6
2019 0326 Karalie Adams .....	7
2019 0305 Karen and Dale .....	7
2019 0000 Karen Berry .....	7
2019 0226 Karen Fletcher .....	8
2019 0401 Karen Power .....	8
2019 0314 Karen Tommee Carlisle .....	9
2019 0402 Karianne Schlosshauer .....	10
2019 0310 Karla Gostnell .....	13
2019 0312 Karla Gostnell .....	13
2019 0402 Karla Kim .....	14
2019 0319 Karma Delaney .....	14
2019 0308 Karstan Lovorn.....	15
2019 0000 Kasandra Griffin .....	15
2019 0402 Kasandra Griffin .....	16
2019 0329 Kasey Zimmer-Stucky.....	17
2019 0307 Kate Kavanagh .....	17
2019 0331 Kate LaForge .....	17
2019 0329 Kate Marshall .....	18
2019 0401 Kate Mill .....	18
2019 0401 Kate Rafter .....	18
2019 0000 Kate Walker .....	18
2019 0402 Katherine Ballash.....	19
2019 0325 Katherine.....	19



2019 0329 Katherine Anne .....	20
2019 0227 Katherine Camp .....	21
2019 0303 Katherin Jones .....	22
2019 0326 Katherine McGee .....	22
2019 0307 Katherine Mulles .....	22
2019 0401 Katherine Schultz.....	22
2019 0226 Katherine Sherman .....	23
2019 0401 Katherine Wilkerson.....	23
2019 0401 Kathleen Youell.....	23
2019 0301 Kathryn Levine .....	24
2019 0225 Kathryn Midson .....	24
2019 0315 Kathryn Reynolds.....	24
2019 0329 Kathryn Sunderman .....	25
2019 0312 Katie Ash.....	25
2019 0318 Katie Mello .....	25
2019 0329 Katrina Scotto di Carlo .....	25
2019 0401 Katy Kolker et al.....	26
2019 0326 Katy Liljeholm.....	28
2019 0307 Katy Wolf.....	28
2019 0312 Katy Wolf.....	28
2019 0331 Katy Wolf.....	29
2019 0331 Katy Wolf.....	30
2019 0331 Kavan Bahrami .....	31
2019 0331 Kayci Murray-Balto.....	31
2019 0000 Kaylee Friggin .....	32
2019 0319 Kayleigh O'Hara .....	32
2019 0331 Kayleigh O'Hara .....	33
2019 0401 Kaytee Arnold .....	33
2019 0307 KC Eisenberg.....	34
2019 0312 Keil Johnson .....	35



2019 0401 Keil Mueller .....	35
2019 0326 Keith Alnwick.....	36
2019 0217 Keith Liden .....	36
2019 0402 Kelcie Fletcher .....	36
2019 0226 Kellee Anderson.....	37
2019 0307 Kelley Gardiner .....	37
2019 0331 Kellie Russ .....	37
2019 0302 Kelly Brignell .....	37
2019 0401 Kelly Francois .....	38
2019 0307 Kelly McNutt.....	38
2019 0226 Kelly Ohanley .....	38
2019 0329 Kelly Ohanley.....	38
2019 0328 Kelly Reed.....	39
2019 0327 Kelsey Baker.....	39
2019 0327 Kelsey Baker.....	39
2019 0401 Kemper Shrout.....	40
2019 0307 Kent Boden .....	40
2019 0402 Kerry .....	40
2019 0401 Kerry Aszklar.....	40
2019 0331 Kevin Burke.....	41
2019 0402 Kevin Chambers .....	41
2019 0000 Kevin Johnson .....	41
2019 0319 Kevin Johnson .....	42
2019 0329 Kevin Kaufman.....	42
2019 0330 Kevin Oleson.....	43
2019 0327 Kevin Rudiger .....	43
2019 0327 Kevin Schaper.....	43
2019 0401 Kevin Vandemore .....	43
2019 0330 Khanh Pham .....	44
2019 0326 Khris Soden .....	45

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with K



2019 0307 Kiel Johnson .....	45
2019 0329 Kiel Johnson .....	45
2019 0328 Kim Kauzer .....	45
2019 0313 Kim Nurmi .....	45
2019 0401 Kim Slack .....	46
2019 0312 Kimber Nelson .....	46
2019 0401 Kimberly Nurmi .....	46
2019 0227 Kimberly Williams.....	47
2019 0322 Kimmie .....	47
2019 0330 Kippahs Yourway .....	47
2019 0401 Kirk Paulson.....	48
2019 0306 Kirsten Davis.....	48
2019 0331 Kitty Davis .....	49
2019 0331 Kitty Davis .....	50
2019 0331 Kitty Davis .....	50
2019 0331 Kitty Davis .....	51
2019 0309 Krista Reynolds.....	51
2019 0331 Kristin Flemming .....	51
2019 0221 Kristen Gross .....	52
2019 0301 Kristin Eberhard .....	52
2019 0221 Kristen Gross .....	52
2019 0329 Kristina .....	52
2019 0402 Kristina Frye.....	53
2019 0219 Kristy Overton .....	53
2019 0225 Krystal Eldridge.....	53
2019 0401 Kyenne Williams .....	54
2019 0329 Kyle Downs .....	54
2019 0326 Kyle Helland.....	55
2019 0312 Kyle Stephens.....	55
2019 0401 Kylie Bettencourt.....	55

Environmental Assessment Comments  
First Name Begins with K



2019 0220 Kylila .....	56
2019 0401 Kyna Rubin .....	56



## 2019 0224 Kai McMurtry

**Comment:** I moved to Portland in 2014 with my wife. We'd be trying to move since 2012. We were drawn to Portland because so many of our deep personal values were reflected in the city and among the city's residents. One of those values was sustainability and sustainable transportation. I've lived in major cities on both U.S. coasts and nearly wept when riding my bike around Portland in those early days. Not only was the infrastructure better than anything I knew, the drivers were kinder and more patient. I've watched cities around the U.S. leapfrog Portland in transportation investment in only the few years we've been here. I've come to realize "comparatively" better infrastructure is not really something to brag about. Objectively good or great - those are worth bragging about. Portland does not have objectively great sustainable transportation options or infrastructure. Many PDX'ers feel that Portland is at a critical juncture in growth, liveability and culture. A freeway expansion in 2019 is not a Portland looking towards a brighter future. That's a vision of Portland that is apathetic to progress. Portland's reputation has been built on nothing if not anti-apathy. Please do not waste our money, harm our health, and send us back to the 20th century. Thank you.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0311 Kammy Kern-Korot

**Comment:** To whom it may concern,

I am concerned about the following issues:

- o Expanding freeways is not an effective strategy for reducing congestion. ODOT has failed to make the case for why this project should move forward.
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o The project will increase air pollution in the backyard of Harriet Tubman Middle School, which already has some of the worse air quality in the state.

For a project with an estimated cost of over \$500 million, I believe 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 0326 Karalie Adams

**Comment:** Decongestive Pricing is the only way to reduce traffic congestion and reduce carbon emissions to save the planet. We do not get a second chance!!

People drive one car, one person because that is all they have ever done in their lives. We need incentives for people to use through buses and carpool assignments. Otherwise our children have to live with more traffic congestion and a scorched planet!! No new freeways!!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0305 Karen and Dale

**Comment:** I am writing to urge your committee to reconsider this project before massive amounts of money are spent on a project that most people know will not begin to solve a traffic congestion problem. Not only will it waste money and resources it will increase pollution when we are in dire need of more progressive solutions. We need to look at what other cities in our country and around the world are doing successfully to manage transportation. It's so cliché to point to LA as a prime example of what building more freeways accomplishes. But that is a perfect example and one of many.

Wouldn't it be great to hear that a committee listened to the experts and postponed an expensive project until a more satisfactory solution was found?

The health of our population has paid dearly for these costly mistakes and lack of forward thinking. Let's not make another one.

Thank you for your time.

Karen and Dale Bernards

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0000 Karen Berry

**Comment:** Not only is the I-5 expansion project contrary to Portland's Climate Agenda, not only does it spend a ridiculous amount of money on a project that has had a dearth of consumer input, but those of us living in close-in Northeast are sick of the constant construction causing slowdowns and backups on NE Broadway. (It can take 15 minutes to negotiate the blocks between 15th and Grand on a work morning.)

Please don't do this to us again without a more in-depth review of: 1) the options to improve traffic and 2) the competing uses of this huge amount of money.

I can't help but wonder if this is another boondoggle by moneyed interests recently reported by The Oregonian?



**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0226 Karen Fletcher

**Comment:** I wish to express my opposition to the expansion of I-5 at the Rose Quarter. Expanding freeways has never reduced congestion. It's also very expensive and the funds could be better spent on public transportation and making the schools around I-5 safer for Portland's children. Please do not do what we've always done - I hope you'll be more creative and proactive with Oregon's traffic issues. Thank you for your consideration.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Karen Power

*Representative Karen Power*

**Comment:** It is my honor to represent House District 41, covering SE Portland, Milwaukie, Oak Grove, and parts of unincorporated Clackamas County. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) on the proposed I-5 Rose Quarter expansion project, and for the robust outreach that ODOT has conducted during the public comment period. It is in the following capacities that I write to request a full Environmental Impact (EI) statement analysis, including more specific detail on alternatives to the proposed \$500 million project that expand beyond a "no-build" scenario and pro-active greenhouse gas (GHG)

reductions that could come from a project of this caliber.

As a state legislator, the youngest legislator mom, and a suburban resident, I am acutely aware of Portland's high levels of diesel pollution and the disproportionate effects that unhealthy air has on our most vulnerable citizens. My wife and I live two blocks in from Highway 224 in Clackamas County. My toddler's health and early lung development is a key reason I am a chief sponsor of House Bill 2007, a bill to reduce diesel pollution in our most densely populated communities by upgrading fleets and phasing out old, dirty heavy duty truck engines. However, it is in my capacity as co-Chair to the Joint Committee on Carbon Reduction that I am daily reminded that our planet has 12 years to halt emissions and curb the worst of the coming effects of climate change. The 2018 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report, Chapter 2, on Mitigation, includes the following excerpt and policy direction on reducing GHG emissions if we are to hold overall warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels:

"The combined evidence suggests that aggressive policies addressing energy efficiency are central in keeping 1.5°C within reach and lowering energy system and mitigation costs (high confidence) ... Demand-side policies that increase energy efficiency or limit energy demand at a higher rate than historically observed are critical enabling factors for reducing

mitigation costs in stringent mitigation pathways across the board ... [a]mbitious sector-specific mitigation policies in industry, transportation and residential sectors are needed in the short run for emissions to peak in 2030 (Mejean et al., 2018)."<sup>1</sup>



1 Chapter 2, Mitigation Pathways Compatible with 1.5°C in the Context of Sustainable Development, available at: [https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/sites/2/2019/02/SR15\\_Chapter2\\_Low\\_Res.pdf](https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/sites/2/2019/02/SR15_Chapter2_Low_Res.pdf)

In reading the Climate Change Technical Report (CCTR) for the 1-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project

(January 2019), this subject portion of 1-5 experiences some of the highest traffic volumes in the entire state. It strikes me, then, that this is also a key component of our state's ability to meet our share of GHG emission reductions by 2030 and beyond. If 121,400 vehicles travel through this section each day, what is an estimated reduced number of vehicles post-project, and benchmarks for success in meeting GHG reductions and reducing air quality impacts to adjacent schools and sensitive populations? A wall mitigating noise impacts is surely insufficient. While some emission reduction elements outlined in the CCTR note "federal, state, and local efforts to develop more stringent fuel economy standards, inspection and maintenance programs, and transition to cleaner, low-carbon fuels for motor vehicles" are part of an overall climate change strategy, the IPCC report also draws our clear attention to reduced overall use of fossil fuels altogether. I did not see that element reflected in the current base analysis and hope it will be part of a larger EI.

Portland has long been known for its bike-and pedestrian-friendly allure and strong transit grid, and we know we must do more in order to preserve Oregon's cherished natural beauty and livability. In light of the dire IPCC report issued last year, I believe we must be scrutinizing each major initiative and doing all we can, as fast as we can, to ensure a livable planet for our future generations. Thank you for the opportunity to

comment on the EA and I look forward to continued partnership and engagement.

**Attachments:** [2019 0401 Karen Power ATT](#)

## 2019 0314 Karen Tommee Carlisle

**Comment:** I am a champion of race-fair development and environmental reparations which are sorely needed in Portland. Portland is in a unique position to be a leader in stopping climate change and we tout ourselves as such internationally. Now is the moment to invest in infrastructure that \*decreases\* our carbon emissions, not \*increases\* them! We are on a collision course with climate chaos. If we do not take BOLD action to change the way we meet our basic needs, we are facing the end of human life on earth and we're already taking many other species out with us.

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



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

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0402 Karianne Schlosshauer

*Safe Routes to School National Partnership*

**Comment:** Safe Routes to School National Partnership | Pacific Northwest Regional Network

[www.saferoutespartnership.org/pacific-northwest](http://www.saferoutespartnership.org/pacific-northwest)

March 30, 2019

Oregon Department of Transportation Attention: Megan Channell 123 NW Flanders St.  
Portland, OR 97209

Dear Ms. Channell:

The Safe Routes to School National Partnership, working in Oregon via the Pacific Northwest Regional Network, is a national non-profit that works to advance safe walking and bicycling to and from schools, to improve the health and wellbeing of kids of all races, income levels, and abilities, and to foster the creation of healthy communities for everyone.

Our charge is to build policies and secure funding in the region to support students and families to be able to walk and roll to and from school and in their communities, and we work to ensure that those in our community who have the fewest options for transportation are given the most opportunities for better ways to get around. We are ever mindful that new or improved transportation opportunities must not negatively impact the health and wellbeing of the people in our communities, but rather seek ways to improve lives through transportation. For us and those we fight for, the fundamental questions we ask in 2019 of the I-5 Rose Quarter Project: what transportation approach best relieves congestion while not ignoring the social and environmental impacts of past and current transportation projects? What transportation approach best supports our economy while also supporting the health and community of those living, working, playing, and praying nearby?

HB 2017 directed ODOT to invest in congestion relief and freight mobility in the Rose Quarter in order to benefit the economy as measured by congestion and reliability. Past planning processes at ODOT took that directive and brought forward the proposed I-5 Rose Quarter Project as we see it today through the lens of this Environmental Assessment (EA). In our view, the past planning, needs, and intentions of this project have not been brought up-to-date with current and future considerations, including not only congestion and economic needs, but also co-benefits to climate emissions reductions; air quality, health, and safety improvements; and other local, regional, and state goals such as reducing vehicle miles traveled.

In its current iteration, the I-5 Rose Quarter Project utterly fails on environmental justice remediation, air quality, health, and safety, and appears to not even achieve the outcomes it is charged to address, namely congestion relief. Urban congestion relief has never been achieved



by freeway expansion, auxiliary lanes or otherwise, because of induced demand the EA itself indicates the congestion relief sought will not be realized.

Specifically, we are deeply concerned by the lack of depth of analysis on environmental justice, air quality, and environmental/climate emissions impacts:

1) Harriet Tubman Middle School, with more than two-thirds students of color, sits directly adjacent to the stretch of I-5 in question. Students, their families, the nearby community, and Portland Public School Board have raised grave and relevant concerns about their ability to be outside near their school, which would naturally include walking or bicycling to and from school, something encouraged for students living within 1.5 miles of a school. A PSU study found that the carbon emission levels are currently so dangerous that students shouldn't be allowed to play outside. The concern is that increased vehicle emissions and closer proximity of the interstate's footprint widening will decrease the air quality to the point that it will be even more unsafe for youth to breathe or be outside at all. African American children are nearly twice as likely to have asthma than White children, and seven times as likely to die from asthma related causes than the White population (Source: US Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Minority Health). People of color have a higher rate of asthma than White people in part because their communities are historically impacted by transportation emissions of high-volume roadways in their communities. The EA does not demonstrate the full impact on this school, and warrants further and deeper investigation.

2) There is a long and dirty history of environmental and social injustice to the historically Black community in the neighborhood that was once Lower Albina before it was torn apart by the construction of I-5. The community displaced will not ever have their neighborhood back, and no level of congestion relief nor freight mobility will allow this community to realize their needs, because this project doesn't allow them to build what they need - including the creation of infill development that bridges I-5 and connects Albina to existing active eastside neighborhoods, not to mention breathable air. The EA does not demonstrate the full impact on this environmental injustice, nor how it will be mitigated, and warrants further and deeper investigation.

3) We were shocked by the audacity of the claim that this project will be better for the environment. It is well established that transportation is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States and accounts for half of the total increase in U.S. emissions since 1990. The ways in which transportation can make improvements to the climate and environment include transit service, frequency, and reliability improvements, reduction in



vehicle miles traveled, safe facilities that enable high uptake of walking and bicycling, and vehicle electrification including rapid shifting of diesel trucks and fleet vehicles. Adding lanes and allowing for induced demand on I-5 will only increase climate emissions directly along this corridor, adding to environmental and air quality concerns. The EA does not demonstrate the full impact on the environment, and warrants further and deeper investigation.

After review of the EA, we are left with the questions unanswered: What transportation approach best

relieves congestion while not ignoring the social and environmental impacts of past and current transportation projects? What transportation approach best supports our economy while also supporting the health and community of those living, working, playing, and praying nearby?

Seeking solutions for congestion relief in this corridor must include serious discussion about the fact that there is more than one way to relieve congestion. It must include serious consideration of the climate, health, and environmental justice impacts of transportation. The corridor is congested today not because there are not enough travel or auxiliary lanes, but because those who seek to travel through it don't have enough reliable options to do so: Options such as congestion pricing have not been fully explored in the context of this project, and worse, have been set aside as not relevant to this project; opportunities such as advisory speed limits and transit- and freight-only lanes, which could meaningfully provide positive solutions for freight and the regional economy, are not meaningfully considered; ODOT facilities within the City of Portland with far greater safety needs go unfunded, as do nearly \$250m in Safe Routes to School infrastructure needs around Portland schools. We recognize that funding was allocated to make improvements on I-5, but congestion and this project do not exist in a vacuum it must be recognized that the reason so many people must rely on a private vehicle to get around, and why so many low-income families spend a majority of their income on owning and operating a car, is because the options available to them are not safe, not convenient, and not sufficient.

Just as businesses are reliant on government agencies to invest in infrastructure to support a healthy economy, families across the city and region are counting on government agencies to invest in crucial infrastructure that will make their communities safe to live and travel in. We urge ODOT to lead the region in a sincere and comprehensive conversation about how to spend limited transportation dollars in a way that will fundamentally benefit our transportation system, our climate, and our communities; provide options that truly work for all; and tackle, not repeat, the many societal issues we face today because of past transportation decisions.

There are too many uncertainties about whether this project meets its intended goals, and far too many questions about health and environmental justice impacts left unanswered. We join with others in requesting ODOT conduct a full Environmental Impact Statement that fully investigates and addresses the numerous air quality, climate, and environmental justice concerns.

Sincerely,



Kari Schlosshauer

Senior Policy Manager, Safe Routes Partnership

Portland, Oregon

**Attachments:** [2019 0402 Karianne Schlosshauer ATT](#)

## 2019 0310 Karla Gostnell

**Comment:** Hello, I live in the Eliot neighborhood. I recently returned with my family to my hometown of Portland after 30-some years in Seattle and New York. I was drawn home by our city's reputation for forward-thinking urban planning and environmental consciousness. We bought our first home in the Eliot neighborhood, reflecting our embrace of urbanism, walkability, living near work and relying on alternative modes of transportation. With the I-5 expansion project, I am dismayed to witness the City's willingness to favor the regressive transportation policies of the last century (expanding motor vehicle infrastructure) over forward-thinking investments in alternative transportation modes. As I walk and bike in the Rose Quarter area, I am constantly aware of the improvements that are sorely needed for the safety and comfort of pedestrians and cyclists in this bustling central-city area - and yet the City supports a half-billion dollars to widen I-5? If Portland intends to live up to its progressive reputation, this money should be used to further the safety goals of Vision Zero, and to aim for Oregon's goals for reduced carbon emissions. I am concerned for the air my child breathes in our neighborhood, and I am concerned about our City leaders' allegiances - whether it is to the interstate trucking industry or to addressing Portland's poor air quality and the very real global crisis of carbon-fuel emissions and climate change. Please put this project on hold until alternative methods such as congestion pricing on I-5 have been tested. Thank you.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 Karla Gostnell

**Comment:** Thank you for that very quick accommodation. I have to get my son home to dinner. I live in the Elliott neighborhood, which is the neighborhood that's bisected by I-5 at the area where this expansion is being discussed. I'm a native Oregonian and I recently returned to Portland with my family after living for years in larger American cities with strong systems of public transit. I was drawn home by Portland's reputation for forward-thinking urban planning and environmental consciousness. We moved in to the close-in Elliot neighborhood because of our embrace of urbanism, walkability, and relying on all sort of alternative modes of transportation. With the I-5 expansion project, I am dismayed to see the City's willingness to favor the regressive transportation policies of the last century by expanding motorcycle infrastructure over forward-thinking investments in alternative transportation modes. As I walk and bike in this bustling central city neighborhood, I'm constantly aware of the improvements that are desperately needed for the safety and comfort of pedestrians and cyclists. If Portland wants to live up to its reputation, this money would be better spent to further safety goals of Vision Zero. To invest in mass transit alternatives and to aim for Oregon's stated goals for



reduced carbon emissions. I'm concerned for the air my child breathes in our neighborhood. I'm concerned about Portland's poor air quality and the very real global crisis of climate change caused by carbon fuel emissions. Please put this project on hold until alternatives such as congestion pricing have been tested. Thank you so much.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0402 Karla Kim

**Comment:** When I heard that the kids and staff at Harriet Tubman Middle School would be exposed to high levels of air pollution due to the I-5 Rose Quarter expansion, it brought back some not so fond childhood memories. I attended an elementary school in Los Angeles that when the air pollution levels were high, we would have "indoor recess" instead of playing in the school yard and enjoying the outdoors. The valley air was so polluted and unhealthy, we were denied the right to play and exercise at so we could accommodate the growing car culture and congestion of LA. How do you explain to a child that they cannot go out and play on a sunny day? No child or adult should be denied the right to breathe clean air in their communities. It's time we stop catering our lives and health for the car.

It makes me scratch my head as to why ODOT wants this I-5 Rose Quarter expansion since we have templates and historical references of how freeway widening does not improve commuting and congestion as well as impacting the air quality in communities. Los Angeles County is a good point of reference of how not to continue this process of spending billions on fruitless efforts of freeway expansion. As a former LA commuter on the 5, 10, 210 and 405 freeways, there was no significant improvement in my daily commute when we had a freeway widening project or enhancement. Angelenos STILL have to endure endless traffic, vehicle accidents and construction that never seem to be reduced by freeway expansion and supposed highway improvements.

It's time we take on a better strategy of moving more cars off the road and enhancing our transportation infrastructure. Portland should be a leader and innovator in enhancing our public transportation and making it safer to bike and walk in our communities. Portland, we can do this!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0319 Karma Delaney

**Comment:** Rather than spending money on a road expansion why not invest the funds into a more reliable subway system? I personally would prefer to take public transit to and from work everyday but the because everytime I've taken the MAX it's been mostly late and there isn't any subways that are anywhere near my work also the bus would take HOURS with traffic. I feel like I have no choice but to drive.

To be completely honest driving does scare me. Not because I Think I'm not a good driver, but because I don't trust anyone else on the road. Increasing accessibility to reliabile public transportation would encourage more people to take it. Meaning less people on the road and less accidents. Which in turn will also help the environment. I strongly encourage you to think



more about what will benefit us as humans in the long run. The future IS better and faster public transportation.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0308 Karstan Lovorn

**Comment:** What a colossal waste of time and taxpayer money. I live and drive in Portland and use this section of highway regularly. I've often been stuck in traffic on this section and have even been rear-ended (fender bender) in this exact stretch this project is proposed for. And I'm still against it. A half-billion dollars could radically alter transportation in Portland, making it safer, faster, and more efficient for everyone (sidewalks, public transit, bike lanes, etc.). But instead you (ODOT) are proposing to essentially throw it away on this project that will literally accomplish none of your claimed goals. This whole thing is a massive boondoggle. We're in the middle of a climate crisis. Please spend this money more wisely.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0000 Kasandra Griffin

*Community Cycling Center*

**Comment:** Hello, thank you for being here. My name is Kasandra Griffin. I'm the executive director of the Community Cycling Center. We're a 25-year-old transit justice organization. My office is at Northeast 2nd and Schuyler in the middle of the project area. I am also the parent of a two-year-old, and lose sleep at night about climate change.

First, I wanted to echo Commissioner Sam Chase and others in recognizing that institutional racism inherent in the history of this area, and also echo others, including Dr. Lopez, prioritizing the Albina Vision in whatever we move forward in here.

Next I wanted to skip past bikes and talk about baseball because I figure a lot of people are talking about bikes and things. In the early 2000s, I was on a softball team, and the softball team's name was Triple Convergence. And that was a pun because my softball teammates were all urban students -- urban planning students. We thought it was a good pun because, you know, in softball triples are a good thing, but three strikes and you're out is a bad thing. So it was a good pun but nobody got it, but we thought it was really funny.

20 years ago introductory urban planning students knew the concept of triple convergence, which is that people adjust where, when, and how they travel based on the availability of travel lanes. If there is more freeway space, more people will travel. If there is less freeway space, fewer people will travel the freeway. There has never been a freeway widening project that has actually decreased the traffic or decreased emissions. It is absurd of ODOT to claim that this will do so. We all know that won't. And I urge you to oppose the freeway widening project and redirect the funding to solving actual life-safety problems on other ODOT facilities. Thank you.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0402 Kasandra Griffin

### *Community Cycling Center*

**Comment:** The Community Cycling Center would like to add ours to the chorus of voices opposing the proposed I-5 Rose Quarter freeway widening project.

The Community Cycling Center is a 25-year old transportation justice organization. Our mission is to broaden access to bicycling and its benefits. Our vision is to help build a vibrant community where people of all backgrounds use bicycles to stay healthy and connected. We believe that all Portlanders “regardless of income or background” should have the opportunity to experience the joy, freedom, and health benefits of bicycling.

Our office is right in the middle of the project area, at 1805 NE 2nd Avenue, so we have a direct stake in the project as a local business. Additionally, here is a short list of our major concerns about the project:

1. Low income individuals and communities of color who live or work near the freeway will be impacted by the vehicle emissions associated with higher traffic volumes. Asthma and autism are just two of the many diseases associated with exposure to the exhaust and particulate matter from freeways. We do not think it is worth it to impose those burdens on people so that (a) a few people have faster trips, or (b) more people can commute from Oregon jobs to Washington homes.
2. Low income youth and youth of color who attend school near the freeway will also be impacted by the increased vehicle emissions. This is most notable for the students at Tubman Middle School.
3. Low income individuals and communities of color throughout Portland, Oregon, the country and the world will bear the primary impact of the climate change that is exacerbated by every freeway expansion project.
4. The African American community of Portland, historically based in the Albina neighborhood, is working to create their own vision of an Albina neighborhood revitalization project, and this proposal does not take that into account.
5. Cyclists moving through the Rose Quarter will be affected by massive multi-year disruptions, which will not be justified by the actual eventual bicycle facility improvements in the project.

Instead of repeating the mistakes of the 20th century and exacerbating pollution and climate change, our preferred alternative is for you to scrap this project as currently conceived, and instead do the following:

1. In keeping with your claim that safety is your #1 goal: Reallocate ODOT funding to prioritize safety improvements for vulnerable road users on ODOT's many high-fatality corridors, instead of trying to justify this freeway expansion with claims of reducing fender-benders.
2. In keeping with your claim that reducing congestion is your #2 goal: Implement a strategy that will actually work: decongestion pricing. Freeway widening projects never actually decrease congestion for more than a trivial amount of time. The concept of triple convergence means that



people's choices of mode, time, and destination will always converge to fill up available space on a road. Decongestion pricing, on the other hand, can incentivize people to make different decisions, and subsidy programs for people living on low incomes can maintain or even improve equity as compared to the status quo.

What serves the people of Oregon best is a transportation system that prioritizes safety, especially for vulnerable road users, and that is actively working to minimize and mitigate the disastrous impacts of climate change. Freeway widening projects do the opposite.

If you are unwilling to take that bold step (yet,) we urge at least the following:

1. A full environmental impact assessment
2. Inclusion of a robust congestion pricing system as one of the alternatives
3. Complete project forecasting that does not rely on any currently unfunded projects being completed

**Attachments:** [2019 0402 Kasandra Griffin ATT](#)

## 2019 0329 Kasey Zimmer-Stucky

**Comment:** I absolutely oppose the I-5 freeway expansion as proposed. A project with an impact as great as this, should be voted on by the people who will be most affected i.e. taxpayers and Portland residents. Please do not rush into this project the same way you rushed into approving the numerous cheaply made, unsightly, uninhabited, overpriced, newly constructed apartment buildings that have taken over our city.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0307 Kate Kavanagh

**Comment:** If you increase the number of traffic lanes around Portland and still have the bottle neck that occurs during rush hour over the bridge to Vancouver you will still have stop and go and idling.

Main concern: It is not time to increase ways to pollute the environment at a time when the state of the planet requires we look for ways to do things differently, not persist in the same problematic behaviors. It is not a solution for developing children, it is one for current business interests.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Kate LaForge

**Comment:** As a new citizen of Portland I can enthusiastically say that Portland is the best city I have ever lived in for biking. It's a pure joy -- the infrastructure is incredible and the ease of use and safety makes it the clear transportation choice for me. In spite of this, many people still have unsafe journeys around the city on bike. Biking infrastructure can always be improved and



as wonderful as Portland's is it could be better. This infrastructure can also always be supplemented by public transit, the MAX, bus system, and light rail. At the end of the day we're all just trying to enjoy our commute and get wherever we're trying to go in a reasonable amount of time. The I-5 expansion will not deliver this to anyone. It will take much needed transit resources and redirect the city's attention towards vehicles for years. The amount of money going into this project would be much better used transit options that are more efficient, environmentally friendly, and are more enjoyable. I strongly oppose the expansion of the I-5 corridor and sincerely hope Portland realizes that the city is growing and that should be accommodated but this expansion is misguided and will ultimately just make things worse.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Kate Marshall

**Comment:** I OPPOSE the \$500 million upgrade to I-5 in Portland's Rose Quarter area . After reviewing news releases and project information, I do not believe it will accomplish the named goals. Relying on a non-existent CRC bridge or even project results in misleading projections. I do not believe it addresses responses that could reduce carbon impact on the climate. Adding more auxillary lanes in short-distance between I-84 and just north I-405 does not relieve the congestion created by users going to Washington. I urge ODOT to do a full environmental impact statement and to reassess other options.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Kate Mill

*Central Eastside Industrial Council*

**Comment:** Kate Mill from Central Eastside Industrial Council. I have a question about current design as it relates to an easement at the Eastbank Esplanade. We've had several presentations but this is the first time we've heard about the easement. If you could give me a call my number is XXX-XXX-XXXX. Thank you. Bye.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Kate Rafter

**Comment:** I oppose the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion. I'm a daily driver and I understand that expansion will not alleviate traffic congestion. The \$500 million needs to be invested in public transportation instead to get more cars off the road.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0000 Kate Walker

**Comment:** I am a resident of North Portland and frequently bike and occasionally drive through Rose Quarter. I'm concerned about climate change, induced demand of more driving, and don't



want to see the removal of Flint Avenue Bridge, which is an essential route for many cyclists coming from north and northeast.

I am interested and concerned about ODOT's plan to expand I-5 in this area. Following is a list of my concerns regarding the information presented in the Environmental Assessment:

- Studies show that freeway expansion does not solve traffic congestion. There are no studies proving that freeway expansion has solved this issue in any North American city to date.
- As a bike and pedestrian advocate, I want to see that \$500M allocated to bike/ped infrastructure improvements and prioritizing public transportation, which will get people out of single occupancy vehicles, reduces demand, and addresses climate change issues. \$500M could build a lot of sidewalks in East Portland, bus rapid transit across town, or fund light rail - all of which would be better for air quality, reducing carbon emissions, public health and congestion relief.
- I understand the Flint Avenue Bridge will be replaced with "better bike/ped connections" but the steep, 9% grade will make biking more challenging to all.
- I urge ODOT to implement decongestion pricing before expansion. Road pricing is the only policy proven to reduce traffic congestion; also proven to improve air quality and reduce carbon emissions.

Thank you for consideration of my viewpoint on this matter. I believe I-5 freeway expansion through Rose Quarter to be an important issue.

Best,

Kate Walker

katewalks@gmail.com

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0402 Katherine Ballash

**Comment:** I am against this freeway expansion because I believe that it is being rushed through without significant attention to the citizen's concerns, I.e. Increased pollution near Harriet Tubman school, disruption of bike routes, and increased noise pollution. Furthermore, we need to consider the idea of congestion pricing to encourage those who use the freeway to pay their fair share. I am tired of seeing Washington state licensed cars cutting through my neighborhood. That is infuriating especially after they voted against paying their share of the new bridge across the Columbia.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0325 Katherine

**Comment:** I love the city of Portland and was lucky to be able to go to college in the city. One of the main reasons that I love Portland is because it is one of the only cities that seems to value



public transit more than freeways. Now that I live in the LA area I see the real negatives of a city that is made up of mostly freeways. It is a horrible mess of traffic and makes it impossible to get around without a car. I would like to strongly voice my dissent to the plan to widen the freeway. Thank you.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Katherine Anne

**Comment:** I oppose the proposed Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion and urge you to act on the following facts and reject this project.

(Borrowed from [nomorefreewayspx.com](http://nomorefreewayspx.com))

Congestion won't improve. Freeway expansion has never solved traffic congestion, in any North American city, anywhere. Ever! ODOT's own hired consultants admit that this project won't address recurring traffic congestion on this corridor. There are numerous examples of induced demand across the country, including most recently in Los Angeles, who spent \$1.6 BILLION on a "freeway bottleneck" widening project only to find it made traffic \*worse.\*

Increase in air pollution. This project proposes to expand a freeway into the backyard of Harriet Tubman Middle School, where air pollution is already so bad that PSU's researchers recommended that students forgo outdoor recess. This is an environmental justice issue - 40% of Tubman's students are Black, and 73% are identified by PPS as vulnerable populations.

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.

ODOT is hiding the data. The entire traffic projection information on which ODOT's claims about the purported benefits of this project are based have been made largely inaccessible to our community groups to independently verify. Our coalition has brought on traffic engineers to review the information that should have been available to them, but ODOT still hasn't released numerous data sets and appendices that would allow our community groups to independently verify ODOT's assertions that this project would lower carbon emissions, improve air quality or lower traffic congestion. ODOT's strategy is to tell the public "trust us, this is good for the community," and isn't providing any of the materials available for us to double-check their dubious claims. Our coalition wrote a letter on March 4th asking for this information and we still haven't received it. How can ODOT claim to be providing meaningful public engagement with the project when they won't even make the data available for the public to review?

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



million could build 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.

Widespread Community Opposition: Despite ODOT's claims that this project "reconnects the community," there are numerous concerns about the surface-level bicycle and pedestrian facilities currently proposed. ODOT intends to remove the Flint Avenue crossing (one of the city's most popular bike commuting routes), the proposed "lids" over the freeway won't be strong enough to support buildings like the Albina Vision is proposing, and is opposed by all major bike/ped groups and local neighborhood organizations (we wrote a letter to Portland City Hall last year articulating the ways the surface-level street changes are not an improvement to the community).

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

Ask for a full Environmental Impact Statement. ODOT's truncated Environmental Assessment document simply isn't focused enough on the significant impacts to health and public safety this project represents. Asking ODOT to more fully study alternatives (including decongestion pricing!) to this expansion with a full Environmental Impact Statement should be an immediate priority..

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0227 Katherine Camp

**Comment:** I commute to Rose quarter nearly every day and therefore see the congestion surrounding the area. But investing in another highway expansion will just invite more cars to fill the lanes. Instead investments should be made to improve the efficiency and reach of public transportation. I take a bus to work which takes me nearly 4 times as long as it would to drive in a car, but by doing so I know I am decreasing traffic congestion and CO2 emissions caused by lament that they would take public transportation if it didn't increase their commute time so substantially, so perhaps we should look at that solution before adding more cars to the road ways.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0303 Katherin Jones

**Comment:** ODOT needs to do an honest environmental and health impact study on the expansion's effect on Harriet Tubman Middle School. The project should be halted until this is completed. This is the school that my children will attend, it is unacceptable to sacrifice their well being for a project that doesn't have clear benefits for the citizens of Portland.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0326 Katherine McGee

**Comment:** As a resident within a mile of the current i5 freeway, I am already at increased risks from excess air pollution due to heavy traffic. Adding more lanes to the freeway will not address the need to reduce our use of cars and cut back on single occupancy trips. We should be a city on the forefront of climate protection transportation planning. Instead we have planners willing to spend \$500 million to add lanes to a freeway where they do not live. More and more people living in cities are choosing not to own cars, seeking more environmentally sustainable transportation options. Where is the bus rapid transit? The carpool lane? The tolling for driving and polluting our air?

Then there is the additional scar on a neighborhood that was ripped apart with the first freeway construction. Destruction of street bridge crossings that are used by cyclists in one of the busiest biking route in the city. And cutting closer to a public middle School which only just installed an air filtration system to handle current freeway pollution.

This expansion is unacceptable and against the standards and goals of the residents of Portland. I urge oversight to reconsider continuing to fund this project.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0307 Katherine Mulles

**Comment:** Please do more research into the well-documented phenomenon of "induced demand." More lanes does not reduce traffic issues.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Katherine Schultz

*City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability*

**Comment:** The Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission (PSC) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Environmental Assessment of the I-5 Rose Quarter project.

After hearing your presentation at the March 26, 2019 PSC meeting and reviewing the comments of the City's Bicycle, Pedestrian and Streetcar Advisory Committees, as well as those of the Portland Parks Board, we have the following significant concerns:



-The surface street improvements are inconsistent with our Transportation System Plan (TSP) that prioritizes pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. Instead the project appears to impede these modes while it supports the flow of vehicular traffic. The final design should give priority to walking, biking and transit in accordance with Policy 9.6 of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan.

-The key land use objective of incorporating this project into the N/NE Quadrant Plan, relinking Albina in general and the Blanchard site in particular with the other parts the Rose Quarter, does not appear to be accomplished, with a single, auto-oriented (10 percent grade) street added as an East/West connection.

-We are skeptical of the project claims that proposed freeway travel improvements will not induce new demand, which would effectively erase or reverse claimed reductions in air toxins and greenhouse gas emissions.

We join the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees in calling for a full EIS and would specifically request consideration of a congestion pricing alternative.

**Attachments:** [2019 0401 Katherine Schultz](#)

## 2019 0226 Katherine Sherman

**Comment:** We need efficient, affordable, accessible public transit. NOT more freeways. More freeways will not solve our congestion problems and are against our values of social and environmental justice.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Katherine Wilkerson

**Comment:** Makes no sense to spend huge amounts of money on a project that creates more problems of congestion, pollution, and doesn't resolve traffic problems.

Oregon is losing a common sense denominator. As a 5th Generation Oregonian I am saddened many times with decisions that create more confusion and concerns.

Find better solutions!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Kathleen Youell

**Comment:** As a mother that has to take her son to Randall Children's Hospital for pediatric cardiac appointments, I have ridden right past Harriet Tubman Middle School. I cannot believe that a school is so close to a school when we know better! We know that transportation exhaust is the biggest contributor to Climate Change. We know that air pollution can increase asthma rates. We know better! ODOT should be leading the way with a plan to get the drivers AWAY from schools, not trying to induce demand. This is shameful.



I work hard to bike and bus my kids around, to bike or walk to do all my errands, and to only rent a car if we are going out of the Metro area. I'm not the only parent who is willing to do this work - - to completely change our lives and how we live them -- in order to safeguard my children's future. I'm sure the parents who have children attending Harriet Tubman want their kids to be able to breathe as much as I want mine to.

You need to stop this widening plan that connects I-5 to a new bridge across the Columbia. There is no funding for that bridge, and there is no reason for adding more lanes and drivers to this area. It won't help lungs or traffic or the planet. It is truly a no-win situation

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0301 Kathryn Levine

*Portland Streetcar*

**Comment:** Thank you -

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0225 Kathryn Midson

**Comment:** Expanding lanes on I5 makes no sense. By the time the expansion is completed in 2025, we will be living with the pretty well known effects of planet warming, and the expansion would be one more sad joke. If we are to survive and prosper on this planet, we need to think strategically. We shouldn't be building for the yesterday that got us in this predicament. Use some of the money to repair existing roads, but invest most of it in expanding public transit.

You claim this expansion would reduce pollution, but wouldn't the eventual bottleneck of the Columbia River bridge just slow traffic, albeit further on, moving the idling pollution into different neighborhoods?

I walked through a parking lot belonging to Fred Meyer on SE 26th. I would estimate 10 to 15% of cars had Washington plates. That's easily a bus full. Why not encourage businesses to provide bus service from Vancouver park and rides? Lots of larger employers could make it attractive, and Trimet could run the bus service getting around liability issues. I'm sure there are lots of good ideas to get the Vancouverites to their jobs and home again, and they are a significant portion of the congestion problem. Lastly, no one sensible believes the expansion could reduce pollution. Trains and buses do. Put our, OUR, money where real pollution reduction is.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0315 Kathryn Reynolds

**Comment:** I strongly oppose the proposed expansion of the freeway in the Rose Quarter. As the parent of a child who will soon be entering elementary school, I'm feeling suddenly very aware of the issue of air quality (and water quality for that matter) in our schools--and it is not



only short-sighted but completely INJUST to dump even more pollutants into the lungs of the kids at Harriet Tubman Middle School. Let's put this investment into safe neighborhood routes for kids to get to school, and into community projects that support climate resilience, instead!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Kathryn Sunderman

**Comment:** Freeway expansion is just stupid. It is the latest "bridge to nowhere" plan for this city. Grow, grow, grow. Let be Seattle when we grow up. For goodness sake, commit to public transit, sufficient bicycle routes, greenways and other future oriented methods of travel.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 Katie Ash

**Comment:** Message: I am deeply troubled by this \$500 million investment in fossil fuel infrastructure for our city. Not only will this project NOT improve traffic congestion, it is poisoning some of the most vulnerable children in our city--the kids at Harriet Tubman Elementary School, a community that has been disenfranchised by urban renewal projects for decades. With all of the research about climate change and the urgent need to cut fossil fuels and carbon emissions IMMEDIATELY, it is absolutely irresponsible and reprehensible to move forward with this project. I am currently pregnant with my first child, and I am terrified of the world that my son will be growing up in. A world with scarcity of food and water, with climate change refugees, rising sea levels, and unpredictable weather patterns. This is happening within our lifetimes and certainly within the lifetimes of our children. We must prioritize the environment, invest in public transit, bike lanes, walking paths, and alternative forms of transportation. Please halt this freeway expansion immediately and redirect these funds to sustainable uses that will better serve our city and future generations. Thank you, Katie Ash

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0318 Katie Mello

**Comment:** I feel that this is a necessary project, but please work with Portland Public Schools to make this right for Harriet Tubman School. That school is very close to the freeway, air quality and noise are a big concern. The hill that it is on seems unstable as it is, much less cutting some of it away. Portland is growing, and the school population is growing. This school is important. Please do right by this school in your plans, do not cause problems that will need to be fixed by PPS taking more money away from students.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Katrina Scotto di Carlo

**Comment:** I'd like to add to the comment pile requesting that the city does not move forward with this plan. Apart from transparency concerns with the process, we need to be moving away



from concepts like freeway expansion and towards concepts that recognize the growing crisis of climate change.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Katy Kolker et al

*350 PDX*

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

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

The source of this climate damage is not some faraway event -- climate change is the sum result of every-day actions and our responsibility is to immediately and collectively cease contributing actions. We must make immediate and significant steps to eliminate existing sources of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, including eliminating the use of fossil-fuel vehicles.

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

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

Transportation emissions already comprise 40% of Oregon’s greenhouse gas emissions. Despite increasingly rigorous GHG emissions requirements for cars and light trucks, the transportation-related GHGs contribution to the State’s GHG emissions rose from 35% in 2014 due to increased vehicle-miles travelled. The region’s population is forecasted to increase by 390,000 people by 2050, and it is imperative that we develop a transportation network that accommodates these new residents without any additional vehicle miles traveled and any increase in associated emissions. Incredibly, the environmental assessment (EA) of the project claims that the project will not increase vehicle miles traveled and will result in decreased GHG emissions! Such bold claims require exceptional evidence and ODOT’s description of methods, results, and data in the EA to justify these findings is inadequate. To decarbonize our transportation sector, we must fully redirect our resources towards investments in walkable



communities connected by frequent, reliable public transportation. As many local transportation advocacy organizations have pointed out, this project actually worsens commute times for the transit lines that pass through the neighborhood. It's simply disingenuous to invest half a billion dollars in a transportation project in the center of Oregon's densest city and claim that this project has any benefits to carbon reduction.

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Katy Kolker, 350PDX Interim Executive Director



Chris Palmer, 350PDX Volunteer & Communications Coordinator

Jessie Maran, 350PDX Volunteer

Jesse Lopez, 350PDX Volunteer

**Attachments:** [2019 0401 Katy Kolker et al ATT](#)

## 2019 0326 Katy Liljeholm

**Comment:** Our cities exist in a valley. I was shocked by the poor air quality when I moved here. And it absolutely affects my family's health. When my husband started working downtown, he developed asthma. In his thirties. Now my youngest has it, too. I am deeply concerned that freeway expansions would increase pollution. It would simply be yet another highway that cars are idling on during rush hour. Adding a highway will do nothing to alleviate traffic congestion. Please engage in a better, evidence-based project.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0307 Katy Wolf

**Comment:** I am opposed to this project for many reasons. I will submit verbal and further written testimony/comment. This project is a GREY OLD DEAL and we need GREEN NEW DEALS If we're going to survive climate change. \$500 million can be so much better spent on transportation demand management and public transit & biking.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 Katy Wolf

*Boise Neighborhood Board Land Use and Transportation committee member*

**Comment:** My name is Katy Wolf. I serve as a Boise Neighborhood Board Land Use and Transportation committee member, and I'm adamantly opposed to this project continuing forward. This is a kind of backwards thinking paradigm that other smarter cities have already rejected. And it's Orwellian marketing language that gaslights you into thinking it's a good idea. Don't be fooled. This project's environmental assessment report is strikingly lacking in transparency. None of the math behind their glowing traffic congestion, air pollution results are shown.

Remember in math class when you had to show your work? Why wouldn't we require ODOT to show their work on a half a billion dollar project? How are we to believe that by adding square footage to the freeway, thereby increasing traffic. There's a well-known and proven concept of induced demand that we would not be worsening air pollution and toxic air emissions from diesel fuel. It's insulting.

A study last year showed that Oregon's air emissions are steadily increasing. Transportation being the largest factor. This project markets itself as improving safer street-level infrastructure for bikes, pedestrians and transit, but grass-roots experts like economist Joe Cortright and



Jonathan Maus, founder of Bike Portland, examined this project and found it is not actually doing any of these things and would make these problems worse.

And who will get hit first and worst by this increased pollution? Oh, yes, children of color. The children of Harriet Tubman School will have this freeway right in their backyard. Right now it's unsafe for them to even play outside at recess. ODOT claims you can mitigate the increased air issues with a freeway wall covered in some plants. That is not social and environmental justice. That us just sad.

The most fatal flaw of this environmental assessment is the glaring omission of congestion pricing as a project alternative. Other cities that have tried freeway expansion are now turning to congestion pricing, the only proven method of improving congestion. Maybe we can learn from their mistakes. This environmental assessment is a marketing sham and should be a wakeup call to anyone who thought this project might have some merit.

At the very least, a full environmental impact statement should required to address these issues. But if we have any backbone, we should be telling ODOT to put a hard pause on it while we wait for congestion pricing to take effect and be studied. At any time there are plenty of ways to actually improve safety in this area without pitching our right. It's a disastrous project.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Katy Wolf

*Boise Neighborhood Board Land Use and Transportation Committee*

**Comment:** My name is Katy Wolf, and I serve as a Boise Neighborhood board and Land Use and Transportation Committee Member. And I am adamantly opposed to this project continuing forward without a full Environmental Impact Statement. I expressly want to address our City and State elected leadership: Don't be fooled by the marketing language about solving congestion and reconnecting neighborhoods. Your constituents need you to put some badly needed scrutiny on this boondoggle. We expect you to hold ODOT accountable, and for you to follow your commitments to environmentalism, equity, and smart planning.

This project purports to solve a congestion bottleneck. It does not. Through public records requests, transportation activists have found that the traffic modeling is highly skewed towards their desired outcomes. By now, numerous news articles have uncovered the hidden assumptions in the Environmental Assessment, which are a violation of the NEPA process. Assumptions like the construction and completion of a \$3 billion Columbia River Crossing project. When the same traffic modeling showed a similar, previous project on I-5 near Lombard would solve congestion, reality after the fact showed that congestion did not improve, and collisions actually increased. The traffic modeling also does not account for "induced demand", a proven and accepted traffic problem whereby adding capacity adds more usage. Through induced demand we get the same or worse traffic, worsen air pollution and toxic air emissions from diesel fuel. Why are we allowing ODOT to continue to use this flawed modeling, and accept its conclusions?



A study last year showed that Oregon's air emissions are steadily increasing, transportation being the largest factor. This project markets itself as improving safer street level infrastructure for bikes, pedestrians and transit, but grassroots experts like economist Joe Cortright and Jonathan Maus, founder of Bike Portland, examined this project and found it is not actually doing any of these things, and would make these problems worse.

Who will get hit first and worst by this increased pollution? Children of color. The children of Harriet Tubman School have this freeway right in their backyard. Right now it's unsafe for them to even play outside at recess. ODOT claims they can mitigate the increased air issues with a freeway wall covered in some plants. That is not social and environmental justice. That is just sad.

The most fatal flaw to this Environmental Assessment is the glaring omission of "congestion pricing" as a project alternative. Other cities that have tried freeway expansion are now turning to congestion pricing, the only proven method of reducing congestion. Can we learn from their mistakes?

This Environmental Assessment is a marketing sham that should be a wake up call to anyone who thought this project might have some merit. At the very least, a full Environmental Impact Statement should be required, to address these issues. But if we have any backbone, we should be telling ODOT to put a "hard pause" on it while we wait for congestion pricing to take effect and be studied. In the meantime, there are plenty of ways to actually improve safety in this area without hitching our wagon to this disastrous project.

Thank you.

Katy Wolf

**Attachments:** [2019 0331 Katy Wolf ATT](#)

## 2019 0331 Katy Wolf

*Boise Neighborhood Board Land Use and Transportation Committee*

**Comment:** My name is Katy Wolf, and I serve as a Boise Neighborhood board and Land Use and Transportation Committee Member. And I am adamantly opposed to this project continuing forward without a full Environmental Impact Statement. I expressly want to address our City and State elected leadership: Don't be fooled by the marketing language about solving congestion and reconnecting neighborhoods. Your constituents need you to put some badly needed scrutiny on this boondoggle. We expect you to hold ODOT accountable, and for you to follow your commitments to environmentalism, equity, and smart planning.

This project purports to solve a congestion bottleneck. It does not. Through public records requests, transportation activists have found that the traffic modeling is highly skewed towards their desired outcomes. By now, numerous news articles have uncovered the hidden assumptions in the Environmental Assessment, which are a violation of the NEPA process. Assumptions like the construction and completion of a \$3 billion Columbia River Crossing project. When the same traffic modeling showed a similar, previous project on I-5 near Lombard



would solve congestion, reality after the fact showed that congestion did not improve, and collisions actually increased. The traffic modeling also does not account for induced demand, a proven and accepted traffic problem whereby adding capacity adds more usage. Through induced demand we get the same or worse traffic, worsen air pollution and toxic air emissions from diesel fuel. Why are we allowing ODOT to continue to use this flawed modeling, and accept its conclusions?

A study last year showed that Oregon's air emissions are steadily increasing, transportation being the largest factor. This project markets itself as improving safer street level infrastructure for bikes, pedestrians and transit, but grassroots experts like economist Joe Cortright and Jonathan Maus, founder of Bike Portland, examined this project and found it is not actually doing any of these things, and would make these problems worse.

Who will get hit first and worst by this increased pollution? Children of color. The children of Harriet Tubman School have this freeway right in their backyard. Right now it's unsafe for them to even play outside at recess. ODOT claims they can mitigate the increased air issues with a freeway wall covered in some plants. That is not social and environmental justice. That is just sad.

The most fatal flaw to this Environmental Assessment is the glaring omission of congestion pricing as a project alternative. Other cities that have tried freeway expansion are now turning to congestion pricing, the only proven method of reducing congestion. Can we learn from their mistakes?

This Environmental Assessment is a marketing sham that should be a wake up call to anyone who thought this project might have some merit. At the very least, a full Environmental Impact Statement should be required, to address these issues. But if we have any backbone, we should be telling ODOT to put a hard pause on it while we wait for congestion pricing to take effect and be studied. In the meantime, there are plenty of ways to actually improve safety in this area without hitching our wagon to this disastrous project.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Kavan Bahrami

**Comment:** I would prefer to see expanded public transit, ex. bring back the TriMet 'free zone' to encourage and support the use of public transit. Also, a \$ fare for those coming into town from from out of state! The congestion on 5 though the NE is caused by Vancouver traffic.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Kayci Murray-Balto

**Comment:** Hi ODOT,

As a born and raised Oregonian I am proud of our history of environmental justice and valuing the climate. Last year I decided to move my new son and husband from Boston back to



Portland. I am very disappointed to have learned that Oregon wants to spend \$500 million dollars on a highway project making it easier for people to drive.

This is not the future I want for my new son. We know that global warming is a real immediate concern. Making it easier for people to drive is not the solution. We need to invest in transit and bike lanes so dependency of driving can be drastically reduced.

I am also the Health teacher at Harriet Tubman Middle School. My classroom looks out over the highway and my students spend time looking out of the window often. They frequently comment about the pollution from the trucks and cars. I often have to take questions from the students asking me what the health impacts are of having a highway so close to the school building. I don't have many resources to reference, to answer their questions. If ODOT would decide to do an Environmental Impact Assessment I might have a better tool to use to answer their questions. Sadly, ODOT has not done a EIA for this project. My students know when they are being lied to and right now I feel like this whole school community is being lied to. What are you hiding?

Finally, my husband rides his bike daily and we don't own a second car because it is safe enough for him to ride. However, as a new bike rider I don't feel like there are enough safe places for me to ride. I would like to ride more because of the health and environmental benefits.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0000 Kaylee Friggin

*Local 196 Piledriver*

**Comment:** I am for this proposition because it will create jobs for construction workers and stimulate the economy. This will reduce travel time and increase safety for bicyclists and merging traffic.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0319 Kayleigh O'Hara

**Comment:** It's extremely concerning that ODOT is considering expanding I-5 in the Rose Quarter, and I am strongly opposed to this decision.

The first issue is air pollution and its health impacts. Air quality in the area is already so poor that students can't enjoy a normal recess break ([https://s3.amazonaws.com/arc-wordpress-client-uploads/wwweek/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/05143206/Tubman-PSU\\_HTMSReport\\_Phase1-Outdoor-Monitoring\\_Final.pdf](https://s3.amazonaws.com/arc-wordpress-client-uploads/wwweek/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/05143206/Tubman-PSU_HTMSReport_Phase1-Outdoor-Monitoring_Final.pdf)). Expanding the freeway would only increase the current, unacceptably high level of pollution. Who would pay to mitigate that? Who would pay for increased healthcare costs for children (and other sensitive groups) in the area?



Second, we have less than 12 years left to ease the worst impacts of climate change. Given that transportation is a huge source of emissions in Oregon, we should be adding sidewalks & bike lanes and expanding access to public transportation. We should NOT be expanding freeways.

Third, widening I-5 wouldn't help with congestion issues (<https://www.portlandmercury.com/news/2018/03/07/19724128/a-new-report-shows-highway-widening-wont-solve-portlands-congestion-woes>). If this project isn't actually solving a problem, and is instead exacerbating existing problems, what's the point?

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Kayleigh O'Hara

**Comment:** Please, please reconsider the proposed Rose Quarter freeway expansion. I've submitted one comment already opposing the expansion, but upon learning that the traffic projections cited to justify the expansion are inflated and inaccurate (<https://www.opb.org/news/article/odot-used-long-dead-i-5-bridge-replacement-to-plan-rose-quarter-upgrade/>), I wanted to speak out again. We simply cannot afford this project!

For those of us who spend time outdoors around Rose Quarter, all of the traffic pollution has a noticeable impact on respiratory health. I have felt my nose and lungs burning after a run in the area, and not the good kind of burn one expects from exercise. It's my only route to the esplanade, though.

Beyond the everyday health impacts, the climate implications of this project are disastrous. The transportation sector is one of the biggest sources of greenhouse gas emissions in our state. Increasing those emissions is the last thing we should be doing. As someone whose generation will be the among first to see the worst impacts of climate change begin, I'm already terrified. We have to do everything we can to stop climate change NOW, while there's still time, and that includes preventing any more freeway expansions. Tolling, bike lanes, pedestrian routes, and public transportation are all better, cheaper, and healthier alternatives for our communities and the world.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Kaytee Arnold

**Comment:** While the traffic in Portland has become rather frustrating, building yet another freeway, spending money, increasing our fossil fuel footprint and having yet another construction project around Portland is not the answer. We should be focusing on making the bike lanes/paths safer and getting the word out about biking, walking and public transportation. It is time to think outside of the box instead of the recycling the same ideas of just building more and expanding as this is no longer the best answer for the city. If Portland truly has all this money to spend on a useless road that will solve 0 problems, it can be invested in so many other great outlets like after school programs, the arts, more bike paths, etc.



It's time to start thinking critically about these problems and how we can truly improve the city rather than jumping to the easiest but the best solution.

I hope you will challenge yourselves to be better than this.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0307 KC Eisenberg

**Comment:** My daughter will be entering kindergarten this fall. Like many parents, I feel tremendous anxiety about her safety as she makes this important transition. But my fears aren't limited to the unpredictable threats of school shootings or the risks to her health from attending public schools in polluted areas. No, the biggest threat facing my daughter is predictable, inescapable, and entirely catastrophic: It is climate change.

According to a report released by scientists at the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change last October, we have only twelve years to curb carbon emissions enough to avoid the worst effects of global warming. So by the time that today's first-graders are graduating from high school, the opportunity to make enough changes to avert global climate chaos will be over.

My daughter, two years behind these students, will graduate from high school and emerge into a world where her fate has been written by the people making decisions about carbon-polluting projects today. Will today's decision-makers choose to build a world that enables her to live with the same security and stability that we currently enjoy, a world where she can enjoy watching her own children grow?

Or will they decide instead to increase carbon pollution, setting my daughter up for a life of instability, food and water shortages, and resource competition that history indicates will lead to major conflicts and quite likely global war? These are the anxieties facing the parents of small children today.

It is because I want my daughter to enjoy a future of stability and safety that I strongly oppose ODOT's plan for expanding I-5 in the Rose Quarter. All evidence indicates that this misguided attempt to alleviate congestion will increase carbon pollution, in both the short and long term, while doing little to address the traffic problems it purports to solve. According to data from other ODOT expansion projects on I-5, and from many other freeway widening projects in other American cities, this project will have either no impact or a negative impact on the very problems it says it will solve.

There are many ways that our state can spend \$450 million of our taxpayers' money. Improving mass transit and accessibility in underserved areas, expanding light-rail systems to connect urban and suburban areas, improving pedestrian and bike infrastructure and safety throughout the state—it doesn't take much imagination to find better ways to invest this money. And however it is spent, our elected officials should ensure that it results in a net decrease of carbon emissions in our state.

It is unconscionable, with the evidence we have about climate change and the threat it poses to us and our world, that ODOT would even propose a freeway expansion project. In an era of



rampant corruption and misspent tax dollars, a person can't help but wonder what back-room deals between ODOT officials and their wealthy contractor friends this proposal is really meant to fulfill.

It is for these reasons that I strongly oppose ODOT's I-5 expansion project, and I hope that this ill-advised project is brought to an abrupt close.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 Keil Johnson

*Friends of the Green Loop*

**Comment:** Hello, my name is Keil Johnson. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak here today. I'm the co-director and founder of the Friends of the Green Loop. Our mission is to advocate for the completion of the green loop through the central city. The green loop is a circular park from the Tillicum to the Broadway Bridge. The I-5 Rose Quarter project would go cross on Clackamas and will help the green loop and you mentioned it in your video. The Friends of the Green Loop do not support this project because it will continue I-5's legacy of environmental injustice, and we urge you to start over. Around 40 percent of our greenhouse gases that are burned in the state come from transportation. We cannot afford to build transportation projects that do not dramatically reduce this number. According to your own environmental assessment, this project would only reduce our emissions by .2 percent. To all of the people in this room who are working on this project, I ask you to consider what you will tell your children or your grandchildren when they ask what you did to stop climate change. Will you be able to look them in the face knowing that you helped spend \$500 million on a transportation project which does so little to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions?

Building this project would continue the death of our future and we have no alternative but to fight you for it. The green loop is about Portland's commitment to sustainability. This project is about a bureaucracy and its leaders who are stuck in the past. We already tried building freeways through our cities and it does not work. We need transportation leaders who understand the challenges of the future and do not continue to build out some 1950's fantasy.

To those of you who pushed for this project, know that your time in power is coming to an end. The young people in this room and the state are smarter and better at organizing than you, and we will eventually win. We will win because we have nothing to lose. Your failure to lead on pressing issues we face leaves us no other choice. We only get a few chances in our lifetime to invest this much money in how we move around. Let's start over and make sure we get it right.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Keil Mueller

**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 0326 Keith Alnwick

**Comment:** Good day to you,

I'm writing to express my heartfelt opposition to the Rose Quarter freeway expansion. I've lived in Portland for 20 years and I've seen congestion get to extremes that I left other cities to avoid. But expansion is not the answer. Even if there is a short term reduction on emissions due to logjams, long term analysis suggests we will only be in the same place, or worse, a few years down the line. If you have money to spend, spend it on truly transformational initiatives.

Fund improved mass transit services up and down the I-5 and I-84 corridors. Fund affordable housing in our city that will alleviate congestion, pollution, promote livability, and true 20 minute neighborhoods as mandated by the PDX 2040 plan. Consider a single user vehicle toll and/or congestion pricing to incentivize alternate transit options and ride-sharing. Find better ways to route industrial and freight traffic outside the city center. Incentivize businesses to develop flex time and work from home initiatives. And before you spend a dime on the RQ, consider it will all be meaningless if you don't build a multi-modal and earthquake resilient bridge system over the Columbia and Willamette. It may be simpler to not involve our neighbors to the north in your development plans, but it doesn't make it a wise use of our resources.

I love this place dearly and I want it to be a model to the world, and a center of innovation as we all face massive challenges. Don't think like Robert Moses, be like Tom McCall. Do this the Oregon Way.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0217 Keith Liden

**Comment:** Looks like pedestrian/bike access has the potential to be significantly better. It all will all depend on final design details. The connections for the new ped/bike bridge aren't that clear. The traffic analysis regarding downstream impacts on I-5/I-84 seems a bit too limited. If cars are getting through here faster, they appear all but certain to bunch up (technical term) downstream on I-84 from I-5 to 33rd and I-5 from I-84 to I-405. \$500 million is a lot to spend when the death rate (not simply fender benders) is worse on other portions of the state system. Overall, I think the money should be spent on more serious safety problems.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0402 Kelcie Fletcher

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

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0226 Kellee Anderson

**Comment:** Come on, ODOT. This is not a good solution. Everyone knows it, and you likely do too. Back to the drawing board. Find a better way. Thank you for your time.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0307 Kelley Gardiner

**Comment:** I'm a homeowner in East Portland, a driver, and a parent of two small children. We don't need any freeway expansions. We need sidewalks.

When all the research shows that creating more capacity just increases the number of cars, why is this even a question?

As a East Portland resident who doesn't commute every day, I'd love to see the addition of some express buses to my neck of the woods. Safe, attractive transit hubs for transfers would make the experience better, too. Dedicated bike lanes are great, too. I might just get my bike out of storage if it felt safer to travel that way.

But what I'd love to do most with precious transportation dollars would be to add sidewalks in my neighborhood. It's a challenge to talk less than half a mile to the bus stop with my toddler and preschooler, because we have to walk three blocks out of our way or negotiate a dangerous walking situation along a busy street with no sidewalk.

More sidewalks for kids. Fewer freeways. We need safety and community, not car capacity.

s

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Kellie Russ

**Comment:** I live in Tigard, but I work in North Portland. I travel I-5 every day. I do not want the widening project as it will affect the neighborhoods of the people I serve. I would rather have to take 45 minutes to get home than widen the freeway. It is a temporary solution that will be outdated by the time it is completed. Encourage more bus use, expand the MAX into SW, and stop destroying our city and our urban neighborhoods in the name of more \$\$\$\$.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0302 Kelly Brignell

**Comment:** Portland MUST reconsider freeway expansion plans in the light of our CLIMATE CRISIS ....IMMEDIATELY. The expansion of any fossil fuel reliant infrastructure is a DISASTROUS MISTAKE. Alternative - fossil free -solutions to transportation deserve these dollars - NOT FREEWAY EXPANSION that is extremely harmful on multiple levels!



Thank you for your commitment to a fast track for a GREEN OREGON. The next US President will undoubtedly mandate emergency climate remediation and Oregon will not have wasted precious funds on obsolete and dangerous fossil fuel reliant infrastructure - but rather been insightful and committed to progressive solutions for our future.

Thank you.

Kelly Brignell - Portland

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Kelly Francois

**Comment:** When I moved my family to Portland from Louisiana 5 years ago, we were looking for a different lifestyle. What attracted us to Portland was the tremendous active and public transit culture. Coming from a car dominated city (Baton Rouge) we were enthralled with the idea of exploring a city that had other transportation options other than a personal vehicle. I was thrilled to hear about how innovative Portland was with finding a way to spend highway funds to build a light rail system! Now, in a sad comparison, Portland and my hometown of Baton Rouge are both attempting to solve traffic woes by building more car infrastructure (Rose Quarter highway expansion). I know that Baton Rouge will make the ill informed choice to spend hundreds of millions to create induced demand. I'm hoping that wisdom will prevail here in Portland, and the \$500 million will be invested in projects that will actually help alleviate climate change, will encourage more people to find alternatives to getting around (other than private vehicle) and will make all of us safer. Expanding the Rose Quarter interstate will only add MORE cars, will induce demand for more traffic, will spend a tremendous amount of our limited resources and worsen our air quality. Let's not be like Baton Rouge, let's learn from how disastrous car culture is to our environment, and let's invest in changes that will actually help our city!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0307 Kelly McNutt

**Comment:** Neighborhood has been a growing area for a while and proposed changes will continue to propel it into positive change.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0226 Kelly Ohanley

**Comment:** Let's tackle climate chaos.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Kelly Ohanley

**Comment:** Let's invest in public transportation. Not more freeways. Thank you.



**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0328 Kelly Reed

**Comment:** The EA demonstrates very little improvement on any measure for a tremendous amount of money. I believe congestion pricing could provide more benefits to all parties and would create the type of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities we need to face our future. The EA's alternative to build was "no build" instead of an actual alternative or alternatives. If our goal is to reduce weaving and improve safety, let's look at alternatives such as eliminating some on and off ramps altogether. Let's look at congestion pricing. Let's look at projects that would actually meet our climate goals. I understand that the funding was allocated for this particular project. But it's not too late for the legislature to reconsider. The impact on Harriet Tubman school, the 10% grade pedestrian connection, the construction impacts, and the questionable need for this very costly project are all reasons to conduct an EIS instead of an EA. The EIS should look at real alternatives and should consider the impact of congestion pricing. Thank you for your public service.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Kelsey Baker

**Comment:** My name is Kelsey Baker and I live in the Eliot neighborhood in North Portland. I'm contacting you to request that you complete a full Environmental Impact Statement for the I-5 Rose Quarter "Improvement" Project, to more candidly inform the public of the project's impact. Currently, the shorter Environmental Assessment has too many holes and loose ends to provide a clear picture of how our neighborhood will be impacted. The current report fails to include the use of CRC traffic data in the environmental assessment that was released last month.

Thank you for considering the residents of this neighborhood as you move forward in the process for this project.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Kelsey Baker

**Comment:** My name is Kelsey Baker and I live in the Eliot neighborhood in North Portland. I'm contacting you to request that you complete a full Environmental Impact Statement for the I-5 Rose Quarter "Improvement" Project, to more candidly inform the public of the project's impact. Currently, the shorter Environmental Assessment has too many holes and loose ends to provide a clear picture of how our neighborhood will be impacted. The current report fails to include the use of CRC traffic data in the environmental assessment that was released last month.

Thank you for considering the residents of this neighborhood as you move forward in the process for this project.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0401 Kemper Shrout

**Comment:** We need to focus on infrastructure that focuses on improving and expanding mass transit and on protected bike lane and expanding and roads that are motor-vehicle free. Our world is getting hotter and CO2 emissions NEED to be reduced drastically and quickly.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0307 Kent Boden

**Comment:** Project is a huge benefit to all commuters traveling the I-5 in Rose Quarter. Thank you for all your work to make this project a reality.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0402 Kerry

**Comment:** I do not support this project based on the information in the Environmental Analysis. I believe that the data that the EA is based on is not sufficient enough to move forward with this project. An Environmental Impact Statement is needed to provide more information to the local community based on traffic, air quality, health impacts, and other topics

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Kerry Aszklar

**Comment:** Hello -

I am writing to express opposition to the I-5 Rose Quarter "Improvement" Project. This project and its environmental assessment do not address the issues that it claims to.

Expanding the highway will only induce demand and increase the number of cars that use it, which will lead back to the original "issue" of safety on I-5. This EA also does not examine other alternatives such as congestion pricing. Additionally, the build option of the EA makes bold assumptions of automobile traffic based on the building of many, many transportation projects in the area, which does not make sense. For one, it assumes that all projects in Metro's 2035 Transportation System Plan will be constructed, including the Columbia River Crossing project, which has died years ago and has not been revisited thoroughly for this project to make assumptions on.

The air quality aspect to this EA is not robust. It assumes that fleet emissions will be cleaner from AVs and electric personal cars, but this is assuming too much. Additionally, I-5 is used by many industrial trucks that run on diesel, which does not help air quality.

Lastly, bicycle and pedestrian "benefits" from this project are not thorough and do not help the experience of those walking or bicycling. As a regular bicycle commuter, I know that this project will not help.

A full environmental impact statement is needed for this project.



Thank you,

Kerry

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Kevin Burke

**Comment:** I oppose freeway expansion. We have twelve years to cut carbon emissions to avoid a hellscape of fire and flooding. Widening freeways will worsen carbon pollution and air quality. Please go back to the drawing board and figure out more ways to get people out of cars and onto buses and bikes.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0402 Kevin Chambers

**Comment:** I write as an Oregonian and Portlander who is concerned that ODOT's environmental assessment for its I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project fails to adequately describe the impacts of the project or sufficiently evaluate alternatives to alleviate congestion in the project area.

The EA focuses on benefits for car and highway users and does not properly address potential negative impacts for other road users in the area. It also does nothing to undo the historical damage wrought by the original I-5 construction.

At a time when it's increasingly critical that we curtail the transportation sector's production of greenhouse gases, the EA does not consider the very real possibility that other more effective tools exist that will maintain community mobility, reduce congestion, and also reduce carbon emissions. These options include more robust transit and a well-designed tolling scheme during periods of peak highway use.

I believe what is needed is a deep reworking of this project so that it can successfully meet several critical outcomes: reduce congestion, with a particular focus on prioritizing freight over commuters who could be served by transit;

reduce carbon emissions; improve access and mobility in the larger project area, with priority given to pedestrians and users of high-efficiency, small-footprint vehicles such as bicycles; actively address the historic damage done to the lower Albina neighborhood, for example through creating infrastructure that can support the return of a high density residential neighborhood as described by the Albina Vision.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0000 Kevin Johnson

**Comment:** 1-5 Ramp Comments



1. I regularly bicycle and drive for business through this area. After studying the maps, I fail to see anyplace close to \$500 million in value in changes.
2. A highway dependent city is not the city that will attract the kind of industry and employers we need and want. Like with the legacy of Robert Moses in New York, so many regret his highway projects. The damage that kind of planning and its negative effects played out for decades and still drive uncomfortable and expensive choices. This sort of project seems like it has some (too much?) of his DNA.
3. It's sad but the Albina neighborhood as it was has been destroyed. It's done. Statistics documenting displacement, gentrification, and change demonstrate that conclusively. Despite the wrong that was done, a highway project won't bring that back - ever. Money put in very different kinds of projects could be a start. Building streets or ramps as some sort apology seems like fake empathy or faux apology.
4. The other project aspects seem to be minor carrots. Funds could be more effectively used elsewhere with more power and impact.
5. This is a waste of taxpayer dollars. To allege it would bring all sorts of wonderful benefits is to ignore the opportunity cost and how one might actually spend \$500 million in a far more meaningful and impactful way.
6. We have not tried congestion pricing. If successful, we won't need this project. That seems a far more prudent plan and next step. Having lived in other cities that built new freeways to ease congestion, things seemed better for a month or two, then things were as worse, if not much worse in regard to traffic and delays.
7. NO.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0319 Kevin Johnson

**Comment:** A freeway expansion locks our state into a car based world for the rest of your and our lifetimes. When we could imagine spending \$500,000,000 on freeway expansion or a host of things that would have greater, longer, and more powerful multiplier effects in terms of people and our long term health, it seems FOLLY and IGNORANT to spend it on roads, not people or other infrastructure that is far more meaningful. This is one of the defining choices our state will make. Let's not squander the choice.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Kevin Kaufman

**Comment:** Freeway expansions are NOT where we need to put our investment dollars. Spend the money on housing.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0330 Kevin Oleson

**Comment:** After reviewing the website on this project, I support it. I-5 hasn't seen improvements in this area since I was a kid in the 60's.

Time to make I-5 safer.

Kevin Oleson

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Kevin Rudiger

**Comment:** I strongly oppose the widening of I-5 in the Rose Quarter. Our State talks a lot about stepping up to take on climate change. Widening a freeway just moves us in the wrong direction. What's more, this won't solve congestion, as freeway expansions across the country and the world have shown us. We can and should tackle the issue of congestion - through continued investment in transit, bike infrastructure and other alternatives. Widening our freeways is not the way forward.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Kevin Schaper

**Comment:** I oppose freeway expansion. We have known since the 50's that it will only induce demand. Climate change necessitates that we stop spending money to increase the movement of cars and instead spend it on the efficient movement of people. My family is making the choice to sell our ICE car for a low range electric knowing that when we go to Portland we'll go by train and use bikes and transit when we get there. Stop building like it's the 1960s and recognize what the future holds.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Kevin Vandemore

**Comment:** Hello,

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to provide written testimony on the proposed Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion. Upon consideration of the proposal I must respectfully, but forcibly, register my firm opposition to the current plan.

We in the Portland area (and Oregon in general) have been blessed to find ourselves living in areas of abundant beauty. We have easy access to nature, our environmental quality is (comparably) high, and our communities are held up (rightly so) for the livability and high quality of life they afford.

I'm afraid this project directly challenges those very things that have helped to make our home so desirable. I, along with many others, have seen first-hand how we have struggled to



accommodate the growth in population. And I, along with many others, am often frustrated by the congestion that plagues our community.

There is a real desire “and need” to do something to alleviate congestion, but we know that expanding freeways is not a good answer to our problems.

Expanding the freeway will lead to more automobile use which will have a direct and measurable impact to our environment, our communities, and our treasured way of life. Climate change is real, and at a time when we see our state literally burning “and more and more so each year.” I cannot believe this push to expand this freeway has gone as far as it has.

To say nothing of the existential threat of climate change, we have problems with air quality in inner-Portland, where I live, and I am afraid expanding auto use will certainly in the long-run lead to increased pollution—for me, my neighbors, and the community, to say nothing of the students and teachers at Harriet Tubman Middle School.

In addition to the environmental impact of expanding freeways, even if climate change were not real, or if the adoption of zero-emission vehicles was rapid and sudden, who wants to live surrounded by a freeway mega project? Building such infrastructure isn't conducive to a good quality of life, and I believe it will lock future generations into a built environment of auto-dependency and urban sprawl. In the 21st century, there are proven alternatives to combat congestion and traffic.

Before we plunge head-long into this expansion, please tap the brakes and let's consider this thoughtfully. Please perform a full Environmental Impact Statement, and please consider what impact decongestion pricing would have on the Rose Quarter.

Decongestion pricing is a reasonable, fiscally responsible market-based tool that will help ensure that those who want to use our roadway resources, pay for that resource. We may find, when we're done, there is no need for this costly project at all.

My perspectives and opinion come from being a long-time resident of the Portland area. I've a genuine love for our community and I'm greatly concerned about the type of legacy this Project, if it were completed as proposed, would leave to future generations.

Although much more can be said, I hope the above will suffice. Thank you for the opportunity to provide written testimony on the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0330 Khanh Pham

**Comment:** This freeway expansion will clearly increase pollution and not even solve our problems. We need to spend \$500 million on increasing access to public transportation. We've got 11 years to make drastic changes in how we move around, and this is moving us in the exactly wrong direction. Please listen to the community.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0326 Khris Soden

**Comment:** As someone who is very concerned about combating the effects of climate change, I feel very strongly that the I5 Rose Quarter expansion plans should not happen. We should be using alternatives such as congestion pricing to reduce unnecessary auto trips on this section of the freeway. Even outside of the environmental damage that this project would cause, this is a massive amount of public money that would be of a benefit mainly to auto users, with minor to no benefit to people that don't use cars for transportation.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0307 Kiel Johnson

**Comment:** Try congestion pricing first!!! Here will always be demand for freeways in the central city and this project will just create more demand. So many more critical improvements that should be prioritized. Show us your data.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Kiel Johnson

**Comment:** I am writing to comment on the I-5 Rose Quarter project. I do not support this project and am very concerned that you used traffic data that included a new and wider Columbia River crossing bridge in your assessment. Completing a similar project at Rose Parks has not reduced congestion (especially Northbound). We need to try everything else in the tool book before we start widening freeways. Implement Congestion Pricing first, invest in better bicycling and transit, ODOT needs to be an active part in encouraging density which will result in shorter commutes and less congestion on our transportation system. This project will not solve our region's transportation problems and I hope you reconsider it.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0328 Kim Kauzer

**Comment:** Please do not expand the freeway! It will increase pollution and will not actually decrease congestion. Please spend that money expanding public transit or making more greenways. This will not solve the problem!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0313 Kim Nurmi

**Comment:** Comment: I strongly support your project on many levels but particularly regarding freeway access for ambulances going to Emmanuel as much traffic in north Portland will soon be diverted for bicycles. This lack of access could cost many healthcare dollars not to mention human tragedy. Thank you for your good work., Many people support you but do not have the time the bike advocates have to testify.



**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Kim Slack

**Comment:** This project will be a waste of money and will not alleviate traffic congestion.

Use the money to improve bus lines instead.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 Kimber Nelson

**Comment:** I am very concerned that the proposed freeway expansion has not taken into account serious community concerns and likely does not provide enough community benefit to justify its cost.

ODOT has failed to make the case for why this project should move forward. Expanding freeways does not reduce congestion or help decarbonize our transportation system. 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.

As a public health nurse I am also concerned at the human safety issues that are not being addressed. The project will further worsen air pollution at Harriet Tubman Middle school, which already has some of the worst air quality in the state. And 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. There are much better uses of our money, creativity, and time.

Kimber Nelson

Brentwood-Darlington neighborhood

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Kimberly Nurmi

**Comment:** I am approving of the general project. I am very, very concerned about emergency access to Emanuel hospital via emergency vehicles and private cars .So many traffic diversions ,speed bumps are making emergency air cars to many of Portland's hospitals difficult and his project help acces to Emmanuel hospital .Also without the freeway expansion it would seem there would be more idling of cars resulting in more enviromentle impacts. To sum up my option I agree with the proposed project to improve emergency access to Emmanuel Hospital and to reduce emmisions due to idling cars. Thankyou

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0227 Kimberly Williams

**Comment:** I oppose expanding any of our highways for many reasons. Primarily, more lanes will equal more cars which will not equal reduced carbon emissions. More highways means more concrete which means less trees which are the greatest asset this city has. They are the reason we moved here from Dallas. It's hard to feel human in that city. Don't turn Portland into a concrete jungle. Spend the money on improving existing roads and alternate modes of transit. For example, I would love to see Trimet trains have more lines.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0322 Kimmie

**Comment:** My name's Kimmie, live in NE Portland. I strongly support this project partly because Emmanuel Hospital is there and they need access and without this project it could greatly hinder access. I recently had to take a friend to the hospital and it was a nightmare. We need to widen this for many reasons. If we don't widen I worry about access to the hospital. Partly because Williams and all other areas will be broken up with bike lanes and everything else. Because of the safety of Portlanders I support your project very much.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0330 Kippahs Yourway

**Comment:** I took the liberty to browse through your website and realized that you have built a phenomenal website, however to get relevant traffic you need visibility on major search engines. Most importantly, SEO touch is required in order to make it more famous and popular over internet. We will be taking the complete responsibility of your website starting from error fixation, updates on websites, keywords ranking, Social media presence, etc. We excel in promoting and increasing the visibility of a

website in various search engines, which directly helps in increase revenue for the website. Our Team strictly follows White-hat techniques so that major search engines won't get a chance to penalize your website. The works are done manually and organically so that our clients will get organic and natural results. Please find some of the major steps performed by our Team while promoting a Site: In-depth analysis to find out the technical errors. Competitor & keyword analysis to find out best set of keywords for your Site. Content based link building process will be initiated. Both on-page & off-page will be carried out to make your website more productive and spam free. Regular updates on various social media networks will be incorporated for brand promotion. We offer several other services for your website which will help you to get better visibility and online presence. Feel free to write us back for any further queries or details. We will be looking forward to your response.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0401 Kirk Paulson

**Comment:** I would like to provide public testimony from my perspective as a resident within the City of Portland, independent from my employer and independent from any involvement I've had with the project in the past.

1) I urge the project to take into account the recent requests from Albina Vision Trust (such as providing a full Environmental Impact Statement) to explore ways of designing the freeway caps to allow for multi-story buildings to be developed atop the structures, to partially remediate past issues of destroying a neighborhood and community as it was known at the time, that took place during the initial construction of I-5. I believe it is crucial that we work to fix this community problem in a meaningful and substantial way, to reconnect the community more so than what's currently proposed.

2) In the name of traffic safety, and at a time when transportation funding is a limited resource, I personally believe it's in the best interest of our community to reallocate the funding for this project to instead be used on implementing safety features along existing ODOT roadways that travel through the urban fabric of the city (e.g. 82nd, Powell, Lombard, etc.). Such roadways are statistically much more dangerous to all roadway users, as compared to the segment of I-5 that is part of this proposed project. The ability to provide safety improvements on such roadways to allow for a jurisdictional transfer with PBOT to take place would be more in line with the city's adopted goals, in my opinion.

Thank you for taking into account my preferences for this project as a resident of NE Portland.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0306 Kirsten Davis

**Comment:** Dear ODOT,

I am writing to comment on the proposed Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project. I'm amazed that in this day of serious climate change realization you are actually planning such a project. This project is just a knee-jerk business-as-usual plan of action when what we really need is a new paradigm with cars no longer at the center of how we function as a society. Instead of more money and space devoted to freeways, we should be spending the money on: a terrific, comprehensive and efficient public transit system, truly safe and efficient bike infrastructure and pedestrian infrastructure. These modes of transport are the ONLY potentially sustainable ways of moving from one place to another in the future. Anything else is blindness, foolishness and wishful thinking.

Cars have been the scourge of our society for a long time. They promote aggressive, entitled attitudes in people, are dangerous and fundamentally non-democratic, as everyone is sealed away from each other in small, alienating compartments. They cause tremendous pollution. They have displaced many neighborhoods, typically neighborhoods of color when freeways are planned. In fact, this expansion will impinge on the Harriet Tubman school as well. As such, car culture has promoted inequity. They promote a ridiculously expensive infrastructure, one that we



cannot keep up with--as the numerous potholes and poor pavement quality throughout the city testify. Bike paths and train tracks, on the other hand, would require less and less expensive upkeep. Ever more extensive pavement devoted to cars has damaged our ecosystems as valuable land has been paved over for them.

People are less physically and mentally healthy when they commute via car. They are more sedentary, stressed, lonely and alienated as they struggle through rush-hour gridlock. If we had an amazing public transit system that way of getting around could be incredibly time-efficient and simple, but we would need to be "all in" because a partial public transit solution wouldn't serve people's real-life needs sufficiently to be used in a serious way. With public transit and bike/pedestrian infrastructure, it's "all in" or "all out". And THIS is where our money should be spent.

Quite honestly, you may not realize it, but this isn't really a choice. It never has been, but now we are really seeing clearly that this way of proceeding isn't viable if we are to attempt to address the existential threat that is climate change.

So, for the record, I am 100% against this freeway expansion plan, for many, many reasons. Such a plan runs counter to my hope and vision for our society. I hope to see us addressing our needs much more creatively than just spending millions and millions of dollars on projects that we must begin to acknowledge are huge mistakes, and ones we can no longer afford to make.

Thank you in advance for cancelling this project and focusing instead on other modes of transportation.

Sincerely,

Kirsten Davis

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Kitty Davis

**Comment:** The Rose Quarter widening project will not solve congestion, it will make it worse. Induced demand is a concept that has shown repeatedly that increased space simply fills with more cars. Removing the ramps into and out of the Rose Quarter would have far bigger improvements to safety in the Rose Quarter and along I-5. Tolling I-5 is the only proven method to reducing congestions. The Rose Quarter project does not include HOV lanes or any transit improvements. In addition to reducing SOV trips, encouraging transit and making walking and biking safer will help reduce congestion. This project does nothing for transit and the proposed improvements will be less safe for people biking and walking. This project should be paused immediately until congestion pricing can be implemented and our needs re-evaluated. We risk spending an enormous sum of money on a project that won't work and that we may never need. Oregon should prioritize safety and saving lives and focus on proven strategies like congestion pricing over proven failures like widening.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0331 Kitty Davis

**Comment:** too small and disconnected from each other and the surrounding urban fabric to be functional open spaces. These relatively small open spaces will be surrounded by busy roads and freeway ramps making them hard to access and unpleasant to be in. Because the lids are not connected, the loud freeway will dominate and the air quality will be horrible. In our Mediterranean climate, which is getting hotter and drier every year, any vegetation over the lids will need permanent irrigation. Will ODOT commit to paying irrigation fees in perpetuity? PBOT no longer maintains any of the outdoor public spaces it owns, and PP&R does not have the operating budget to pay on-going irrigation and maintenance fees for a public openspace that is of such low value. Without direct connections to successful commercial or residential spaces, these leftover lids will not be successful plazas. If they are not continuous to block noise, and irrigated, they will not support plant life to become quiet oases. The lids are being constructed as temporary staging areas, and ODOT has done a poor job of showing them as being repurposed, but from an urban design perspective, this will not work. These spaces will become derelict open spaces, unwanted and unloved, more of a detriment than a benefit. If this project were to take a serious look at addressing the urban design challenges, it would begin on the surface with a continuous cap that could support buildings. It would consider removing the ramps to and from Broadway, or at least minimizing them by making them one lane, and having them intersect Broadway at right angles to slow angles and create short crossing distances for pedestrians. Transit and bike would be well integrated with the Flint crossing restored, no bi-directional, out-of-direction travel like what is proposed for Vancouver-Williams. Parks and plazas would have meaningful connections to community assets. The freeway is a blight on this neighborhood, and this proposal does next to nothing to ameliorate that. The financial cost is too high for a project that will leave the neighborhood with worse traffic, derelict spaces and worse air and noise pollution.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Kitty Davis

**Comment:** The Rose Quarter project will take up to 5 years to construct. During that time, critical bike routes, bus and streetcar routes, and walking routes will be interrupted. In addition to the permanent substandard roads and sidewalks this project proposes, the extended construction window is disruptive enough and long enough to have long-lasting negative impacts to walking, biking and transit user patterns. Portland needs to be doing everything it can to bolster alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle trips, and this project will drive people away from those alternatives during the years it takes to build, and in the subsequent years due to unsafe and unpleasant proposed changes such as constructing intersections with large radii to facilitate high speed turns and making crossing distances unnecessarily long.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0331 Kitty Davis

**Comment:** I oppose the Rose Quarter highway expansion. Although the project comes at a very high cost to Oregonians, it will not deliver the benefits we need in Portland or the state; the local benefits are not good enough and the improvements to the interstate will not materialize as advertised. Portland has many urgent transportation needs, many on ODOT-controlled rights-of-way, and those should be addressed before the time and money on widening the freeway in the Rose Quarter. Oregon should be focusing on improving safety/reducing traffic fatalities, and working hard to meet our climate change goals, our Vision Zero goals and improving our atrocious air quality- this project moves the needle in the wrong direction for all of those areas. Not addressing air quality is clearly an equity issue that this project is glossing over.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0309 Krista Reynolds

**Comment:** I oppose the Rose Quarter highway expansion. I am deeply concerned about climate change, and making it easier for single passenger drivers to commute is not a part of the solution to reducing carbon emissions.

Freeway Expansion is Climate Denialism. 40% of Oregon's carbon emissions come from transportation, as a recent Oregonian article pointed out, Oregonians need to drive a lot less. If we are going to spend \$500,000,000 on a transportation project that addresses the urgent existential threat that climate change represents, this money should be spent on improving and prioritizing public transportation and building walkable communities.

I also oppose the project for the following reasons:

Congestion won't improve, as discussed in this news report.

<https://www.portlandmercury.com/news/2018/03/07/19724128/a-new-report-shows-highway-widening-wont-solve-portlands-congestion-woes>

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

Respectfully submitted,

Krista Reynolds, NE Portland resident

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Kristin Flemming

**Comment:** This proposed freeway expansion is both an absolute boondoggle and completely against the values that Portland purports to live by. It is a complete waste of money that is desperately needed in many other infrastructure projects, it is bad for the environment, it will do



nothing to improve the traffic situation and it will have a truly horrifying effect on the air quality near an elementary school. I see no reason whatsoever to go forward with this project, and am ashamed that so many of my current representatives are supporting it.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0221 Kristen Gross

**Comment:** We need a proper EA that has not yet been provided. We don't need wider free ways. Induced demand will increase carbon emissions. It will negatively impact low income families and people of color at a much higher rate than anyone else.

We need congestion pricing not more vehicles on I-5. The Flint Ave bikeway is one of the busiest in the city. Removing it does not support ped/bike infrastructure. the proposed bike/ped improvements are subpar.

I oppose the I-5 Rose Quarter Expansion Plan.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0301 Kristin Eberhard

*Sightline Institute*

**Comment:** Please add me to the notification list.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0221 Kristen Gross

**Comment:** This project is an atrocity. This will not ease congestion, it will just increase demand in the area and add more vehicles and carbon emissions. These emission will most impact the students of Harriet Tubman. Accidents in this area are minor ones(no fatalities in over a decade). When I-5 was widened north of this project, accidents actually increased. At a time when we know we need to drastically cut carbon emissions and reduce car trips, a freeway expansion just doesn't make sense. This money could fund so many transit and active transportation projects vs a tiny stretch of freeway.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Kristina

**Comment:** Freeway expansion along I-5 will continue to increase traffic from throughout Portland and will be a further incentive for Portland workers to live in Vancouver.

Tolling the freeway is an inequitable solution to pay for the construction. Portland wages still have not caught up with increasing rent and housing prices.



If we want to create a sustainable solution, money should go towards supporting the expansion of trimet services. The highest deterrent of utilizing transit is poor transit options - busses need to run more frequently and added lines to serve the Portland metro area.

Bus rides typically take 45-60 minutes each way, this is because of indirect lines, traffic, and transfers that are not timed properly causing riders to wait 15-30 minutes at transfer stops (could be solved with increased service and decreasing the number of transfers).

Please consider boosting trimet instead of freeways. There is only so much that will change by adding pedestrian and bike transit - we live in the PNW, not everyone is capable of (or interested in) biking 5-10 miles to work or into town when it is cold and raining. We cant change the weather, but we can change our public transit.

Expecting Portlanders to increase biking or walking excludes individuals who are not capable of utilizing this luxury. Please provide a service to all Portlanders by increasing our public transit - support TriMet.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0402 Kristina Frye

**Comment:** Expanding our highway system will not relieve congestion. This money could be better put to use by fixing the roads that we already have or implementing congestion pricing. Portland does not want this!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0219 Kristy Overton

**Comment:** I am writing to express my opposition to the freeway expansion. In this age of climate crisis, we need to be doing everything we can to \_decrease\_ freeway usage. This is a LOT of taxpayer money at stake, and I would so much rather see it go to climate-forward actions that obviate the need for a wider freeway in the first place.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0225 Krystal Eldridge

**Comment:** The proposed expansion of I-5 in Portland recklessly disregards the reality the climate change must be aggressively fought at every possible opportunity, and ignores worthwhile studies that have found that expanding traffic lanes merely increases the amount of cars on the road. I am a resident of Portland and have been for nearly my entire life, and I do not support your plan to expand the freeway. It is an inequitable use of power and further entrenches car-centric living. The money would be petter spent, and our futures better secured, by putting the money solely toward improving public transit options, and I request that you do so.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0401 Kyenne Williams

**Comment:** I am writing as a native Oregonian and long-time Portland resident, who votes, works in the transportation field and uses public transit as her sole means (other than feet and bicycle) to navigate this metropolitan area. Once again (see I-5 Bridge replacement project) is watching a poorly thought out, wildly expensive, unoriginal boondoggle try to grow wings and attempt flight.

NEWS FLASH: Expanding freeways is not an effective strategy for reducing congestion.

WHY are we not trying something new? History shows we don't learn from the past (heaven forbid) and we could do something DIFFERENT and implement strategies such as congestion pricing! Or put MORE money in public transportation and see it grow (King County).

IS THE STATE CONSCIOUSLY TRYING TO SPEED UP CLIMATE CHANGE: this project is entirely at odds with the City's Climate Agenda. 40% of Oregon's emissions are from the transportation sector. Of course maybe the real plan is to increase air pollution, decrease air quality and kill enough of us off to reduce congestion? Hmmm.

WANNA SPEND MORE MONEY?: try transit or address EQUITY for a change (see serious road safety problems in East Portland).

I'm so disappointed in ODOT's short-sighted, hugely expensive plan to fix NOTHING. We'd get more permanent employment from congestion tolling and transit.

RE-THINK before you make things worse.

Gratefully,

Kyenne Williams

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Kyle Downs

**Comment:** I've been a lifelong Oregon resident, moved away for a few years, but part of the reason I moved back is because Oregon has straightforward, common sense solutions to difficult problems. I want to register my disapproval of the I-5 expansion. I know traffic and congestion has serious economic costs, but it doesn't seem to me that this is a practical solution. I think we should do everything in our power to encourage expansion of public transit options and as well as minimizing congestion in city center. This seems to do the opposite to me, as well as implications to the residents that live near the freeway.

It seems to me that we can find another way to encourage longer term thinking in the way we deal with congestion that is both more environmentally friendly as well as more beneficial to local residents and the state as a whole.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0326 Kyle Helland

**Comment:** This freeway widening project will not benefit Oregonians. It will hurt us. Induced demand, closures, delays, and a focus on auto traffic is not visionary for our 21st century problems. I support the 'no build' option for the I-5, Rose Quarter project.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 Kyle Stephens

**Comment:** I'm a Portland resident who commutes from North Portland to the Lloyd Center daily, using a mixture of bike and car. I drive a few times a week and I almost always encounter the I-5 bottleneck at the Rose Quarter. Yet I 100% oppose this proposed freeway expansion, or any freeway expansion in Portland. Please stop planning for single occupancy automobiles!

The State and City must shift their funds and priorities to mass transit and non-single automobile occupancy forms of transportation. Vancouver, WA is growing and Portland is growing and adding a little freeway capacity isn't going to do a single thing to reduce congestion. Instead, you will induce more single occupancy automobiles into the road, resulting in the same congestion and MORE greenhouse gas emissions. Please, think outside the box and don't apply historic freeway planning methods when we need to be implementing future ideas. We need trains, buses, and more infrastructure to support biking and walking.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Kylie Bettencourt

**Comment:** Good afternoon,

I am writing to urge you to stop the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project. I am a SE Portland resident and the proud member of a single-car household. Making the decision to become a single-car household was nerve-wracking, but it was an important step for my husband and I to uphold our values.

My husband and I both work in Tigard. Most of the time we work different schedules, so sharing one car gives us the opportunity to use additional modes of transportation. For me this includes biking, using TriMet and walking. Often, my commute utilized a combination of all three. While this is not always easy, it has benefited me by giving me the opportunity to exercise, connect with members of the community, save money and occasionally save time when cars are stuck in traffic. The personal benefits I have seen from biking, walking and using TriMet far outweigh the benefits of driving car.

For the city these benefits are even greater. Taking a car off the road not only helps to relieve traffic congestion, it helps to improve air quality and reduce climate change. I can not stress enough the importance of this. We need to act quickly and aggressively to reduce carbon emissions, and while I can only make decisions for my family, one car at a time, you have the opportunity to influence thousands of drivers and invest in infrastructure that prioritizes



improving public transportation and building walkable, more bikeable communities. As a recent Oregonian article pointed out, Oregon simply cannot decarbonize our transportation sector without driving a lot less. Please, change your plan and invest in a clean and healthy future for the city of Portland.

Sincerely,

Kylie Bettencourt

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0220 Kylila

**Comment:** No comment included

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Kyna Rubin

**Comment:** Dear ODOT:

I am writing to express my opposition to the I-5 expansion. The enormous cost will not provide the desired results. In fact, adding an extra lane will only attract more traffic and pollution that run counter to everything Portland is trying to do to reduce air pollution and traffic congestion. This expansion is ill-conceived, as there are non-polluting and much, much less expensive alternatives to dealing with highway traffic congestion. What a total waste of taxpayers' money. Surely you can do better.

Sincerely,

Kyna Rubin

NE Portland

**Attachments:** N/A