



Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with L

Ordered by first name

Contents

2019 0401 Lacey Friedly.....	5
2019 0328 Lance Comfort	5
2019 0401 Lance Lindahl.....	5
2019 0301 Landon Isabell.....	6
2019 0224 Lane Collins	6
2019 0314 Larry Griffith	6
2019 0226 Larry Lohrman.....	7
2019 0325 Lars Petticord.....	7
2019 0304 Laura Alexander.....	7
2019 0328 Laura Bradley.....	7
2019 0401 Laura Content	8
2019 0302 Laura Dunn	8
2019 0327 Laura Feller.....	8
2019 0401 Laura Hall.....	9
2019 0226 Laura Hanks.....	9
2019 0311 Laura Hanks.....	9
2019 0330 Laura Hanks.....	10
2019 0327 Laura Lawrence	11
2019 0401 Laura Raney	11
2019 0329 Lauren Adrian	11
2019 0302 Lauren Bates.....	11
2019 0331 Lauren Hacket.....	12
2019 0327 Lauren Hall-Behrens	12
2019 0402 Lauren Hudgins.....	12
2019 0304 Lauren Mitchell.....	12



2019 0329 Lauren Russel.....	13
2019 0312 Laurie Honor	13
2019 0325 Lauriel Amoroso	13
2019 0000 Lea Peace	14
2019 0326 Leann Warren	14
2019 0227 Lee Chapman	14
2019 0000 Lee Shaker.....	14
2019 0401 Leeor Schweitzer	15
2019 0402 Sally Mays.....	15
2019 0327 Lenny Anderson.....	15
2019 0219 Lenny Dee.....	16
2019 0305 LEON m OSWALT	16
2019 0301 Leon Porter	16
2019 0330 Leon Porter	17
2019 0322 Leopold Jung	18
2019 0219 Leslie Spector	18
2019 0401 Leslie Alwiel	19
2019 0401 Leslie Corless	20
2019 0326 Leslie Hickey.....	20
2019 0402 Leslie Poston	20
2019 0327 Libby Martin	21
2019 0314 Lina Sylvae	21
2019 0401 Linda Elliott	21
2019 0326 Linda Jue	22
2019 0304 Linda Knudson	22
2019 0326 Linda Knudson	22
2019 3030 Linda M Wysong	23
2019 3030 Linda M Wysong	23
2019 0330 Linda Magnuson	23
2019 0401 Linda Robinson.....	23

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with L



2019 0330 Linda Wysong24

2019 0331 Linda Wysong25

2019 0329 Lindsay Goldner.....25

2019 0308 Lindsay Pour25

2019 0313 Lindsey Wise.....25

2019 0328 Linny Stovall.....26

2019 0325 Linore Blackstone26

2019 0326 Lisa Dodson27

2019 0329 Liz Gardiner27

2019 0225 Liz Trojan27

2019 0328 Lizzie Martinez28

2019 0322 Lloyd Vivola.....28

2019 0000 Loana Austin29

2019 0328 Logan Egbert29

2019 0327 Loran Lamb-Mullin29

2019 0000 Lorence Long30

2019 0307 Lorence Long31

2019 0000 Lori Baumann.....31

2019 0000 Lori Baumann 2.....31

2019 0321 Lori Pesavento32

2019 0228 Lorraine Heller32

2019 0226 Louise E Hoff32

2019 0331 Love Johnson.....32

2019 0329 Lowell Kissling33

2019 0401 Lucas Haley34

2019 0401 Lucy Bellwood.....34

2019 0304 Lucy Cohen.....35

2019 0226 Lucy Wong35

2019 0329 Lucy Wong35

2019 0224 Lydia Swagerty36

Environmental Assessment Comments
First Name Begins with L



2019 0311 Lyle Funderburk	36
2019 0331 Lynn Dorman	36
2019 0329 Lynn Peterson.....	36



2019 0401 Lacey Friedly

Comment: Induced demand means that building more freeway lanes is an infinite upward struggle that will only keep compounding the problem. Building more freeways is NOT the solution we need. Green transportation infrastructure is the only thing we should be building in the 21st century, given that we already know it's better for public health, climate change, and personal well-being for residents of Portland. Instead of widening the freeway we should be looking at more ways to shift people's transportation mode away from SOVs.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Lance Comfort

Comment: Portland desperately needs an expansion of the interstate 5 freeway through downtown. The heavy congestion through the area increases air pollution and by slowing travel creates a costly barrier to both people and goods travelling through our area.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Lance Lindahl

Comment: Over the past 15 years, I have had the privilege of having worked on the planning, engineering, and construction phases of a wide variety of transportation projects in the Portland Metropolitan Region. This includes Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail, the Portland Streetcar Central Loop, and the development of the Madrona Studios Apartments. Although I have worked on a wide variety of projects both in the Rose Quarter District and within the I-5 right-of-way, I am at a complete loss as to what the public benefit of constructing the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project will be. ODOT's own calculation of improved travel times have been justly called into question by the fact that the travel modeling assumes that the Columbia River Crossing will be constructed as currently designed. It also fails to take into consideration the reduction in traffic that is certain to happen once the recently approved tolling plan for I-5 is implemented. I also have no idea how this current project can legally proceed without the completion of a full Environmental Impact Statement. The Madrona Studios Apartments provides transitional housing for some of Portland's most vulnerable residents and will be directly impacted by this project. It is also my understanding that widened ramps and freeway bridges will be built on and over the north end of the Vera Katz Eastbank Esplanade. This is linear park is a signature public attraction, one of the few public greenspaces located in the Central Eastside Industrial District, and a key link in the bike and pedestrian network in the Central City. Any impact to this public resource needs to be carefully studied. Although I applaud the idea of adding highway covers to this portion of I-5, those in the current plans are poorly placed and designed. Ideally, these should be built in conjunction with the development of new commercial and residential projects on top of them. Without this, these caps will be an ongoing maintenance and policing nightmare for both ODOT and the City of Portland. They are otherwise too small and too isolated from the surrounding built environment. Without active programming they will be overtaken by illegal camping and for the dumping of trash and debris,



not unlike how much of the surrounding public right-of-way is used today. The Clackamas Bicycle & Pedestrian Crossing will likely create more harm than benefit as well. Its "U" shape means that by design it will not provide any time or distance benefit for those that will use it. Even worse, its grade separation from the surrounding streets will make it difficult for "eyes on the street" monitoring by the public and to be effectively patrolled by the police. If this portion of I-5 is to be reconstructed, common sense says that it should include the following improvements as well: 1) Highway covers that are strong enough and placed in the correct locations to allow for future redevelopment consistent with the Albina Vision Plan; 2) Faster public transportation through the exclusive use lanes for Portland Streetcar and TriMet buses; 3) Separated bike facilities that work to both improve safety and to reduce bicyclist travel times; and 4) Enhancements that shift the current noise and visual blight of I-5 away from the Vera Katz Eastbank Esplanade and not towards it. As currently planned, the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project will provide little public benefit to either the Rose Quarter District or to the Portland Region as a whole. The public would be better served by abandoning these current plans and by working instead to improve both the urban environment and the travel times of those traveling by foot, bike, and transit. If a freeway expansion and/or reconstruction project is to be pursued in this area, it MUST include a full Environmental Impact Study so that its negative impacts are more closely understood and mitigated.

Attachments: [2019 0401 Lance Lindahl ATT](#)

2019 0301 Landon Isabell

Comment: Please protect our environment! No freeway expansion!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0224 Lane Collins

Comment: Please do not waste this funding on a counterproductive expansion to I-5. This is not what Portland needs or wants. We need to invest in expansion of our public transit systems, particularly the Max. If the Max were more expansive and had a line through inner Southeast, I would absolutely get rid of my car. No study shows that expanding a freeway will help our traffic issues. We need to be smarter and refuse to make the same mistakes other cities have made. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0314 Larry Griffith

Comment: Please do not consider the public comment in the recent public hearing as representative of the whole community. I am a life long resident of Portland and know the importance of this project. While some changes may need to be made to fully utilize the space above the freeway, this project is vitally necessary. We need changes in our transportation system to recognize climate change realities, but change needs to be managed to current realities. We need this project to keep existing traffic moving.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Larry Lohrman

Comment: Quit building FREEWAYS!!!!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Lars Petticord

Comment: I am against building this freeway expansion. It wont solve congestion and makes lots of things worse, like global warming. 1/2 a billion dollars is a lot of money in my opinion. It could go a long way towards projects that make a difference in peoples lives rather than contributing to global warming

Attachments: N/A

2019 0304 Laura Alexander

Comment: Please do not move forward with the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion plan. As a resident of inner NE Portland (and a regular freeway commuter), I feel that the air and overall environmental quality of our neighborhoods - in addition to the ongoing departure from a fossil fuel-based economy - are more important that this band-aid fix to address the problem of traffic congestion.

Portland schoolchildren should all have the opportunity for recess time out of doors, and we as a city should be leading by example in spending this enormous sum of money in a way that is more forward-thinking (improving and expanding public transit, and investing in more infrastructure to promote alternative forms of transportation).

Thank you for considering our input.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Laura Bradley

Comment: I am writing to request that a full environmental impact study be performed before the Rose Quarter i-5 expansion project is allowed to proceed. As a resident of the Eliot neighborhood who lives very close to the Rose Quarter and regularly walks through that area on the way to work, I would be directly impacted. I don't want to see the traffic in my area increase with a related increase in the air and noise pollution. Please take the time to do what is right for the people who live and work near the Rose Quarter who will be the most affected.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0401 Laura Content

Comment: It's time to take a step back and consider the I-5 Rose Quarter project at the level of detail it requires. Enough concerns have been raised about the the project's potential impacts, costs and effects that a full Environmental Impact Statement is clearly warranted. Decision-makers and the public deserve a full accounting of what this project could mean for neighbors, taxpayers and people who travel through the Rose Quarter area, whether on surface streets or I-5. The EIS should include a thorough, independent assessment of congestion pricing as an alternative, and also thoroughly explore the potential for induced demand to affect the project's ability to relieve congestion.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0302 Laura Dunn

Comment: I oppose the freeway expansion. Oregon needs to put its money where its mouth is in terms of leadership in climate change, climate justice and equity, and public transit. This will not even reduce congestion, yet it will affect the health and well being of young people (many of them of color), bike commuters, and our ability to say we are doing our utmost about climate change. Lets use the money to fund our transit system, so it will be more comfortable and convenient to take transit than drive.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Laura Feller

Comment: Public record shows that the current plan for the I-5 Rose Quarter Freeway widening project is predicated on the assumption the region ALSO spends \$3 billion on building a new Columbia River crossing. Without factoring that into the plans, any environmental action statement is patently false; fabricated by ODOT to advance an agenda that seems to do nothing other than "shift" traffic woes without any thought towards sustainability. Given the level of obfuscation, these plans cannot proceed without a full Environmental Impact Statement that takes the potential long term effects on our community into consideration. ODOT cannot justifiably sink 500 million dollars into a skewed study. To do so would be to ignore that the Portland metro area desperately needs to work on dealing with traffic within the city; whether that be adding sidewalks/bike lanes to large swaths of Portland that need them, adding 4 way stops or lights to intersections too busy to handle less than that, or making strides to improve public transit. We cannot risk the lives and communities that exist here on a project based on a faulty premise - nothing can move forward until an independent party fully studies the environmental impact.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0401 Laura Hall

Comment: Please study alternatives to the freeway expansions. I'm convinced that decongestion pricing or even decommissioning the freeway to create more green spaces that would unite the area. I strongly support the Albina Vision project for this area. My family and I long for a greener, more connected city that supports multiple modes of transportation, and I'm even more excited for the potential of a space that prioritizes pedestrians and bicycles. Investing in such a thing would be an incredible gift for the city's future.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Laura Hanks

Comment: I oppose freeway expansion in Portland. Transportation emissions account for 40% of greenhouse gas emissions in Oregon, so why would we invest \$500 million dollars in a project that would add capacity for traffic? New transportation infrastructure projects must address our crises with climate change, air quality, and equity, not make them worse. Unfortunately, the proposed I-5 Rose Quarter Expansion Project-- like all other freeway expansion projects-- will increase traffic congestion, carbon emissions, and air pollution, and do so right in the backyard of Harriet Tubman Middle School where the pollution is already so bad that public health experts recommend students forgo outdoor recess.

This project will only make things worse. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Laura Hanks

Comment: I am strongly opposed to any freeway expansion in Portland. Congestion wont improve. Freeway expansion has never solved traffic congestion, in any North American city, anywhere. Ever! ODOTs own hired consultants admit that this project wont address recurring traffic congestion on this corridor.

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

Freeway Expansion is Climate Denialism. 40% of Oregons 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. As of Friday, March 8, ODOT still hasnt released numerous data sets and appendices that would allow our community groups to independently verify ODOTs assertions that this project would lower carbon emissions, improve air quality or lower traffic



congestion. ODOTs strategy is to tell the public "trust us, this is good for the community", and isnt 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 havent received it.

Opportunity Costs: Even *if* ODOT can manage to keep this project under \$500,000,000 (pretty unlikely, given the agencys track record), its an enormously expensive undertaking whereas the revenues could be spent on a litany of other projects and needs across the region. \$500 million could build a lot of sidewalks in East Portland, bus rapid transit lines across town, or be a solid down payment towards the proposed underground light rail tunnel. And unlike a freeway widening, all of those investments would be better for air quality, carbon emissions, public health, and congestion relief.

Community Opposition: Despite ODOTs claims that this project connects 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 citys most popular bike commuting routes), the proposed lidsover the freeway wont 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).

Pricing should be implemented before expansion. Road pricing is the only policy actually proven to reduce traffic congestion; its also proven to improve air quality and reduce carbon emissions as well. Why is ODOT moving forward with a \$500 million boondoggle investment without first instituting congestion pricing to see if that mechanism wouldnt solve the traffic problems on the corridor *without* sinking half a billion dollars into the expansion? ODOTs studies of traffic patterns of the proposed freeway expansion *completely* ignore the reality that the state is mandated with moving forward with decongestion pricing, which will enormously impact how many people choose to drive on the corridor and greatly reduce congestion.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Laura Hanks

Comment: First things first. Portland has a traffic problem. Congestion is bad for our wallets, bad for human health, and bad for the planet. Unfortunately freeway expansion has never solved traffic congestion, in any North American city, anywhere. Ever! Bigger freeways mean more people choose to drive and you end up with 4 lanes of bumper-to-bumper traffic instead of 3 lanes (it's called "induced demand"). The result is that you have the same traffic problem, but now with a dramatic increase in local air pollution and climate-frying carbon emissions, all for the pricetag of further racial and economic injustice to Rose Quarter communities, and \$500 million of taxpayer money. Instead we should be looking into other options that are proven to reduce congestion, like Decongestion Pricing, and further investment in our public transit systems and bicycle and pedestrian routes.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0327 Laura Lawrence

Comment: I do not support expanding freeways in any way. What happened to a forward thinking Portland that excelled in public transportation and a myriad of other ways to deal with travel in this town? When more people move here than the freeways can handle, then there will be traffic, regardless of how big the freeways are or how many there are! Can we fix 82nd Ave potholes instead? Freeways solve nothing. Oh and forget about setting up tolls also. Not that you asked, but it's coming up as well, and that is the worst idea ever. IF I have to pay to drive on our current freeways, I'm taking surface roads and going through neighborhoods instead.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Laura Raney

Comment: Freeway Expansion is Climate Denialism.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Lauren Adrian

Comment: It is unconscionable to put \$500 million into a project that does not align with our city and states goals of being a leader on climate change, reducing traffic deaths, and working for environmental justice. Use the money to improve Portlands active transportation infrastructure, improve safety at known dangerous road stretches, or just give it to Harriet Tubman Middle School, where students are ALREADY advised to stay indoors at recess because of bad air quality! Expanding a freeway in the heart of our city is not good for the people. Please be responsible and do not expand I-5!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0302 Lauren Bates

Comment: My name is Lauren Bates (zip code of my residence is 97211). I oppose the I-5 expansion in Portland's Rose Quarter. Freeway expansions have long track records of being ineffective, despite their tremendous cost. Other American cities like Los Angeles and Houston have spent huge sums of taxpayer dollars to expand freeways, only to see induced demand for the expanded roads quickly cause them to have traffic as bad or worse than before the expansion. Houston expanded a stretch of I-10 to 26 lanes, and yet commute time increased from 47 minutes to 74 minutes within 6 years of the expansion (see Humes 2016).

Just as pressing is the negative impact of additional cars and the pollution they produce on the environment. Any effort by ODOT to increase the flow of fossil-fuel powered vehicles is simply irresponsible. Instead, ODOT should begin making money by putting in place congestion pricing (AKA "decongestion pricing") on I-5 during rush hour in Portland. ODOT could then achieve reduced traffic while earning additional money to spend on other, climate neutral transportation solutions for Oregonians.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Lauren Hacket

Comment: The proposed freeway expansion will be detrimental to the community at large and to the environment. It is illogical to assume a freeway expansion in Portland will decongest the city, when it has never been proven to do so in other cities. Please listen to the community in finding a sustainable solution to the problem.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Lauren Hall-Behrens

Comment: Good morning,

I am a resident of the Boise neighborhood and have been for the last 18 years. At first, I believed that the improved bicycle and pedestrian throughways would be good for our neighborhood but, it seems, cars have taken priority in the I-5 expansion plan. I am deeply concerned about the air quality impacts of this project to our neighborhood.

I ask that you please pause, and complete a FULL Environmental Impact Statement to fully inform the public of this projects impact. The shorter Environmental Assessment does not provide a full picture of how our neighborhood will be impacted.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Lauren Hudgins

Comment: I am a Portland resident. Generally speaking, highway improvements should be limited to seismic upgrades or facilitating the passage of public transportation. Making it easier to drive simply allows people to drive more. I do not support any highway expansion that does not include buildable caps.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0304 Lauren Mitchell

Comment: As a community member I strongly ask you not to go through with this project. It's detrimental to the environment, to the neighborhoods you would alter to complete this construction, and to the ideals of stewardship that Portland is so well known for. As my city continues to grow, I want us to live in a place that puts its money where its mouth is and prioritizes public transit over interstate expansion, walkable/bikeable neighborhoods over car use. How many buses could this money buy? How much sidewalk and street repair could it finance? Freeway expansion is the least sustainable solution -- come back to us with something that works better for our community.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0329 Lauren Russel

Comment: I have spent more than my fair share of time stuck in traffic in major cities around the country - New York, Boston and Los Angeles have some of the worst traffic in the country, and freeway expansion projects have done nothing to improve upon this. Portlanders will see no benefits from any type of freeway expansion, and instead suffer the environmental and financial consequences associated with the project. NO MORE HIGHWAY EXPANSIONS!!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Laurie Gonor

Local 1503 Carpenters

Comment: My name is Laurie Gonor. I'm a resident of Gresham, Oregon. I'm member of the Local 1503 Carpenter's Union and I'm speaking in favor of the project with one reservation, which I will get to. It's my understanding that when the trades people who built the city we live in hack across town, they may be expected to pay, either as individuals or as a company for the privilege of building your city. And that confused me a little bit. So we're going to just maybe say that and let it go. I'm also a person who has commuted as far as Vernonia, Estacada, McMinnville, and to Beaverton to Intel, and that mess right there is -- it needs to be fixed. We all have very passionate views about cycling and I actually quit riding my bicycle in Portland because I was concerned about my safety, so I get that. But I'm still not convinced that having to slam on my brakes right in that area is a good plan. I don't like it. And I'll get really quickly to my one concern. I understand there is a great school called Harriet Tubman Grade School and they are very concerned about air quality. I was fortunate enough not to grow up in a city next to a freeway. I grew up in South Beach, Oregon, which is five miles south of Newport. I ran wild all summer and we did drive to the city, Newport, to put me in high school and grade school. Pardon me, grade school and junior high, but I didn't have to do it next to a freeway. So I'm really hoping that somewhere there's a really solid, good positive in helping people not have to leave there. Okay, kids go inside now. You can't spend any more time running around like I got to when I was a kid. I yield the rest of my time to the public.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Lauriel Amoroso

Comment: I do not support the plan to widen the freeway at the Rose Quarter. I live and work in Portland (near the Rose Quarter) and commute via automobile, public transit, walking, and cycling. I understand that when I drive I am contributing to an increase in air pollution and greenhouse gases and work hard to avoid this transportation option whenever I can. I will often commute over an hour on the MAX to avoid driving as I understand the human and environmental cost of this method of transportation. I understand that the best data available has concluded that widening freeways does not improve congestion and therefore this plan puts money into a solution that does not solve the problem, which also takes resources away from modes of transportation that do. I am also a low income community member, living just above



the federal poverty line and do not believe that widening the freeway will help low income residents. I support congestion pricing and a community wide shift to increasing access to and expansion of public transportation as well as pedestrian and cycling infrastructure. The future is not with automobiles and ODOT needs to be part of the solution, not contributing to the problem.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0000 Lea Peace

LU 1503

Comment: I commuted @ the onramp for 8 months while working in NW from Chinatown. Every morning it was super scary to get into the correct lane. We need to make it safer.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Leann Warren

Comment: am a native Oregonian and have lived in Portland since 1987. Now is not the time for old school solutions. We need to be courageous and forward thinking. Trying to cram more traffic onto roads is only going to make things worse. I get that many people long for the days when it was easy to get around in Portland in a single occupancy vehicle pretty much anytime of the day. I remember those days, too. But that's a bygone era. Spending an enormous amount of money on a freeway project is only going to make things worse. It's time to accept that things have changed. We need to focus our efforts on more efficient ways to live whether it's mass transit, alt transportation, remote work, etc. It's time we accept that we are the traffic that we hate. Each of us needs to be willing to change our behavior and find different solutions for transportation. Please, no more freeways.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0227 Lee Chapman

Comment: We need more metro, not more car infrastructure. Portland should continue to lead the movement towards a future without burning fossil fuels. Please dont build bigger freeways, build more subways and designate more lanes to carpool. Those who drive solo will have to choose to wait in traffic for their luxury of one person per car lifestyle.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0000 Lee Shaker

Comment: I'm writing to comment on the proposed 15 Rose Quarter construction project.

After reviewing the proposal, its rationale, and its proposed impact, I can't help but feel that \$500 million of taxpayer money could be better spent elsewhere. The project as proposed seems like a very expensive package that solves the wrong problems.



Moving freight through Portland on truck faster by minimizing merging traffic (and the accidents it causes) is a very short-sighted goal. First, why do we want freight to go directly through downtown Portland? Surely, there's a better path that trades a direct route for a variety of quality of life benefits. Second, why do we think that truck freighting will not change materially in the near future? Anybody following technology knows that driving is rapidly approaching an inflection point at which time sensors and artificial intelligence should rapidly alter existing traffic patterns and interactions. Third, why is ODOT cravenly slathering on spending for ancillary projects like freeway caps and multimodal paths above 195? If such a level of public bribery is necessary to win the support of Portland and its elected officials, maybe the underlying plan lacks merit.

I understand that Oregon is growing and that highways are a critical part of our transportation infrastructure. But for \$500 million, can't we get more than this? Surely there's a better way to both improve the flow of freight and enhance Portland's city streets. Trying to combine these two goals seems both unnatural and expensive.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Leor Schweitzer

Comment: Please do not move forward with this project. At this time we need to expand capacity for transit and light impact transportation within the City of Portland, not capacity for cars and trucks that cuts a gash through the center of Portland. This project resolves none of the stated concerns, but there are many other solutions that may.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Sally Mays

Comment: As a resident of the Eliot neighborhood, I strongly oppose the Rose Quarter freeway expansion due to the negative impact on the environment and safety of our community.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Lenny Anderson

Comment: Where to start?!? Such an ill-conceived and worthless project!

With a warming earth, the last thing we need is investment to make it easier to get around by private motor vehicle. Just the opposite is needed, the sooner the better...transit, bike, walk are our future.

Is freight movement the issue? It has been shown over and over that the obstacle to moving freight in the peak hours is too many SOVs!

Urban freeways are toxic rivers, a major source of deadly air quality in our city. They should be removed or at least covered and emissions filtered, but never expanded.



Not even the Nazis built highways through the middle of cities! On the opposite bank from the center of Frankfurt am Main sit a row of a dozen museums...Portland has a dozen lanes of traffic. Sad. ODOT should put its resources to designing our exit from urban freeways, a huge 20th century mistake.

Put a toll on it, and use those proceeds to advance alternatives to private motor vehicle transportation...transit, bike and walk.

Lenny Anderson

Project Manager, Swan Island TMA 2000-2014

Member, Governors' I-5 Task Force, 1999-2002

Attachments: N/A

2019 0219 Lenny Dee

Comment: With climate change we need to reduce driving, not induce more demand. This project shouldnt go forward without congestion pricing in place.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0305 LEON m OSWALT

Comment: Hi. Please don't widen the freeway. It will be a waste of dollars. It will not eliminate congestion. It will increase pollution. We need to spend that money in ways to lessen the miles driven in cars and trucks. Lets be creative. Lets move forward. Lets come together for our future.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0301 Leon Porter

Comment: I am writing to oppose most aspects of the I-5 Rose Quarter Project. Here are my concerns:

1) There is abundant evidence that the project will reduce neither traffic congestion nor the crash rate at the interchanges. As Joe Cortright pointed out in his excellent recent CityLab article "Backfire: How widening freeways can make traffic congestion worse": "When ODOT widened I-5 between Lombard and Victory Boulevard a few years ago, it only managed to funnel more traffic more quickly into the I-5 Columbia River bridge chokepoint. The result: the bridge actually carried less peak hour traffic than before...[and] the crash rate actually increased after the freeway was widened." ODOT had promised that this earlier freeway widening project would reduce congestion and crashes, but it actually had the opposite effect. There is every reason to expect the same results from this I-5 Rose Quarter Project. Removing a traffic bottleneck creates induced demand, which increases traffic volume and thereby worsens other bottlenecks nearby.



2) Even ODOT's own Environmental Assessment does not predict that the project will significantly reduce carbon emissions or other forms of air pollution. And the Environmental Assessment relies on the unrealistic assumption that the project will improve traffic flow. As explained above, the I-5 Rose Quarter expansion will almost certainly result in more traffic and more congestion--just as every recent freeway expansion everywhere in the United States has done. ODOT's Environmental Assessment should be completely redone based on realistic assumptions derived from actual data about the effects of other freeway expansions. It seems likely that revising the Environmental Assessment to reflect empirical reality would show vastly increased air pollution and carbon emissions from the increased traffic volume, congestion, and crashes that the Rose Quarter Project would induce.

3) The project costs will certainly be much higher than the predicted half billion dollars, for two reasons: large infrastructure projects almost always cost far more than projected, and long-term infrastructure maintenance costs are not included in the half billion dollar estimate. So this project would lead to a vast amount of wasteful spending of public funds. Oregon has many more urgent needs those funds could be better spent on. Until the current infrastructure is adequately maintained and seismically reinforced, and until all more socially beneficial public projects have been fully funded, no freeway expansion can be rationally justified.

4) Decongestion pricing could produce all the alleged benefits of this freeway expansion project at far lower cost, and would result in a net gain of revenue rather than an enormous loss.

5) Local neighborhood organizations all oppose the freeway expansion, and rightly so. It would greatly worsen children's exposure to air pollution at the Harriet Tubman school and also at the Grandma's Place Daycare on N. Flint.

6) The N. Flint overpass is a nice way for pedestrians and bikes to travel between the Rose Quarter area and Albina. Please don't remove it.

7) On one positive note: it would be pleasant to have the freeways capped. I live near the Lloyd Center and often walk to NW Portland via the Broadway Bridge. I would be happier not to struggle through the unappealing, pedestrian-hostile area where Broadway and Weidler cross the freeway. But I'm not sure whether or not the benefits of capping the freeway in that area would justify the expense. It seems that the cost of a freeway cap might be more justifiable if the cap were strong enough for multifamily buildings to be constructed on top of it, as proposed in the Albina Vision plan.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Leon Porter

Comment: I was distressed to read the Oregon Public Broadcasting story about how your Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion Environmental Assessment relied on the bogus assumption that the Columbia River Crossing will also be expanded. Please redo the environmental assessment correctly, based on realistic assumptions. Deceptive Robert-Moses-style data manipulation won't work in Portland in this day and age--we're paying attention.



I'm even more distressed to read about your scheme to make the freeway overshadow the Eastbank Esplanade, and your plans for an easement that will allow you to close the Esplanade as frequently and as long as you see fit. I'm sure a lot of Portland's residents would be extremely unhappy about this if they knew. You should have released this information immediately, not concealed it until the very end of the public comment period. If you have any shred of moral decency, you will extend the public comment period for another several months and hold additional public hearings so that this new information can be discussed openly before any decisions are made.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0322 Leopold Jung

Comment: ODOT's solution to relieve traffic and for being such a "progressive" state, this manner of thinking is greatly archaic. I do not know the backgrounds of the planners involved with this project, but you might want to consider their experience and not going by textbook examples. It appears the planners have not lived or experienced traffic in bigger cities in the US or abroad.

Commonsense would be to do a study of where exactly are these single occupant drivers are going at peak times (obvious answer is the biggest employers in Portland and out of Portland to Salem.) You would think to relieve the traffic is to build facilities around the most significant destinations. It baffles me that there is not a consistent running train running between the Salem, Eugene, and Portland with connecting buses to and from the stations. That 500 million would be better spent on a service (that is not single occupant vehicles) providing daily single occupant commuters to their places of employment. And the use of a daily commuter train could work with the implementation of congestion pricing via tolls on the corridor, encouraging most of the users to use the service.

The expansion near public schools is appalling and with the most recent news that the Portland Public Schools were not even consulted appears to a huge F.U.

The 500M could be allocated to more progressive projects and some cash grab by some local lobby, union, and contracting firm.

Just my taxpayer thoughts.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0219 Leslie Spector

Comment: I am writing to voice my opposition to the Rose Quarter freeway expansion. I have lived in NE Portland for over 20 years, and this community has already experienced enough environmental degradation and poor air quality issues. We already have I 5 running straight through our neighborhood, and expanding it will only lead to an increase in use and emissions that poison our air.



Research shows that freeway expansion has never solved traffic congestion, in any North American city, anywhere. ODOTs own hired consultants admit that this project wont address recurring traffic congestion on this corridor.

This project proposes to expand a freeway into the backyard of Harriet Tubman Middle School, where air pollution is already so bad that PSUs researchers recommended that students forgo outdoor recess. I am a PPS teacher, and I can tell anyone that we already have a crisis of students with asthma and other air quality related health issues.

A recent Oregonian article states that 40% of Oregons carbon emissions come from transportation Oregon cannot decarbonize our transportation sector without driving a lot less. If we are going to spend \$500,000,000 on a transportation project that addresses the urgent existential threat that climate change represents, this money should be spent on improving and prioritizing public transportation and building walkable communities.

Even if ODOT can manage to keep this project under \$500,000,000 (pretty unlikely, given the agencies track record), its an enormously expensive undertaking. I believe this money can be much better spent on other projects which would enable PORTlanders to drive less. \$500 million could be a solid down payment towards the proposed underground light rail tunnel, or be applied to improve our public transportation system. Unlike a freeway widening, all of those investments would be better for air quality, carbon emissions, public health, and congestion relief.

Congestion Pricing should be implemented before expansion. Road pricing is the only policy actually proven to reduce traffic congestion; its also proven to improve air quality and reduce carbon emissions as well. Why is ODOT investing in this expensive freeway expansion without first implementing congestion pricing to see if that mechanism wouldnt solve the traffic problems on the corridor. This is a proven way to reduce carbon emissions and far cheaper.

I strongly oppose this project and demand that ODOT consider applying this money toward projects that will make Portland more livable and lower carbon emissions in our city.. I would much prefer a public transportation system that would enable my community and I to get to our jobs without cars, in a reasonable amount of time.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Leslie Alwiel

Comment: One of the reasons I moved to Portland was the push for Smart Cities and more climate friendly transportation solutions. I have lived in may major metropolitan areas around the world and have experienced traffic congestion and all the negative impacts.

Expanded freeways only lead to more traffic. We need less cars period.

I live in Eliot and hate to see the demise of the Flint flyover and the increased pollution to the local schools.



My recommendation is congestion pricing - tolls and increased cost for driving into Portland during rush hours. These have worked well in London, Washington DC and are to be instituted in New York City. People drive solo when it is cheap and easy.

Continue to improve your great TRIMET system - public transportation that is cheap, convenient and covers major commuting routes is the way of the future.

Be true to Portland beliefs - you know I am right!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Leslie Corless

Comment: Please do not expand I-5 in Portland. This would be an enormous and unwelcome waste of money at a time when we could instead expand options for public transit and livable spaces.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Leslie Hickey

Comment: As a ten year resident of North Portland, I am deeply concerned about a freeway project moving forward without a thorough environmental impact statement. As time is quickly running out on our ability to address climate change without the most dire and catastrophic consequences, I believe that this project is taking our city and state in the complete wrong direction. As a cyclist, I also think that ODOT should not be removing an important connection for cyclists to get downtown -- I hope that the word "transportation" in ODOT doesn't only mean car travel. As countless studies have shown, adding freeways does not improve traffic in the long run -- the only effective intervention is congestion tolling, which is something that should be implemented before freeways are expanded. This is the wrong project for today. The state of Oregon has been a leader on environmental matters before (for example, let's not forget that we were the first state to pass a bottle bill in 1972), and it's time to fight against the status quo and really think about what kind of city (and what kind of future) we want to live in.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Leslie Poston

Comment: It has been well established that freeway widening does not reduce congestion. Instead, it induces more demand and creates more pollution, and at the expense, in this case, of two of our more vulnerable Oregon communities (people of color and children), and in direct opposition to the Albina Vision project. Additionally, it eliminates a well used green throughway bridge, used by both bikes and pedestrians, and completely does away with the esplanade on the east side of the river. Do not widen this freeway.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0327 Libby Martin

Comment: This would be yet another unsupported, ineffective, and disenfranchising bad planning decision. While I agree that something needs to be done to reduce traffic, giving MORE room for traffic has never, NEVER been shown to achieve that. ODOT needs to take a step back and refocus what your values are and what kind of environment we could truly achieve in this region with more progressive and community focused projects.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0314 Lina Sylvae

Comment: I am writing to express my deep opposition to the freeway expansion project. It is shocking to me that in a city as progressive as Portland, that ideas like this still prevail. we need to reduce how much we drive and greatly expand public transport. This project is sending the wrong message and putting children at risk with the increased pollution! Please reject this proposal and put that money to good use creating infrastructure for a fossil free world!!!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Linda Elliott

Comment: I am a Portland resident and I strongly oppose this freeway widening project because it will only make it easier to drive through central Portland and increase congestion through induced demand.

Furthermore the increased traffic will increase air pollution for neighborhoods along that section of the freeway.

In addition, changes to the cycling infrastructure on Williams Ave. and Vera Katz Esplanade will make it harder to bike and less pleasant from the increased shadow over the greenway and re routing of several routes.

This freeway project is the opposite direction we need to take as a community to combat climate change and move towards a greener future with more investment in alternative transportation including transit and bikes.

In order to properly evaluate the impacts of this project a full Environmental Impact Assessment is needed. I strongly urge ODOT to move forward with an EIS.

Please consider redirecting these funds to these sources instead. Portland and the state of Oregon have a chance to lead by example with transportation solutions and this project can be that impetus for change.

Thank you for your consideration.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0326 Linda Jue

Comment: Expanding the freeway(s) only adds more pollution/noise to the areas they are built in. There have been comments that do not support this from experts . . . listen to them.

Look at what San Francisco did after the last large earthquake - they tore down a damaged freeway that cut through a neighborhood. Today, the neighborhood is full of sun and the area where the freeway was is now a walking/park.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0304 Linda Knudson

Comment: Tolls are perhaps the only intervention that will stop people from using their cars instead of public transportation when available. Also, people will start planning when to use the freeways and people from Vancouver might actually stop coming across state lines to buy their food and other purchases instead of staying in their own state and paying taxes. If you drive the freeways, much of what you see is Washington license plates. Some of these people work here, of course, but MANY of them cross the bridge to avoid Washington taxes, and then Vancouver voted AGAINST a new bridge! The climate actually should be our first concern. There are deniers, but that means that they are not educated or concerned about keeping our planet habitable!!! This is a very short sided idea with no science behind it unless you count the scientists who say we have about eleven more years to save this planet. THIS WILL NOT HELP OUR PROBLEM!!!!!!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Linda Knudson

Comment: I oppose this project. What I would rather see are four things:

1) new efforts to encourage staggered times for starting work in Portland on a daily basis. Right now, too many people are using the roads at the same time every day.

2) Tolling the present bridge and building another. FAR too many Vancouver residents are coming to Portland to avoid sales taxes and working here and living in Vancouver to avoid high income taxes in Portland. They represent MANY of the people who shouldn't even be on our roads during rush hours.

3) Strongly incentivise companies to work on car pooling of their employees so we don't have 90% of cars with only ONE person in them.

Get them on public transportation too!

4) And lastly, make the Port of Portland work on reopening and renegotiating with opposing parties in the labor dispute so we get these trucks off our roads and their goods into ships so we get these horrible polluting trucks who NEVER stay in the right lane and drive way too fast OFF OUR ROADS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!



Attachments: N/A

2019 3030 Linda M Wysong

Comment: I am writing state my strong opposition to the I5 Rosequarter Project. This is not a project that is want or needed by the residents of Portland.

As a bicyclist who commutes regularly and uses the Flint Avenue crossing, the idea of making more room for fossil fueled vehicles and less for bikes, seems a very bad idea.

The project will cost over\$500,000,000of our tax dollars that could and should be used for pedestrian and bike improvements and public transportation.

This proposal is not an improvement but a step backward. It seems to be planned for those passing through and will not benefit the residents of Portland.

Stop this project now!

Attachments: N/A

2019 3030 Linda M Wysong

Comment: I am writing state my strong opposition to the I5 Rosequarter Project. This is not a project that is want or needed by the residents of Portland.

As a bicyclist who commutes regularly and uses the Flint Avenue crossing, the idea of making more room for fossil fueled vehicles and less for bikes, seems a very bad idea.

The project will cost over\$500,000,000of our tax dollars that could and should be used for pedestrian and bike improvements and public transportation.

This proposal is not an improvement but a step backward. It seems to be planned for those passing through and will not benefit the residents of Portland.

Stop this project now!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Linda Magnuson

Comment: This is not a time to expand the freeway. This is exactly the wrong direction. Please stop this expansion right now.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Linda Robinson

Comment: This letter is written for two purposes:

1. To request that ODOT prepare a full Environmental Impact Statement for this project,
2. To urge ODOT to cancel this project.



An Environmental Assessment is not sufficient for a project of this magnitude and with so many impacts on the community. A full EIS is needed, and the EIS needs to use traffic data that is NOT based on the assumption that the cancelled 12-lane Columbia River Crossing has been/will be built. Also, the EIS must include a No Build option. I have many concerns about the overall project, including the following:

Worsens air quality impacts for students and teachers at Harriet Tubman Middle School;

Negative impacts on the Eastside Esplanade;

Improvements likely to move the congested area to another segment of I-5;

In conflict with the Portland's Climate Action Plan;

Fails to live up to promises in the I-5 Broadway Weidler Facility Plan;

Preliminary design of the freeway cap does NOT provide space consistent with the Albina Vision;

Proposes to remove a good functioning bike/pedestrian bridge and replace it with another that is less direct;

Results in very little improvement in travel time for vehicles on the highway;

Reduces congestion for only a few years once completed;

Huge disruption of travel by transit, bike and pedestrians during the 5-year construction period, without satisfactory plans to mitigate the disruptions;

Funds could be better used to reduce safety hazards on ODOT streets in East Portland.

Unless these concerns can be addressed, I urge you to abandon this project.

Attachments: [2019 0401 Linda Robinson ATT](#)

2019 0330 Linda Wysong

Comment: I am writing state my strong opposition to the I5 Rosequarter Project. This is not a project that is want or needed by the residents of Portland. It is a plan that is short term, short sighted and rooted in a 1950's transportation philosophy.

It will increase air pollution that effects the children at Harriet Tubman Middle school and all the area. Our density is increasing, more and more people are moving into the neighborhood, everyone breaths and everyone is impacted by climate change.

Please study more fully alternatives (including decongestion pricing!) to this expansion with a full Environmental Impact Statement, Congestion is not solved by freeway expansion. This project is using our tax dollars wisely. It is only creating more problems, not solving them.

Do not move forward with this project!

Attachments: N/A



2019 0331 Linda Wysong

Comment: As a long-time Portland resident who has since the gentrification of the NE Portland, I am appalled by the plans for I5 Rosequarter Project. Urban planning and highway improvements have devastated the Afro-American Community in the past and now your new plan is in opposition to the Albina Visioning Plan.

This is not an improvement. It is another wound to the community as well as being harmful to the air we breathe and the climate.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Lindsay Goldner

Comment: Please do not move forward with this project as planned. You only need to look to the recent widening of I-405 and the INCREASE in traffic and demand in Los Angeles to give you a prime example of why this would be a horrible idea. Increased traffic, not decreased, leads to increased emissions, and declining health standards for anyone living near the highway. This money would be far better used for improving our city's mass transit system; wouldn't it be fantastic to have mass transit that is admired instead of being the city that really *doesn't* work? I certainly think so.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0308 Lindsay Pour

Comment: There are so many ways to improve and invest in transportation in our community. Expanding freeways has been shown not to help with congestion and, for the price tag, closes off an enormous amount of possibilities for other investments in safety, mass transit, and less-polluting transportation options in currently underserved communities. Increases in noise and pollution near minority communities - via an expansion that won't help traffic congestion, and via massive public investment - should be rejected at face value. We need to improve mass transit accessibility, service, reach, and safety - not invest in massive carbon projects.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0313 Lindsey Wise

Comment: To ODOT and project partners,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project. As a lifelong Oregonian, longtime commuter in the Metro area, and current member of the SW Corridor Community Advisory Committee and the Tigard Transportation Advisory Committee, I understand that our growing population and aging infrastructure makes it difficult for people to get where they need to go. But I strongly believe that this \$500 million project to expand the



freeway system in the Rose Quarter area is not the best way to address our transportation needs, and will in fact cause harm not just to the local neighborhoods but to our region.

Climate change is no longer just a theoretical threat. The chemistry of our air and oceans is changing. We are already experiencing devastating fires, floods, and storms. It is irresponsible for us to be encouraging fossil fuel consumption and single-occupant driving by expanding freeways. I do not believe the ODOT claim that completing the Rose Quarter freeway expansion will lower carbon emissions, improve air quality or lower traffic congestion. There are numerous examples around the globe that increasing road capacity only encourages more driving and does not decrease congestion. This City Lab article from Sept. 2018 provides some great examples of hugely expensive road projects that did not lead to a decrease in traffic congestion and explains the concept of induced demand.

PSU researchers have already recommended that kids at Harriet Tubman Middle School do not go outside for recess due to the levels of air pollution that they would be exposed to. It is irresponsible to increase this threat to a vulnerable population of kids, especially when a large percentage of the students are black, a population that historically has been ill treated by large development projects in Portland.

If we truly want to help people get around the city more easily, breathe cleaner air, and meet our city's and state's climate goals, we need to scrap this project and refocus that \$500 million towards any number of more beneficial transportation projects, such as addressing the pressing safety concerns to pedestrians, cyclists, and people with disabilities on 82nd Ave., Powell Ave., and Barbur Blvd., building sidewalks and bike lanes, studying decongestion pricing, and increasing our bus and light rail network.

Sincerely,

Lindsey Wise

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Linny Stovall

Comment: Why are we ignoring LA's experience where expanding highways only created more traffic? Why are we ignoring a mandate to go electric and develop public transport?

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Linore Blackstone

Comment: Dear ODOT, many years ago I served on the Tri Met Board. At that time I served on a transportation committee along with ODOT. Very seldom did anyone speak to the ethical and environmental issues. What I do remember is one gentleman saying, "What I want to do is build a highway that sings to me." Now you are wanting to build more freeway. Verifying your data is difficult but as a human I can speak to the noise, the wild life displacement, the ugliness, the climate change emergency, and to all the practical, ethical and aesthetic issues that are always denied when building a freeway. What you do has a connection to suffering.



Only humans have agency. All other life must adapt. The harm to the air we breathe, the sounds we hear, the life of the space we take over must be discussed. As the American poet, W.S. Merwin wrote in his poem, The Last One--rough paraphrase--well, they decided to be Everywhere because/why not? Everywhere was theirs because they thought so.

Might it be that you should not build another freeway?

Examine your ethic.

With urgency,

Linore Blackstone (former name Allison when on the Tri Met Board)

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Lisa Dodson

Comment: No freeway expansion! This is no improvement.

The proposed 500 million \$ expansion is a terrible use of scarce public money. Not only will any congestion alleviation be temporary but ultimately it is an invitation for more cars to enter the city. The environmental impact will be extremely negative, particularly affecting young children. The idea that this is the place for providing park space for the neighborhood is cynical at best. If that was a serious goal in this project there are many other locations and that should start with neighborhood meetings and consultation with public school leaders.

I ask that you stop this process, regroup with environmental and neighborhood advocates and put this money to better use. Please feel free to contact me if you wish.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Liz Gardiner

Comment: I write to oppose the current plans for the I5 - I84 project. Your approach is stuck in the 1970's. There are so many better ways to improve the efficiency of this interchange and, more broadly, the efficiency of the state highway system in the Portland metro area. Please recognize that in the 21st century, designs should optimize the operation of the whole system by incorporating human factors science into designs and should minimize the toxic impacts of the highway/freeway traffic on surrounding residential neighborhoods. Start over — and authentically engage the environmental scientists and the residents. Liz Gardiner resident of the Lloyd District

Attachments: N/A

2019 0225 Liz Trojan

Comment: We need better, faster mass transit. We should not be spending taxpayer money on freeway expansions. Freeway expansions don't reduce traffic congestion nor do they reduce CO2 emissions. Just say "No" to the Rose Quarter freeway expansion.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Lizzie Martinez

Comment: Dear ODOT,

As a frequent user of I-5 in this corridor, I appreciate your attempts to solve the problem. However, I strongly believe that the current approach of spending half a billion dollars on a project that your studies show will NOT improve traffic is a waste of my taxpayer dollars. I'm also concerned about the health and wellbeing of the students at Tubman Middle School. Given Oregon's disastrous history in treating its black citizens, we must consider their health. Expanding the freeway near their school is not only foolish, it's bordering on racism (intentional or not). Finally, as a bike rider and pedestrian, removing the current biking path to the Broadway bridge and replacing it with one that has a 10% grade makes it all but inaccessible for those of us who are not professional bike riders. To mitigate climate change, we must be encouraging people to get out of their cars and take bike, scooter, walk, not drive their cars. This project does not achieve any of the climate change goals set out by Portland city nor by the state. It also does not improve conditions for pedestrians. As a former resident of the Moda Center neighborhood, the Clackamas bridge is not a useful bridge. It will enable Moda Center fans to get back to their cars faster, but will not knit together the neighborhood.

Please reconsider this project. My main suggestion is to consider implementing congestion pricing first before building the auxiliary lanes. Thank you for considering this viewpoint.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0322 Lloyd Vivola

Comment: I am writing to voice my strong opposition to any and all freeway expansion in Portland, notably at this time, plans to widen the Rose Quarter I-5 in North and Northeast Portland. This \$500 million boondoggle would be a laughable anachronism if it weren't so stupid and catastrophic in the context of the times we live in. Have any of the staff that research and propose this project read even a mainstream newspaper or online news report in the last 10 years? Are you oblivious to air quality and health impacts caused by automobile pollution in our city and cities around the world? Are you so blindly beholden to a mindset that refuses to acknowledge that freeway expansion does not relieve congestion for essential traffic flow? Are you still so insensitive to the emotional and social upset that the Rose Quarter I-5 expansion will cause the local community, not least of all among the children of the community whose Harriet Tubman Middle School will become ground zero in this public works assault? Children in Portland and around the world recently registered their alarm and disgust at the way older generation policy-makers continue to ignore our ever more quickly degraded environmental sanity and integrity. Please send all plans for this freeway project to the dustbins of history where it belongs and begin addressing contemporary, alternative means for addressing traffic congestion. Promote the sort of public confidence and access that increases ridership on our



comprehensive Trimet bus and light rail system. Stop pandering to the stuck-in-traffic whining of unessential automobile use and self-impeding auto traffic overflow.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0000 Loana Austin

Comment: The safety improvements alone are enough for me and my 7 member household to support this project. I am also in favor of increased connectivity for pedestrian and bike safety in the neighborhood. I also support is project for the positive impact on the economy.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Logan Egbert

Comment: Dear ODOT,

I beg of you, please, please do not go through with the planned I5 Rose Quarter Freeway expansion. At a time where we are staring ecological disaster due to climate change right in the face, completing a project to allow MORE automobiles on our highways is irresponsible at best. I want my child to have a Portland to live in.

Thank you!

Best,

Logan Egbert

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Loran Lamb-Mullin

Comment: Greetings,

I oppose this project based on my strong concerns with ODOT's complete lack of regard for climate change. We must stop using single occupancy vehicle as our primary means of transportation NOW. To this end we need to NOT SPEND A NICKLE on freeway expansions, but rather EXPAND MASS TRANSIT and other alternatives to driving.

I am sorry for shouting, BUT I FEEL VERY STRONGLY THAT ODOT ENGINEERS NEED TO UNDERSTAND THE TIME TO ACT ON CLIMATE CHANGE IS NOW!

Respectfully yours,

Loran Lamb-Mullin

Native Oregonian

Attachments: N/A



2019 0000 Lorence Long

Comment: Good evening. My name is Lorence Long. I live at 1400 NE Second A venue, Portland, at the corner of Clackamas and Second Avenues, at the exact point where the proposed bicycle and pedestrian bridge across 1-5 will land on the east side of the Willamette River.

There are 200 people living in my building, which is known as Calaroga Terrace. Many of these people are disabled, and get around with the assistance of wheelchairs, walkers, and canes. A number have dogs that they must frequently walk.

First, I am concerned about the separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic on the bridge, so that slow-moving pedestrians, including those who are disabled, may not be placed in danger by cyclists who are running late to work or in a hurry to get home.

Second, I am concerned about the angle of elevation needed to overcome the height difference between the west bank and the east bank of the highway: will this be gradual enough to allow disabled pedestrians to go in either direction with safety?

Third, the thrust of traffic in and out of the west end of the bridge onto Second A venue will need some exceptionally ingenious planning to deal with-

- a. the frequent parking of ambulances and paramedic fire trucks at Calaroga's back door on Second A venue and also the passage of ambulances going to Unity Hospital two blocks away
- b. the traffic in and out of the Calaroga carport right across Second Avenue
- c. the onstreet parking on Clackamas that serves health personnel visiting patients at Calaroga
- d. the cars from Weidler that take shortcuts through Second A venue and Clackamas in order to avoid waiting for the traffic light at MLK
- e. the traffic lights on Clackamas at MLK and Grand that now have to be tripped by going up on the sidewalk to push a button, and waiting;
- f. The fact that the bike lane going east on Weidler from Second A venue is not placed along the curb but is placed in the middle of the street, making access from Second Avenue challenging;
- g. the need for a bike lane on Second A venue going to or coming from the north across Broadway and Weidler at Second, and then to the north;
- h. and the need for traffic controls for both bicycle and pedestrian traffic coming off the bridge.

I understand from talking with officials at the open house last Thursday that the design particulars of the bridge have not yet been worked out. I hope that as they are, the elements that I spoke about: separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic on the bridge, that the angle of elevation required to connect the different heights of the two ends of the bridge be workable for



disabled pedestrians, and the need for imaginative traffic planning-that these elements will be given due consideration as the design process goes ahead. Thank you for your attention.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 Lorence Long

Comment: I live at the corner of Clackamas and 2nd Ave., where the proposed bicycle/pedestrian bridge would empty or crowdedly reduce traffic at rush house.

The east end of the beidge will run through the Legacy Lab parking lot, which is very crowded with cars throughout the dat. What agreements are in place to accommodate the bridge traffic?

What separation will be maintained between pedestrians, wheelchairs, and walkers on the hand and bicycles on the other?

How will bicycle traffic be controlled as it flows out onto Clackamas at rush hour?

How will wheelchairs, etc. be able to access the bridge at its eastern end? At what rate will the equalization of height between the east and west banks of the highway be increased/decreased at which point on the bridge?

Will the pedestrian bridge be able to support emergency vehicles in the event of an earthquake as is the bridge between 4th Avenue and I-84?

Attachments: N/A

2019 0000 Lori Baumann

Laborers Union

Comment: So much support for this project.

Hoping its all local workers, so that our communities w/local workforce can benefit from this project. I realize there are some concerns, but I really feel like continuing to do nothing about this bottleneck will continue to create even more problems for the area.

This seems like a very productive design.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0000 Lori Baumann 2

Comment: I realize there are some concerns, but I really feel like continuing to do nothing about this bottleneck will continue to create even more problems for the area.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0321 Lori Pesavento

Comment: Please do not expand I-5 near the Rose quarter this will not solve congestion and will increase pollution as well as increase carbon footprint near Harriet Tubman school. Thanks
Lori Pesavento

Attachments: N/A

2019 0228 Lorraine Heller

Comment: I am against more freeway expansions. I am worried about climate change and would like to encourage bike riding. I know from experience that building more freeway just means more cars. We need to make radical changes and one should be a moratorium on freeways. Sincerely, Lorraine Heller

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Louise E Hoff

Comment: Cities all over the world are closing off streets and only allowing pedestrians and bicycles, some streets allow taxis and handicapped cars, parking and tolls encourage people to take comfortable public transit (unlike the max, with human monitors on the trams to deter violent people from making it uncomfortable for others), plants, benches and trees are added for new landscaping. why on earth are we behaving like a third world country in revving up more space for SUVs?

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Love Johnson

Comment: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the environmental assessment. I urge you to also complete a full Environmental Impact Statement and take note of the gaps in the EA pointed out by various agencies and community organizations:

In previous debates, no TDM-only alternative was studied because it was stated that if a TDM-only alternative were built and someone then moved their trip off the freeway, a new driver would be there to take their place immediately. This is induced demand, and to model this project without it goes against previous approaches, research-based consensus in the field, and common sense.

Calculat the increase in person delay that people riding bikes and buses will experience due to the street configurations "given that both are shown to be positive" in addition to the decrease in vehicle delay.

Street design should make transit and bicycling work better, not simply maintain the status quo (or in the case of delay time, make it worse).



The Columbia River Crossing should be removed from the assumed project list given the obvious lack of political feasibility of its construction.

Congestion pricing should be added, given that its implementation is imminent.

Consider the sound impacts on non-human animals in addition to humans.

Though this funding and design timeline is common practice, the need to resolve funding before resolving design will lead to value-engineering out the most impactful components of street design.

The covers are unusable for either development or park space due to lack of the structural integrity needed to support buildings and noise and pollution people would experience in open space, and to pretend otherwise is misleading.

I would also like to echo the points many others have made about:

- Impacts to Harriet Tubman Middle School and concerns about environmental justice and institutional racism

- Higher crash rates on other ODOT-managed facilities, including 82nd Avenue

- Street design that encourages speed coming off the freeway and crashes with people walking and riding bikes

Induced demand is real, climate change is real, and climate leaders don't expand freeways - especially when the "sweeteners" of the deal aren't all that sweet.

Respectfully submitted by a fellow planner,

Love Jonson

"Whenever I see an adult on a bicycle, I have hope for the human race." - H.G. Wells

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Lowell Kissling

Comment: I do not support the I5 Rose Quarter project. The caps designed for it are a flimsy joke incapable of supporting any meaningful weight, which will inevitably lead whatever is on top of it to be an urban wasteland. The environmental impact to the surrounding area will be even worse than it is now, which is unacceptable especially for the nearby middle school. ODOT has not been honest with the public at any point in this project, conveniently omitting their assumption of a new I5 bridge when making their Environmental Assessment but including it when calculating traffic improvements. It will be horribly detrimental to cycling infrastructure in the city: blanketing portions of the Eastbank Esplanade and leading to its frequent shutdown for routine highway maintenance; replacing existing I5 crossings with a new one that has a preposterously high 10% grade; and shutting down widely used cycling paths and lanes for the many years it takes to complete this project. ODOT is not operating in good faith with this



project, as they have refused to run an EIS, opened it to a ridiculously short public comment period, lied about the existence of design documents because they knew their release would endanger the project, and tried to slow-walk the release of those documents so they wouldn't be available until after the public comment period ended. For these reasons, I absolutely do not support the I5 Rose Quarter project.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Lucas Haley

Comment: I am writing to express my concern about going forward with the freeway expansion. Putting more cars through central Portland is not the way forward, in so many ways. That I'm sure you're aware of.

Please help keep Portland a livable city.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Lucy Bellwood

Comment: To whom it may concern,

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the expansion of I-5 in Portland's Rose Quarter.

Repeated studies have shown that road pricing is the only proven way to reduce traffic congestion, and ODOT's own investigators have concluded that adding a lane to I-5 will not ease congestion in the area. Why jump ahead to this costly and damaging course of action? The impacts are far from hypothetical. Vulnerable students at Harriett Tubman Middle School are already suffering from the emissions pouring into their playgrounds and classrooms from highway traffic. An additional lane will only induce further traffic demand, increasing pollution in the area and harming our city's youth.

Given these concerns, I'm frustrated that ODOT hasn't released a full environmental impact report for this proposed expansion, and fail to see how additions to I-5 will do anything but enlarge Portland's carbon footprint. At this critical juncture in our environmental history, we must take decisive action to reduce carbon emissions and support alternative modes of transportation in our communities.

I firmly believe that the proposed \$500 million for this unwieldy and damaging project would be better spent on Rose Quarter improvements that prioritize cycling and pedestrian infrastructure, public transportation, and community wellness. Rather than falling prey to the long-standing and harmful myth that the automobile industry is the most valuable player in any civic environment, let's champion a bold new model for sustainability in Portland.

Thank you for your time and consideration in reading these comments.

Sincerely,

Lucy Bellwood



Attachments: N/A

2019 0304 Lucy Cohen

Comment: Hello, I am writing to oppose the I-5 freeway expansion through the Rose Quarter. Please, please! As a parent, as a member of our neighborhood, as a resident of Portland, as someone on this planet, I emphatically oppose this project. Not only is it silly to think that expanding I-5 will reduce congestion--decades of experience shows the opposite--but spending this much public money on infrastructure to make it easier to drive through the heart of our neighborhood makes me want to cry. We need safe bike and walking routes and dedicated transit lanes, not more investment in cars and trucks. Climate change is real and happening and as a community and as a city and as a country, we need to look forward, not back. Air pollution at Harriet Tubman middle school is already too toxic. Invest in cleaner, safer public transit, biking, and walking, not in building MORE highway. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Lucy Wong

Comment: Dear ODOT,

Please don't continue with the plan to expand the Rose Quarter Freeway. I'm in my 20s and I think constantly about climate change and what should be done in order to protect our air, water, and land. Putting this kind of money behind freeway expansion makes no sense when it means investing in more infrastructure for cars. We know that promoting public transportation, biking and walking, and having people actually want to do those things because it's convenient and safe, are how we're going to fight over the impending climate disaster. It's already hit elsewhere, and we can feel it in our fires and in the summer months. Please reconsider and put that money somewhere that won't stoke the fire of climate chaos.

Thank you,

Lucy

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Lucy Wong

Comment: I am writing to express my disapproval of the I-5 expansion. I've read statements of opposition from many local advocacy groups and even PBOT's own advisory committee and am sorely disappointed that so much money is being proposed to not only not improve surface street public transit and pedestrian infrastructure, but will likely lead to induced demand! I bike on the Flint Ave bridge five days a week and to hear it's going to be removed, but no other reasonable alternative put in place, makes no sense.

This is a project that will put more cars on the road, lead to worse air quality, and all without even first looking into congestion pricing.



Please, at the very least do a full Environmental Impact Statement.

Thank you,

Lucy

Attachments: N/A

2019 0224 Lydia Swagerty

Comment: Widening the freeway will only bring more cars into the city at a faster rate and still be congested. It would be smarter to invest that money into express commuter buses or expanding and improving the other public transportation options to make them more appealing to the masses.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Lyle Funderburk

Comment: Don't widen the freeway for more cars. Instead work on projects that help expand public transit, cycling and walking. Projects need to attempt to reduce, not increase pollution. And school students nearby need to have outdoor recess as currently they are told that there is too much pollution for them to do so.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Lynn Dorman

Comment: A big step backwards for Portland. I thought we had concern here for the environment but like other states I have lived in, it's all about the \$\$\$. I have lived through so many "build it and it will help the environment and traffic" scenarios in my lifetime and each one of them created more dirty air, more auto/truck traffic, and way more congestion! Can we please stop appeasing the monied persons and lobbyists and think of the many ways to increase and improve the non-automobile scenarios. We all deserve cleaner air :(

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Lynn Peterson

Metro Council

Comment: The I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project has a significant place in our region's history and presents an opportunity to address a unique set of land use, economic and transportation challenges with impacts that will ripple across greater Portland. It is with this lens that the Metro Council appreciates the opportunity to submit public comment on the Environmental Assessment for this project. Metro staff are also submitting a letter with more detailed technical comments on the Environmental Assessment (attached).



The Metro Council urges leadership and staff of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) to explicitly acknowledge and consider the significant historical context surrounding the Rose Quarter area during project evaluation, planning and implementation. In the 1950's the Oregon Highway Commission razed the predominantly black Albina neighborhood displacing hundreds of families and destroying black-owned businesses and community to build I-5. These actions, along with other government policy decisions have made a lasting detrimental impact on the African-American community of Portland. It is our collective responsibility to address these wrongs through a community-centered approach to project development to help limit further harm and provide new opportunities for healing and growth.

Specifically, in accordance with the regional policies included in the Regional Transportation Plan, the Metro Council would like to see the following elements of the project continue to stay at the forefront of ODOT's attention as it moves forward:

- Create opportunities for consistent and continuing dialogue between ODOT, impacted communities and the city to ensure the most viable opportunity for redevelopment;
- Look at alternatives and align urban design elements of the project and the lid to create active, safe, and usable spaces supportive of community visions such as the Albina Vision;
- Features like walkability, access to affordable housing and local business growth potential for displaced communities should be central to design planning;
- Ensure robust engagement with communities of color, especially the African American community, providing opportunities to impact decision-making on project outcomes and objectives;
- Consider project elements that recognize the impacts of the freeway's construction and attempt to reconnect the neighborhood space with a focus on people, cultural, and community amenities and cohesion over convenience to the automobile;
- Continue to advance the surface street improvements proposed in the plan to address pedestrian and bike safety, mobility and transit access;
- Monitor and invest in systems and plans that decrease greenhouse gas emissions and diesel particulate effects on the surrounding schools and neighborhoods and seek other strategies to improve air quality; and
- Work towards a thoughtful and comprehensive value pricing system that contributes to decreased trips and less congestion throughout the corridor.

As you know, I am convening a task force to advise the Metro Council on a 2020 measure to invest in much-needed transportation solutions across our region. Funds from such a measure could be used to advance equity, safety, and climate resiliency in conjunction with the project.

The Metro Council and I appreciate the work that ODOT has done thus far and want to emphasize our interest and willingness to stay engaged as the project moves ahead and to ensure that the final design accommodates neighborhood needs and desired outcomes including authentic community building, increased pedestrian and biking safety, transit access,

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with L



enhanced urban development capacity and a commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Attachments: [2019 0329 Lynn Peterson ATT](#); [2019 0401 Elissa Gertler ATT](#)