



# Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with M

*Ordered by first name*

## Contents

|                                       |    |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| 2019 0226 M. Lee .....                | 8  |
| 2019 0401 Machel Stupfel .....        | 8  |
| 2019 0331 MacKenzie .....             | 8  |
| 2019 0302 Madaleine Peterson .....    | 8  |
| 2019 0327 Madi Carlson .....          | 8  |
| 2019 0402 Madisen Lattanzi .....      | 9  |
| 2019 0226 Madison Arnold-Scerbo ..... | 9  |
| 2019 0326 Madison D Hathaway .....    | 9  |
| 2019 0401 Madison Maschger .....      | 10 |
| 2019 0326 Maggie Gardner .....        | 10 |
| 2019 0228 Maia .....                  | 11 |
| 2019 0313 Maia Dean .....             | 11 |
| 2019 0312 Maia McCarthy .....         | 11 |
| 2019 0313 Maia Watkins .....          | 11 |
| 2019 0401 Maitri Dirmeyer .....       | 12 |
| 2019 0402 Mara Gross .....            | 13 |
| 2019 0305 Mara Isbell .....           | 13 |
| 2019 0225 Marc Berezin .....          | 14 |
| 2019 0401 Marc Czornij .....          | 14 |
| 2019 0401 Marcia Strickland .....     | 14 |
| 2019 0228 Marcus Rodriguez .....      | 15 |
| 2019 0331 Marcy Holmes .....          | 15 |
| 2019 0329 Margaret Edera .....        | 15 |
| 2019 0307 Margaret H Musgnung .....   | 16 |
| 2019 0328 Margaret Linn .....         | 16 |



|                                    |    |
|------------------------------------|----|
| 2019 0329 Margery Mayock .....     | 16 |
| 2019 0401 Maria .....              | 16 |
| 2019 0326 Maria Chuop .....        | 17 |
| 2019 0219 maria nazzaro .....      | 18 |
| 2019 0307 Maria Opie .....         | 18 |
| 2019 0326 Maria Opie .....         | 18 |
| 2019 0308 Maria Schur.....         | 19 |
| 2019 0327 Maria Schur.....         | 19 |
| 2019 0329 Mariah Dula.....         | 19 |
| 2019 0326 Mariana Lindsay.....     | 21 |
| 2019 0327 Marijane White .....     | 22 |
| 2019 0330 Marilyn Costamagna ..... | 23 |
| 2019 0329 Marion Thompson .....    | 23 |
| 2019 0312 Marisa Morby .....       | 23 |
| 2019 0401 Marissa .....            | 24 |
| 2019 0226 Marjorie Nafziger.....   | 24 |
| 2019 0401 Marjorie Nafziger.....   | 24 |
| 2019 0401 Marjorie Skinner.....    | 24 |
| 2019 0320 Mark Miskiewicz.....     | 25 |
| 2019 0327 Mark Boswell.....        | 25 |
| 2019 0226 Mark Canright .....      | 25 |
| 2019 0311 Mark Canright .....      | 25 |
| 2019 0330 Mark Canright .....      | 26 |
| 2019 0401 Mark Greenfield .....    | 27 |
| 2019 0330 Mark H Linehan.....      | 27 |
| 2019 0218 Mark Harris .....        | 28 |
| 2019 0311 Mark Harris .....        | 28 |
| 2019 0330 Mark McClure.....        | 28 |
| 2019 0330 Mark McClure 2.....      | 29 |
| 2019 0329 Mark Meininger .....     | 29 |

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with M



|                                   |    |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| 2019 0308 Mark Nacua.....         | 30 |
| 2019 0401 Mark robinowitz.....    | 30 |
| 2019 0327 Mark Settle.....        | 32 |
| 2019 0401 Mark Whitaker.....      | 32 |
| 2019 0329 Marlene Winn.....       | 34 |
| 2019 0312 Marlen Warren.....      | 34 |
| 2019 0225 Marni Cohen.....        | 35 |
| 2019 0305 Maro Sevastopoulos..... | 35 |
| 2019 0312 Marsha Hanchrow.....    | 35 |
| 2019 0326 Marsha Hanchrow.....    | 36 |
| 2019 0313 Marshall Goldberg.....  | 36 |
| 2019 0327 Marshall Mcgrady.....   | 36 |
| 2019 0327 Marshall Steeves.....   | 37 |
| 2019 0226 Martha Van Dyke.....    | 37 |
| 2019 0329 Martin Frazier.....     | 37 |
| 2019 0401 Martin Highwolf.....    | 37 |
| 2019 0327 Mary Baumgardner.....   | 37 |
| 2019 0325 Mary Davies.....        | 38 |
| 2019 0401 Mary Locke.....         | 38 |
| 2019 0329 Mary Lou Soscia.....    | 38 |
| 2019 0329 Mary Ramsay.....        | 39 |
| 2019 0401 Mary Vogel.....         | 39 |
| 2019 0401 Mary Wahlquist.....     | 40 |
| 2019 0401 Matchu Williams.....    | 40 |
| 2019 0326 Mathew Lippincott.....  | 41 |
| 2019 0401 Matt Glidden.....       | 42 |
| 2019 0326 Matt Kelly.....         | 43 |
| 2019 0312 Matt Kindall.....       | 43 |
| 2019 0401 Matt Lucas.....         | 43 |
| 2019 0325 Matt Meskill.....       | 44 |

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with M



|                                   |    |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| 2019 0307 Matt Morrissey .....    | 44 |
| 2019 0322 Matt Ransom.....        | 44 |
| 2019 0327 Matt Roberts .....      | 45 |
| 2019 0327 Matt Stewart.....       | 45 |
| 2019 0305 Matt Swetnam .....      | 46 |
| 2019 0331 Matthew Arnold .....    | 47 |
| 2019 0325 Matthew Celentano ..... | 47 |
| 2019 0401 Matthew J Hall .....    | 48 |
| 2019 0331 Matthew J. Brown .....  | 48 |
| 2019 0313 Matthew Kane .....      | 49 |
| 2019 0402 Matthew Loudermilk..... | 49 |
| 2019 0225 Matthew Meskill .....   | 49 |
| 2019 0328 Matthew Miller.....     | 49 |
| 2019 0401 Matthew Moore .....     | 50 |
| 2019 0328 Matthew Subotnick.....  | 50 |
| 2019 0401 Matthias Arnason .....  | 51 |
| 2019 0401 Maureen Andersen .....  | 51 |
| 2019 0331 Maureen O'Neal.....     | 51 |
| 2019 0327 max ogrady .....        | 52 |
| 2019 0219 MB.....                 | 52 |
| 2019 0219 MB SG .....             | 52 |
| 2019 0331 Meara Reed .....        | 53 |
| 2019 0401 Meg Cotner .....        | 53 |
| 2019 0311 Meg Ruby.....           | 53 |
| 2019 0222 Megan Horst .....       | 54 |
| 2019 0326 Megan Leatherman.....   | 54 |
| 2019 0223 Megan Pearson.....      | 55 |
| 2019 0307 Megan Stratman .....    | 55 |
| 2019 0316 Meggan K Odell .....    | 56 |
| 2019 0331 Meghan Hawkins .....    | 56 |



|  |    |
|--|----|
| 2019 0321 Melanie Parker .....           | 56 |
| 2019 0301 Melba Dlugonski .....          | 56 |
| 2019 0329 Melba Dlugonski .....          | 56 |
| 2019 0331 Melelani Sax-Barnett.....      | 57 |
| 2019 0401 Melissa Haggerty .....         | 57 |
| 2019 0401 Mercedes Elizalde.....         | 58 |
| 2019 0401 Micah Meskel .....             | 58 |
| 2019 0312 Michael.....                   | 60 |
| 2019 0328 Michael Andersen .....         | 61 |
| 2019 0327 Michael Barrett.....           | 62 |
| 2019 0401 Michael Espinoza.....          | 62 |
| 2019 0225 Michael Fanuzzi .....          | 62 |
| 2019 0312 Michael Fyffe.....             | 63 |
| 2019 0317 Michael Hashizume.....         | 64 |
| 2019 0329 Michael Hutchens .....         | 64 |
| 2019 0402 MichaelKale .....              | 65 |
| 2019 0322 Michael Klennert .....         | 65 |
| 2019 0219 Michael Limb.....              | 65 |
| 2019 0326 Michael Morrison.....          | 66 |
| 2019 0304 Michael O'Brien.....           | 66 |
| 2019 0219 Michael Orr .....              | 66 |
| 2019 0327 Michael Owens .....            | 67 |
| 2019 0313 Michael P .....                | 67 |
| 2019 0401 Michael Parkhurst.....         | 67 |
| 2019 0312 Michael Ryan .....             | 68 |
| 2019 0304 Michael Westling.....          | 69 |
| 2019 0327 Michael White .....            | 69 |
| 2019 0401 Michael White .....            | 70 |
| 2019 0401 Michela and David McMahon..... | 70 |
| 2019 0401 Michele E Reeves .....         | 70 |



|                                    |    |
|------------------------------------|----|
| 2019 0329 Michele Miller .....     | 72 |
| 2019 0326 Michele Price .....      | 72 |
| 2019 0329 Michelle .....           | 72 |
| 2019 0219 Michelle DuBarry .....   | 72 |
| 2019 0329 Michelle Marx .....      | 73 |
| 2019 0330 Michelle Medler .....    | 76 |
| 2019 0311 Michelle Poyourow .....  | 77 |
| 2019 0327 Michelle thomas .....    | 78 |
| 2019 0305 Michelle Zellers .....   | 78 |
| 2019 0401 Mikayla Maki .....       | 78 |
| 2019 0401 Mike Faden .....         | 78 |
| 2019 0303 Mike Kehoe .....         | 79 |
| 2019 0328 Mike Landauer .....      | 79 |
| 2019 0402 Mike Lettunich .....     | 79 |
| 2019 0319 Mike O'Brien .....       | 79 |
| 2019 0000 Mike Orr .....           | 80 |
| 2019 0331 Mike Schepps .....       | 80 |
| 2019 0402 Mike Warwick .....       | 80 |
| 2019 0401 Mike Wietecki .....      | 81 |
| 2019 0316 Mikhaila Bishop .....    | 83 |
| 2019 0401 Mikhaila Bishop .....    | 83 |
| 2019 0401 Mila Mimica .....        | 83 |
| 2019 0329 Mitchell HuffMenne ..... | 84 |
| 2019 0329 Molly Dwyer .....        | 84 |
| 2019 0401 Molly Henty .....        | 85 |
| 2019 0329 Molly Porterfield .....  | 85 |
| 2019 0326 Mona Derby .....         | 85 |
| 2019 0329 Monica Kishore .....     | 86 |
| 2019 0312 Monique Gaskins .....    | 86 |
| 2019 0325 Monique Gaskins .....    | 87 |

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with M



|                                    |    |
|------------------------------------|----|
| 2019 0401 Mont Chris Hubbard ..... | 88 |
| 2019 0402 Montserrat Shepard ..... | 89 |
| 2019 0323 Morgan Johnson .....     | 89 |
| 2019 0323 Morgan Johnson 2 .....   | 89 |
| 2019 0327 MORGAN MAIOLIE .....     | 89 |
| 2019 0310 Mr Sparr .....           | 89 |
| 2019 0312 Ms Herout .....          | 90 |
| 2019 0312 Ms. Iannarone .....      | 90 |
| 2019 0326 MUYLYSA MELCO .....      | 91 |
| 2019 0328 Murphy Terrell .....     | 91 |
| 2019 0305 Mykle Hansen .....       | 91 |



## 2019 0226 M. Lee

**Comment:** stop encouraging more cars on highways while there's still time to save the money and trouble.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Machel Stupfel

**Comment:** Stop using the money for light rail it serves a minority of the state. Fix and make i5 larger. It is inefficient and frustrating, the state is outgrowing the road systems. All feeder streets are a mess, 205 and 84 are not safe, way too much traffic .

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 MacKenzie

**Comment:** No thanks to the expansion, we'll find another solution.

Sincerely,

MacKenzie

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0302 Madaleine Peterson

**Comment:** Invest in other methods of transportation! We do not need to create more incentives for car transportation!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Madi Carlson

**Comment:** I am a single mom of two and we are able to get around Portland without a car. We bike, walk, take transit, and when we want to leave town we take the bus to the train station or MAX to airport. Twice a year we end up carpooling somewhere friends have invited us along to, but this is a city easy to travel within and away from without needing a car of one's own and without ever using Uber/Lyft.

Portland doesn't need to make things easier for people to drive who don't realize this...NOT TO MENTION widening a freeway has never once relieved traffic! Congestion pricing would most definitely encourage so many drivers to look at their very easy alternatives and would actually relieve traffic.



Ignoring the health effects this would have on the students of Harriet Tubman Middle School is criminal. My kids attend Woodstock ES and Hosford MS, but that doesn't mean I don't care about the health of their peers at Harriet Tubman.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0402 Madisen Lattanzi

**Comment:** To whom it may concern,  
please do not widen i-5 in Portland. Please do not spend \$500 mill on roads that will significantly degrade public transit and public spaces.

Madsen Lattanzi

Portland, OR

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0226 Madison Arnold-Scerbo

**Comment:** I strongly oppose this project. I am deeply skeptical about the findings in this environmental assessment. I do not see adequate evidence for how this project will actually reduce carbon emissions, reduce traffic congestion, or improve air quality. No freeway expansion has ever achieved such aims, and I am not convinced that this project will either. I need to see more data that went into the creation of this assessment, and without that, I am opposed to this project

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0326 Madison D Hathaway

**Comment:** I live near freeways and this expansion will only increase air quality problems. We need to expand public transportation and make it easier for people to use active transportation by improving bike lanes and pedestrian walkways. As a recent econ grad, I know that the opportunity cost of this project is very high. If we put money here instead of in decarbonizing to minimize the worst impacts of climate change our communities will suffer. I strongly oppose this freeway expansion, please act with my comments in mind and the thousands of other Oregonians who submitted public comment.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0401 Madison Maschger

**Comment:** To Whom It May Concern,

Please do not widen I-5 in Portland. Please do not spend \$500M on roads that will significantly degrade public transit and public spaces. Climate leaders do not expand freeways!

Madison Maschger

Portland, OR

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0326 Maggie Gardner

**Comment:** I am a long-time resident of the Eliot neighborhood. I love my neighborhood and I love my neighbors. The sentiment that we have historically and consistently had our personal welfare overlooked for the sake of some potential "greater good" is not without justification.

I am a multi-modal commuter to my downtown job; bike, walk, bus, carshare, drive most of which takes me over the Flint Ave bridge. My husband walks our neighborhood streets to his job near the Moda Center. Our older son is a recent grad of Boise Eliot Humboldt School, and walked there every day. We spend a lot of time with our toddler, walking our neighborhood streets and in our neighborhood parks including Lillis-Albina and Dawson Park.

Our extended family lives in Vancouver, WA. We feel the impact of traffic delays on a regular basis, and it diminishes the frequency with which we can visit with them. But this construction project will not solve our traffic problems.

What it will give us is an increase in air pollution and further the health risks for myself, my family and my neighbors.

It will give us a huge financial burden, sucking resources away from long-term solutions that will work.

It will negatively impact any trust in government officials and your ability to make sound decisions based on facts, and to make decisions that are in the best interest OF THE PEOPLE.

...all the while, leaving our roads just as congested as ever.

At the very least, you owe us a complete and full Environmental Impact Study that does not attempt to misinform, and that can provide a clear picture of how our neighborhood and our lives will be affected.

This proposed expansion is a band-aid (the cheap kind that falls off before it even does any good). Let's get to the root cause and find a true solution.

I look forward to your decision to PUSH PAUSE on this proposal until a full Impact Study is complete, and a wider set of alternatives are explored.

Thank you,



Maggie Gardner

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0228 Maia

**Comment:** I live a few blocks from Harriet Tubman Middle School and the I5/84 freeways and I am extremely concerned about the poor air quality we already have. I don't see how adding freeway lanes will help decrease congestion and bring down the pollution levels when study after study has shown that freeway expansion only attracts more traffic. The exorbitant amount of money being proposed to spend on this project could be used to make the city easier to get into and around without a car. I am also a mother of a young child who would one day attend Harriet Tubman and with the current proposal I am seriously considering moving away so that we can escape both the poor air quality and what will likely be a long, traffic-inducing mess of a project. Please reconsider this proposal and take the time to explore options that truly discourage congestion and help us build the healthy, public-transit friendly city Portlanders really desire. Thank you.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0313 Maia Dean

**Comment:** The Rose Quarter bottleneck has been a source of frustration and vehicle crashes for decades. Fix it now.

Sincerely,

Maia Dean

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 Maia McCarthy

**Comment:** Research shows that expanding roads leads to more not less driving. The majority of the traffic is single occupant vehicles. This plan flies in the face of the work done on local streets and in neighborhoods to increase access to safe bike and pedestrian travel.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0313 Maia Watkins

**Comment:** Freeway expansion has proven an enormous environmental and public health risk deemed acceptable for one perceived benefit: more timely transportation. Historically, this means transporting wealthy white families who live in suburbs or non-poor neighborhoods (to which they fled following desegregation) to and from the city center.

The cost of freeway expansion, therefore, is often painfully felt by densely populated low-income neighborhoods. Why is it acceptable for this perceived "greater good"-- efficiency-- to be



assumed by poor people? Because black, indigenous, and poc communities have always been deemed expendable by public policy. If we go forward with the freeway expansion, we are saying it is ok for poor people and people of color to continue to assume the burden of air & noise pollution and the demolition of their homes and communities. We are saying it is ok for the kids at Harriet Tubman Middle School, where over 40% of students are black, to be less healthy than kids in more affluent neighborhoods.

Meanwhile, freeway expansion doesn't actually reduce congestion. The only proven way to reduce congestion is to implement congestion pricing, or get people to use mass transit at higher rates. The first will again will be a small burden to affluent families and only serve to keep low-income families off the road, while the second offers a key to real, lasting solutions.

Each morning, I use TriMet to get to work. At 8:00 am, my bus is always overflowing and must frequently forgo picking up additional passengers. I can only assume this problem will worsen as prices of food, housing, and medical care soar, and Portlanders become poorer. When we are facing widening income gaps, a warming climate, and immediate needs of poor people, why address transportation efficiency by using 500,000,000 public dollars to fund a ineffective plan that will only exacerbate inequity in Portland? Why not use it to expand mass transit infrastructure, subsidize transit costs to lower the price of transportation for passengers, mount a public service campaign to increase use of public transit, build more sidewalks and bikeways? Portlanders need access to affordable and timely public transportation, and it is time the city addressed real needs of the masses instead of a wealthier and louder few.

I hope you will take my words to heart and stop this ridiculous project.

Sincerely,

Maia Watkins

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Maitri Dirmeyer

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

I am a Milwaukie resident that works in the LLOYD center area. I rely on multi modal transportation to commute to work including biking along the Vera Katz Eastbank Esplanade via Biketown.

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 communities along that section of the freeway.

In addition, 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.

Sincerely,

Maitri Dirmeyer

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0402 Mara Gross

**Comment:** Dear ODOT,

Please do not widen I-5 through the middle of Portland. Our limited transportation dollars should be focused on expanding transportation options, increasing safety, solving the climate crisis, and addressing inequality. New auxiliary lanes are not an effective way to address these issues, and the project should be replaced with projects that reflect a positive vision for our community.

Sincerely,

Mara Gross

Portland, OR

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0305 Mara Isbell

**Comment:** Good afternoon,

I'm reaching out as an Oregon resident to express my opinion and opposition regarding the proposed 1-5 Rose Quarter expansion. I strongly believe that adding more lanes and expanding highways will not diminish traffic, but rather encourage more people to drive. It is highly short sighted to expand highways when we are likely heading towards a very different method of transportation with the onset of automated vehicles and increased electric modes of transport. In the meantime, expanding highways makes traffic worse.

The funds invested would be better spent on things that increase quality of life. This is important to focus on especially in a town that people move to for the quality of life. Let's invest in public transportation including buses and trains, while also prioritizing bike lanes and sidewalks. Let's



be forward thinking and utilize the funds for electric vehicle charging stations and incentive programs and safety upgrades.

I want less traffic, better air quality, and better use of millions of dollars of public money that improve quality of life and the livability of a city vs continuing to throw money at car infrastructure.

All the best,

Mara

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0225 Marc Berezin

**Comment:** This project solves no problems. It won't decrease congestion, reduce emissions, or improve traffic flow. \$500,000,000 could be much better spent upgrading mass transit infrastructure.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Marc Czornij

**Comment:** The Environmental Assessment done by ODOT does not fully address the significant impacts to health and public safety that this project represents. Please consider the many alternative pathways to addressing traffic congestion, including decongestion pricing, as well as expanding a full Environmental Impact Statement. Funds raised from decongestion pricing can and should be applied to public transit infrastructure and frequency. Why is Portland prioritizing the single occupancy vehicle driver over Oregonians who use the environmentally-sound decision of public transit or active transportation?

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Marcia Strickland

**Comment:** I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed freeway expansion project for the rose

quarter. It is a huge waste of money when it will worsen air quality in NE Portland, take us further

from our carbon reduction goals, and not even have a significant reduction in traffic.

Furthermore, one of the biggest contributing groups to this traffic are commuters from Vancouver,

Washington. So far, voters there have always rejected any effort to create more public transportation options which would be much better solution to the problem. Why should Oregonians pay for freeway expansion for them?



Please reject this plan and use the funds for a better purpose.

Sincerely,

Marcia Strickland

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0228 Marcus Rodriguez

*Pacific Northwest Regional Council of Carpenters*

**Comment:** Good afternoon,

I am in favor of this project due to that fact that I would like to see the members of the Carpenters Union do the work and in turn put money in to their families pocketbooks. These hours would also reflect in the health of our Pension plan, which is ultimately one of our goals here at the Carpenters Union to see our members retire with dignity.

Thank you and have a nice day.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Marcy Holmes

**Comment:** \$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.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Margaret Edera

**Comment:** Please consider the fact that federal funding granted is no longer a guarantee of receiving it. Please take a longer view on this if possible. Yes, we need to relieve congestion quickly but perhaps there are solutions available that are have been taken off the table a long time ago.

For instance: I live in the Maplewood neighborhood. Our Trimet service has been cut repeatedly over the years I have lived here. If I live in Multnomah Village or Hillsdale it is still possible to commute on Trimet although weekend and night service is very limited. Are there other easily recognizable neighborhoods that also have this problem?

What would happen if you had more ways for residents to commute and to engage in evening events without single use cars?

I write this in polite terms but part of me is shaking my finger and getting louder with every word I type.



**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0307 Margaret H Musgnung

**Comment:** It seems foolish to spend dollars on road development when the climate crisis is in full swing. The carbon emissions are a thing to reduce, not increase.

Making better public transportation available to the city is a much more prudent and reasonable way to spend the dollars.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0328 Margaret Linn

**Comment:** This is a slap in the face to the urgent need to focus on air, water and all climate change consequences. Overwhelming evidence speaks volumes of no for this gross installment. Please reconstruct the long look with some sense of reality. Thank you.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Margery Mayock

**Comment:** Please don't widen the highway! I drive, but I don't think this is the right way to deal with congestion. Lets try decongestion pricing. I care about the air quality for people in the nearby neighborhood. I care about equity- once again brown people are bearing more than their fair share of the suffering. I believe that we need to do more to stave off climate change- increasing highway access is not the best use of our funds!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Maria

**Comment:** Dear Mr. Brown,

I've lived in Portland's Eliot neighborhood for 23 years. Wow, this city and this neighborhood sure has changed over that time. The disruption and change has been painful for the neighborhood - a neighborhood that had already been traumatized in many ways as I'm sure ODOT is fully aware of. The neighborhood is getting its feet on the ground and some interesting / fun things are developing here now.

My opinion on the proposed alterations to the freeway is that it takes our neighborhood and blights us with another ugly 'fix' to solve a perceived problem for people around the effected neighborhoods and for people driving through. We're all now aware of the adage: Freeway Expansion Has Never Solved Traffic Congestion.



We are all in agreement, except for the most intellectually challenged, that climate change is happening. What can we do to be more forward thinking?

I work in medicine and there's an expression "a surgeon will always want to do surgery" whether it will fix the problem or not. Sometimes the surgery can cause more harm. I feel this is the problem with ODOT and congestion.

My hope is that something innovative and forward thinking could be brought forward to manage Portland's traffic woes. I am a palliative care nurse in the community and drive everyday from Eliot to downtown Portland and the Southwest hills to visit patients in their homes. Yes, there is congestion, but let's start with a tax on commuters and a lower trimet fare. There are so many people that are encouraged to drive - I personally just thought of 5 people in about 30 seconds - because they think it is cheaper than taking the bus.

ODOT is in the business of building roads. Like a surgeon, you're stuck in that box.

My plea to you is to pause and complete a full Environmental Impact Statement to fully inform the public of the project's impact.

Thanks for your time.

Maria

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0326 Maria Chuop

**Comment:** Dear ODOT,

As a resident of North Portland who travels from Southwest to North Portland almost daily, I strongly oppose the I-5 freeway expansion. The claim that an expansion of the I-5 freeway will improve commute times is supported by poor evidence and in fact, it has been shown that this would, over time, cause more congestion through induced demand, a concept supported repeatedly by highway expansions across the country.

I believe that the leaders of Portland and Oregon can do better. We can become leaders in our country by using creative ways to address transportation in a growing city. For example, the money that is being proposed for this project could be used to expand public transportation, sidewalks, and bike lanes thereby improving transportation equity in the region for everyone, not just those who have cars or who live in Clark County. Our dollars should be serving all of us, not some of us.

There are many other reasons to look more critically at this project before moving forward. A great place to begin would be by performing an environmental impact statement. As public servants, it is the duty of ODOT to provide the citizens of Oregon with all of the information available regarding such a massive overhaul to the fabric of the Portland community.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,



Maria Chuop

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0219 maria nazzaro

**Comment:** We need better more efficient public transportation not more freeways.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0307 Maria Opie

**Comment:** I'm very concerned about the air quality in the Eliot neighborhood. I'm concerned that this project will only cause more problems despite the information you've provided. Maybe this lack of trust is because of the way the community has historically been treated.

In my mind a better proposal (a better use of \$) is free public transportation—this addresses discrimination, environmental racism, and is the best option for our environment.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0326 Maria Opie

**Comment:** I've lived in Portland's Eliot neighborhood for 23 years. Wow, this city and this neighborhood sure has changed over that time. The disruption and change has been painful for the neighborhood - a neighborhood that had already been traumatized in many ways as I'm sure ODOT is fully aware of. The neighborhood is getting its feet on the ground and some interesting / fun things are developing here now. My opinion on the proposed alterations to the freeway is that it takes our neighborhood and blights us with another ugly "fix" to solve a perceived problem for people around the effected neighborhoods and for people driving through. We're all now aware of the adage: Freeway Expansion Has Never Solved Traffic Congestion.

We are all in agreement, except for the most intellectually challenged, that climate change is happening. What can we do to be more forward thinking? I work in medicine and there's an expression 'a surgeon will always want to do surgery whether it will fix the problem or not. Sometimes the surgery can cause more harm. I feel this is the problem with ODOT and congestion. My hope is that something innovative and forward thinking could be brought forward to manage Portland's traffic woes. I am a palliative care nurse in the community and drive everyday from Eliot to downtown Portland and the Southwest hills to visit patients in their homes. Yes, there is congestion, but let's start with a tax on commuters and a lower trimet fare. There are so many people that are encouraged to drive - I personally just thought of 5 people in about 30 seconds - because they think it is cheaper than taking the bus. ODOT is in the business of building roads. Like a surgeon, you're stuck in that box. My plea to you is to pause and complete a full Environmental Impact Statement to fully inform the public of the project's impact.



**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0308 Maria Schur

**Comment:** First, finding where to comment on your online forum is very difficult - every link you click on leads back to another link instead of a comment page. Second, the email address listed above bounces back.

Here are my comments:

- \*Improve the Flint Street bridge by removing motor vehicle access from it altogether
- \*Save money by not building an entirely new bridge where more human users will be put at safety risk
- \*Prioritize clean air and human safety over motor vehicle accommodation
- \*Portland is a special place, please don't ruin it by making freeways bigger
- \*Think of the Esplanade - that beautiful park, which is a cornerstone of Portland, was going to be a freeway until Tom McCall intervened.

Thank you,

Maria Schur

Road User and Tax Payer

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Maria Schur

**Comment:** You're probably aware of this article: <http://cityobservatory.org/theres-a-3-billion-bridge-hidden-in-the-rose-quarter-project-ea/>

Please accept defeat of a new Columbia River Crossing. If you build it, they will come. They will come in cars, thousands and thousands and thousands of cars, along with the traffic, road rage, stench, pollution and fatalities that come with it. Please no.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Mariah Dula

*Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods*

**Comment:** March 29, 2019

Oregon Department of Transportation

[info@i5RoseQuarter.org](mailto:info@i5RoseQuarter.org)



Attention Megan Channell

123 NW Flanders St.

Portland, OR 97209

CC: Senator Lew Frederick; Senator Michael Dembrow

Representative Tawna D. Sanchez; Representative Barbara Smith Warner

Multnomah County Board of Commissioners; Portland City Council

Re: NECN opposition to I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project

Dear Ms Channell,

The Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods is opposed to the proposed I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project, as it will have significant negative environmental effects, specifically on nearby populations, without creating a long-term solution at immense cost to the public. While we cannot support this project in its current form, as an organization that represents more than 60,000 neighbors in inner Northeast Portland, we are highly invested in the outcome of any major development proposals in our district and request to be engaged as stakeholders in any future proposals developed by ODOT.

According to the EPA, the majority of our NE district ranks among the 80- 90 percentile for diesel particulate and air pollution levels in air in the nation. Many of our neighborhoods either border or are in close proximity to the proposed freeway expansion project. Subsequently, residents in our neighborhoods will be highly impacted by the proposed project and increase in air pollution. Two of our schools Tubman and Boise-Eliot border on the Interstate 5 freeway and Portland State University scientists advise that children at these schools to avoid outdoor recess due air quality concerns. With already poor air and vulnerable populations near the proposed project we can little afford to increase harmful auto and truck pollution from increased traffic.

We oppose this project on the grounds that it will produce:

- Significant environmental impacts
- The expansion would worsen air quality and noise, especially for vulnerable populations including children at Harriet Tubman and Boise-Elliot schools
- Analysis based on similar projects show increased driving will worsen greenhouse gas and diesel emissions
- No improvement in congestion and safety over the long-term
- We are concerned that traffic congestion will increase due to latent demand, so the project will not resolve the regional bottleneck.
- After ODOT widened I-5 north of Lombard crashes increased, so we do not believe widening I-5 in the Rose Quarter will increase safety
- Cost to the taxpayers and greater areas of need
- \$500,000,000 of Oregon taxpayer funds would be better invested in infrastructure elsewhere in



project that supports the region's greenhouse gas emissions reduction and equity goals

- Commissioner Joanne Hardesty opposes the project and has recommended that the funds be spent on walking and biking projects that increase equity in our region

In sum, as proposed this project will increase the burden on residents of Portland of poor air quality, noise, and increased traffic at an enormous expense to Oregon taxpayers without creating a

lasting solution to relieve traffic congestion. We request that ODOT reinvest these funds in state owned

roads that have been identified by Portland as High Crash Corridors, which include Lombard and MLK in

our NE district. These investments would have significant safety and equity benefits for our neighbors.

We urge ODOT to reconsider or revise this plan and request to be included as stakeholders in the

planning process going forward.

Sincerely,

Mariah Dula

President of the Board

Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods

**Attachments:** [2019 0329 Mariah Dula ATT](#)

## 2019 0326 Mariana Lindsay

**Comment:** I have spent nearly my whole life living in the North Portland Overlook neighborhood just blocks from I-5. Please do not spend \$500 million on a freeway expansion that based on your data will not combat climate change, will not substantially increase safety and won't make a significant long term change to traffic.

There is so much needed in our city. There are many useful projects that could be completely covered by such a huge expenditure: Safe Routes to Schools, New Bus Rapid Transit Lines, expansion of dense affordable housing in inner Portland, so people don't have to commute nearly as far.

I know these are challenging problems, but please, for the sake of Portland and the world's future, let's invest in data-driven solutions that will improve our climate, our community, and the communities that lost their homes to the first I-5. I am not opposed to any project or change, but I would want to see significant changes in this project and no expansion of the freeway.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0327 Marijane White

**Comment:** Hello,

I am writing to make my opposition to the proposed widening of I5 in the Rose quarter known. This is a backwards and wrongheaded project for Portland to pursue.

I understand that the goal of this project is to increase the peak hour speed of traffic, the level of service. It is surprising and disappointing to see that planners do not understand that a freeway expansion will have the opposite effect. The phenomenon of induced demand is well documented and has played out in every freeway expansion project in the U.S. in recent history. Look at the 405 expansion in LA this past decade -- I've read that project improved congestion for about two weeks before traffic returned to previous levels, and now it's even worse than before the expansion. Building more roads does not reduce congestion, instead, it encourages more people to drive, which in turn increases air pollution. What Portland should be doing right now is pursuing projects and policies that discourage driving so that we can meet our goals of reducing carbon emissions and increase the overall livability of our city.

The pollution increase this project will bring are particularly insidious when one considers the fact that air pollution is already so bad in this part of town that PSU researchers have recommended students at the nearby Harriet Tubman Middle School remain indoors. Portland Public Schools has identified a vast majority of Tubman's students as vulnerable populations, which means this is not just an environmental issue, it is an environmental justice issue. I've read that ODOT has not released the full environmental impact statement for the project. This alone is reason enough to not go forward with the project.

It is also terribly sad to think that millions will be spent in a fruitless attempt to improve traffic conditions that last just a few hours a day, and that the roads will be underutilized the rest of the time. Meanwhile we will be stuck with higher maintenance costs to maintain more roads that will make other problems worse -- not just congestion and pollution, but the disruption of bicycle and pedestrian traffic in the area as well. From a systems thinking perspective, this project makes very little sense.

There are legitimate ways to reduce congestion, like introducing road pricing and improving public transit, and it is difficult to understand why such approaches are not being considered, especially given Portland's reputation as a national leader in transportation policy -- a reputation that is already being tarnished by the news of this project.

I know I am not alone in opposing this project. Many members of our community have voiced strong opinions about the undesirable outcomes of this project should it proceed. I implore you to listen to these voices, and make the decision to not go forward with the expansion.

Thank you,

Marijane White

97215

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0330 Marilyn Costamagna

**Comment:** Simply stated: For environmental, pollution, safety, fiscal impact, people's opposition, best solution to this problem plan and the lack of a full environmental assessment report reasons, I am OPPOSED to the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion.

Even though I have driven on the Rose Quarter FWY several times, I am still against this proposed expansion.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Marion Thompson

**Comment:** Please

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 Marisa Morby

**Comment:** The proposed freeway widening project is the wrong solution to a density and traffic issue. We are all aware there is increased traffic due to a growing population, but the answer is not to widen the freeway.

In reading the report that has gone out for the project, there was no mention of induced demand, which has repeatedly been seen in other urban areas where they increased the width of the roads. Widening the freeway will not solve congestion. It never has, and never will.

In addition to this, you're completely dismissing the children in the school next to the freeway. PSU did a study that showed the levels of pollutants were so high the children shouldn't play outside. And if they do play outside, you're knowingly putting those children at a higher risk of becoming ill. Widening the freeway will make the lives of these children worse.

And the final nail in the coffin is, of course, climate change. I assume you already know that transportation is the largest sector for greenhouse gas emissions. So adding more roadway will contribute to more greenhouse gases because more people will be on the road because there is more room (induced demand). Widening the freeway will accelerate us down an already dangerous path with our changing climate.

Instead of funding this ridiculous freeway expansion, use those funds for cycling and pedestrian infrastructure and increased public transportation options. Start doing congestion pricing, like London and Stockholm have. They have populations of 9 million and 1.4 million, respectively. Portland had a population of around 700,000 in the last census (2016). If they can do this, so can we.

To say that widening a freeway is even an option is ridiculous, short-sided, lazy, dangerous, and sad. We all need to be better and make better choices. This freeway is not a viable option. As a



Portland resident, and person who can only live on this one planet, I oppose the freeway widening.

Marisa Morby

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Marissa

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

I'm truly saddened and disappointed to hear about the proposed highway expansion. I live in NE Portland and if ODOT truly wants to serve the Portland community it would not fund the highway expansion project. The Albina community has already suffered from this highway for decades and this expansion would only increase the burdens this neighborhood bears: air quality issues, congestion in the neighborhood and decreased mobility through their own neighborhood.

Please do not go forward with the expansion project. There are many community organizations out there with alternative solutions to the problems this city faces.

Marissa

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0226 Marjorie Nafziger

**Comment:** Please reconsider the Rose Qtr Expan. Project. In a time of acute climate needs, bolstering alternate transportation infrastructure, pulling back from fossil fuels, improving air quality (esp. for students in the impacted schools in the area, this seems like a huge step in the wrong direction. Our own ODOT's hired consultants admit the gains over congestion are temporary stop gaps over a recurring problem that now requires more out of the box thinking.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Marjorie Nafziger

**Comment:** Please reconsider this ill-advised expansion that at best is barely a short-term solution for congestion. Expense and pollution (especially around schools!) is not Portland's best foot forward. Instead please invest in improved public transit that reduces the need for car travel.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Marjorie Skinner

**Comment:** Confronting climate change is the most important issue in our city, our state, our country, and the world. Sinking half a billion into an investment in fossil fuel-based transportation infrastructure is, in the long term, a waste of money, and in the immediate term a very expensive equivalent of sticking one's head in the sand.



As the effects of climate change become more acute, we will be confronted more and more with the fact that marginalized people will be the first to suffer. Adding to the already shameful air-quality problems of a school with a high population of at-risk students is a desecration of Portland's purported progressive values.

It's just sad.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0320 Mark Miskiewicz

**Comment:** HI,

I wish to comment FOR this project. I use that section of I5 at least once a week and it is always a mess.

I am also one of the hundreds if not thousands who have been injured in this section of I5. I was rear ended in June 2017 when traffic went from 55 to ZERO in a few seconds. I wound up having 4 vertebrae in my neck fused and incurred over \$80,000 of medical costs. I also lost a year of my life recuperating and still have permanent damage. At age 63 a year of your life is priceless.

You can't take back what happened to me but you can help prevent this from happening to someone else!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Mark Boswell

**Comment:** I strongly urge ODOT not to pursue this project. Widening highways has never been shown to alleviate traffic concerns. It also encourages more single-occupancy vehicle travel which works against conservation and climate change efforts, threatening our public well-being.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0226 Mark Canright

**Comment:** As an outdoorsman, I ask you to please not expand the Freeway any more. Thanks, Mark

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0311 Mark Canright

**Comment:** As an outdoorsman, I ask you to please not expand the freeway. Let's instead invest in public transportation expansion!

Thanks for your time,



Mark

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0330 Mark Canright

**Comment:** Greetings! I am a college student who cares deeply about protecting our environment. This project is 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.

There is widespread community opposition to this project: 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 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).

I 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 is a very helpful ask for us.

Thanks,

Mark

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0401 Mark Greenfield

**Comment:** I am writing in support of the proposed improvements to I-5 between I-84 and the Fremont Bridge.

The area in question involves three freeways. To get from the Fremont Bridge to I-84, one must merge over TWO lanes, then get back into the right exit lane following the I-5 south on-ramp from NE Broadway. This is not efficient, and it is particularly problematic given we are talking about connecting three freeways. There badly needs to be a third lane southbound from the Fremont bridge to the I-84 exit. It is long overdue.

To my knowledge, no natural resource habitat areas would be affected by this. If pilings are needed in the Willamette, they would be far fewer than were needed to build Tillicum Crossing, and based on experience I had working on projects like the new I-5 bridge in Eugene and the Sellwood Bridge in Portland, such impacts can be adequately mitigated.

As for congestion, I believe this improvement would relieve congestion rather than create more congestion because it will greatly improve access onto I-84 eastbound. This is not about adding a new travel lane from Vancouver, Washington to I-84, which I would strongly oppose. Any new capacity for moving traffic from Vancouver to Portland should be by light rail, not automobile. Rather, this is an improvement to facilitate the flow of traffic that is already in the Portland area, to get from the Fremont bridge onto I-84. Again, it just makes tremendous sense from the planning standpoint.

I also do not buy the argument that this would run counter to local climate change goals. Currently, the area is one big bottleneck with cars idling in place or moving very slowly. This would improve that. Further, by the time the improvement got built, there would be far more electric and hybrid cars on the road, and cars using gasoline would run cleaner. I think this is an emotional argument without a lot to back it up.

I have worked as a land use consultant to ODOT on a number of roadway improvements, including the Newberg-Dundee Bypass and the Columbia River Crossing, and I believe this project absolutely merits funding. I urge Metro and ODOT to go with what makes sense, to include this project in the RTP, and to provide it full funding.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer comments.

Mark Greenfield

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0330 Mark H Linehan

**Comment:** As conceived, the project is too expensive for the promised benefits. The cost includes \$.5 billion of public money and 4-5 years of construction disruption. The benefit is somewhat easier entrance, exit, and merging on I5, and changes to the surface environment. The benefits are not worth the cost.



\* Congestion on the freeway will not get better. Congestion pricing is much less expensive and more likely to solve this issue.

\* Safety doesn't seem to be big problem on this highway stretch.

\* Air pollution and noise will not get better, certainly not significantly.

\* It is questionable whether cycling and walking routes through the area will improve. The 10% grade on the proposed Hancock/Dixon Bridge makes it unusable as a route for most cyclists. The out-of-direction turn at the west end of the proposed Clackamas Bridge makes it undesirable.

\* The fragmented surface areas created by the highway lids are not very useful as public spaces and not engineered to support major buildings.

In summary, this project should be cancelled as a bad use of public money.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0218 Mark Harris

**Comment:** Yes, stop this foolish project now! It is very shortsighted to plan a freeway expansion when we see how much harm fossil fuel does to the environment? Surely we live in a town that is aware of this and can come up with a better solution than widening a freeway? Ye gods, get your heads out of the sand and act responsibly!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0311 Mark Harris

**Comment:** The earth is hurtling towards utter catastrophe while we enact business as usual. More cars, more roads, more pollution and more congestion. We should be putting that kind of money towards making downtown Portland car free, Start with one day a week that no cars are allowed downtown, Imagine the quiet and relaxation. People will love it.

Do you want more tourism in Portland? Just because we have a few more cyclists than many cities a lot of tourists come here. What if we had no cars downtown, Many more tourists would flock here.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0330 Mark McClure

**Comment:** I stand with Oregon Walks, and others of like mind, and do not support ODOT's I-5 Rose Quarter freeway expansion project.



I first learned of this project when it was proposed in 2010 as the City of Portland/ODOT N/NE Quadrant Project. At that time, I was a very active member of the Lloyd TMA (now Go Lloyd) Pedestrian Committee. I am not representing Go Lloyd in my opposition today.

I have lived in NE Portland for 38 years. I currently work in the Lloyd District, where my spouse and I are considering moving to after we retire.

Sincerely, Mark McClure

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0330 Mark McClure 2

**Comment:** Aaron,

RE: "Can you post a link to our No More Freeways website on your facebook, twitter, instagram, Next Door, local message board or google group for your PTA/Neighborhood Association?"

I added your link to <https://pnwphotowalks.com/about-mark-mcclure> under section -- Supporting Public and Active Transportation --

Mark

PS: Thanks to you and others for your hard work fighting this boondoggle.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Mark Meininger

**Comment:** I write to oppose the I-5 Rose Quarter project in its entirety.

The project is not justified even on the face of ODOT planning documents. Justifications for the project, built into ODOT planning documents, are based upon southbound I-5 traffic volumes that presume the Columbia River Crossing bridge project had been built. It was not. There are no existing plans to build that project. The existing and foreseeable southbound I-5 traffic volumes do not justify the I-5 Rose Quarter project.

With reduction of congestion as a stated goal of the project, studies at-large and experience in the Seattle area have shown that peak load tolling could provide a greater reduction in congestion in the I-5 Rose Quarter area at significantly lower cost than the proposed project. As a result, the expense of the I-5 Rose Quarter project would be a waste of resources at a time when those transportation dollars could be used for other projects.

Supposed environmental benefits touted in the ODOT planning documents are disputed and are not supported by the rigorous analysis of a complete Environmental Impact Statement. In the absence of a complete Environmental Impact Statement the supposed environmental benefits



touted in the ODOT planning documents are conjectural at best and, at worst, amount to a greenwashing of the project that purposely overstates the environmental benefits of the project to tamp down opposition to it.

The original construction of I-5 caused severe damage to several neighborhoods in northeast and north Portland. Although the I-5 Rose Quarter project as proposed includes features to address existing neighborhood transportation issues, the Pedestrian Advisory Committee and the Bicycle Advisory Committee in Portland have concluded that the proposed features do not significantly improve existing neighborhood transportation issues and recommend that the project not be built.

Therefore, I oppose the I-5 Rose Quarter project in its entirety.

Please let me know if you need any additional information or would like to discuss this in greater detail.

Mark Meininger

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0308 Mark Nacua

**Comment:** Spending an estimated \$500,000,000 on a project that hardly addresses Interstate 5 traffic, if at all is a major squandering of a transportation package. It is even more immoral to consider tolling the Interstates, which are already more than paid for by our numerous taxes & fees, and then use the toll money collected from the majority, to benefit the minority (Non private transit users and people in the immediate vicinity of the project).

Not addressing traffic also means continued poor air quality in the area, economic harm, and less safe driving conditions. The addition of shoulders and reworking lanes is a positive of the project, but that should not be the only result of \$500,000,000 taken from a transportation package.

The first priorities of the transportation package should be for things like improving and redesigning critical infrastructure, such as Interstate 5 through the Rose Quarter. Not only should interchanges be redone and shoulders added, but additional capacity is a must. These should be utmost priorities before any other means of transportation is addressed in such a large chunk of the spending bill. If already paid for roads are going to charge a fee on the majority (Private transport commuters & Company transportation), then the money should go toward benefiting the majority.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Mark robinowitz

**Comment:** Dear ODOT:



I am writing to request that the I-5 Rose Quarter Expansion / "Improvement" / Project consider the following.

Upgrade the Environmental Assessment study to a full Environmental Impact Statement. This project is a profoundly controversial proposal. It may cost a half billion dollars, or more (when cost overruns are considered). FHWA guidelines state that controversial approvals with high community impacts generally deserve an EIS, not a perfunctory EA. See FHWA Environmental Guidebook for details. FHWA policy also states that projects with major controversy must be approved by the national

headquarters, not by the State office (in this case, the Oregon division in Salem).

NEPA and FHWA regulations also state that if there are "new circumstances" relevant for a project's analysis they must be examined in a Supplemental Draft EIS. Acceleration of climate change, continued decline of conventional fossil fuels and the short term boom (and bust) of unconventional fracking are new circumstances that need full consideration in an EIS and / or a Supplemental EIS, not a Revised EA.

The recent comment period for ODOT's effort to upgrade Portland to Eugene train service was two months, from October 19 to December 18, 2018. [www.oregonpassengerrail.org](http://www.oregonpassengerrail.org) Surely an expansion of I-5 with more community impact than double tracking most of the rail line deserves at least this much comment time from the citizens who ultimately are the decision makers in an authentic democracy.

Federal law requires that traffic levels two decades in the future are the consideration, not existing congestion. If energy depletion is included in your models, then it is likely that considerably less congestion may be expected by the late 2030s. It is anyone's guess how civilization will cope with the energy downslope as conventional oil wells continue to decline and the fracking boom turns to bust, but assuming continued availability of cheap oil is the least likely scenario.

On November 30, 2018, Anchorage, Alaska experienced a magnitude 7 earthquake that damaged roads, buildings and other structures. If the epicenter had been further east or if it had been stronger, it is possible the Trans Alaska Pipeline System would have broken, which would have had severe impacts on Oregon and Washington energy supplies. Nearly all of the liquid fuels that power Cascadia's cars, trucks, trains, planes and boats comes from the five refineries in Puget Sound which are mostly

supplied by tankers from the Valdez terminal.

In 1964, a magnitude 9 earthquake in Alaska caused catastrophic damage in Anchorage and generated a tsunami that destroyed the port of Valdez (where the pipeline terminal is today). The tsunami also wrecked downtown Crescent City, California, causing additional casualties there.

Privately, I have heard state and federal officials express their personal concern that we are totally unprepared for either the Cascadia Subduction Zone earthquake or the consequence of oil depletion. Strengthening existing structures, not building larger ones, would be part of the



technical preparation for the seismic shock that will happen some day. Transportation triage - prioritizing transit, better trains, car sharing, relocalizing production (especially food) is part of what would be needed for the lower

energy society that looms ahead, whether we believe in it or not.

I personally have used solar PV panels since 1990. They are great, but they are not going to replace our "current" consumption, pun intended, especially this time of year. The reason we have all used fossil fuels is they are incredibly concentrated and living on our solar budget as they are used up will force us all to live very differently. Highway expansions as we enter the era of climate change and oil depletion are the wrong direction.

Please include these comments and attachments for your NEPA process and add me to the interested parties list.

Respectfully,

Mark Robinowitz

Eugene OR 97405

**Attachments:** [2019 0401 Mark Rabinowitz ATT1](#); [2019 0401 Mark Rabinowitz ATT2](#); [2019 0401 Mark Rabinowitz ATT3](#); [2019 0401 Mark Rabinowitz ATT4](#); [2019 0401 Mark Rabinowitz ATT5](#); [2019 0401 Mark Rabinowitz ATT6](#); [2019 0401 Mark Rabinowitz ATT7](#); [2019 0401 Mark Rabinowitz ATT8](#);

## 2019 0327 Mark Settle

**Comment:** Good lord, what are you thinking? The last thing this community needs is a wider highway cutting through neighborhoods, costing gargantuan piles of money, and polluting our environment. This project will only serve to drive up building in the exurbs and screw up the Portland I love. Focus on building denser housing, not turning us into Phoenix.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Mark Whitaker

**Comment:** I have several concerns about the proposed I-5 expansion through the Rose Quarter, and firmly believe that this project should not be built. The project plan is flawed and will not achieve its goals. Here are my main concerns:

1. The Environmental Assessment Is Misleading and Inaccurate. The Environmental Assessment states that this project does not add capacity. This is clearly not true. As Metro's Director of Planning clearly stated, "The EA states (section 3.2.2) that the project does not create new capacity or add substantial capacity to I-5. This statement is not objectively true and is potentially misleading; auxiliary lanes clearly add capacity." I have also learned that the project planners based their analysis on false assumptions about traffic, such as completion of a new Columbia River Crossing. I expect better.



2. Freeway Expansions Do Not Relieve Congestion. Just ask the residents of Los Angeles, Seattle, Sacramento, practically any major U.S. metro area how much traffic has improved after decades of freeway expansion. We've learned and proven again and again that highway widening induces demand and is therefore provides just short-term relief.

3. There Are Higher Priority Needs Across the City and State. ODOT is describing this as a safety project, and yet multiple traffic corridors around Portland (including some operated by ODOT) have more fatal crashes than this section of I-5. A public agency that is truly concerned about safety would prioritize those areas before investing in this project along a section of freeway that mostly has non-serious crashes. (And to add, calling this a safety project is probably also misleading as there is evidence that wider freeways induce speeding and more fatal crashes.)

4. The Effects on Surface Streets and Especially on People Who Walk, Bike, or Use Public Transit Are Either Detrimental or Not Clearly Explained. The project prioritizes car drivers at the expense of those who walk, bike, or use public transit. The project appears to widen certain surface streets (Weidler, Broadway), which is incompatible with making the streets comfortable for non-automobile users. Some of the grades proposed are very difficult for non-automobile users. The effects of bringing freeway traffic closer to the Eastbank Esplanade are not explained. It is not clear how bike riders will navigate changes in alignment along Williams and Hancock. The analysis indicates that bus and streetcar performance will be slowed due to signal phasing changes. All of these things are unacceptable in a City that is attempting to reduce reliance on single occupancy vehicles and promote alternative transportation options.

5. Climate Change. We should not be expanding freeways with the knowledge we have about the impending climate crisis. As noted above, this project prioritizes the throughput of cars and trucks at every instance, both on the freeway and on surface streets. There is almost no discussion of the Rose Quarter being a central hub of Portland's public transportation system. Expanding a freeway right in the middle of one of the City's major transit hubs and one of the City's best traveled bikeways is nonsensical. The City of Portland, Multnomah County, Metro, and the State of Oregon have pledged to be climate leaders. This is not how climate leaders act.

6. Diesel Emissions. Portland has higher diesel emissions than many major metros. This project will bring the freeway even closer to the neighborhood middle school. Allowing more cars and trucks to travel through the center of the City is not going to help the health of students, bikers, walkers, and residents of the neighborhood.

7. Lack of Transparency. Following this project in the press, it has been clear that ODOT has not been forthcoming with the data, drawings, and other materials that would be necessary to fully evaluate this project. It should not require public information requests to receive this information. This information should not be given out halfway through the public comment period. Once again, I expect better.

8. Implement Congestion Pricing First. We know that expanding freeways does not reduce congestion. And we know that congestion pricing can reduce congestion. We should implement congestion pricing to relieve congestion prior to spending \$500 million on a project that likely



won't reduce congestion. This project shouldn't be considered until other alternatives for reducing demand and traffic have been tested.

I wish I had more time to expand upon my thoughts above, but I'm thankful that many other individuals and agencies in Portland are able to provide more detailed, expert, and passionate opposition to this project. Albina Vision Trust, Portland Public Schools, members of the Harriet Tubman PTSA, The Street Trust, Oregon Walks, Portland Bus Lane Project, the Pacific Northwest Chapter of Safe Routes to School, the City's Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committees, AORTA, Oregon Environmental Council, Oregon League of Conservation Voters, Center for Sustainable Economy, Portland Audubon Society, 350 PDX, Sierra Club's Oregon Chapter, OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon, Neighbors for Clean Air the Eliot Neighborhood Association, and Irvington Community Association are examples of organizations that have raised concerns.

On a personal note, my three children will attend Harriet Tubman Middle School. I commute by bus or on bicycle through the Rose Quarter every day. I want to see my government work to leave a better environment and more livable places for my children and future generations. We don't want more freeway lanes next to our school. Residents don't want more cars and traffic and pollution in their neighborhood. I don't want to have to cross multiple new intersections and dangerous alignments that prioritize cars when riding my bike to and from work.

Please do not build this project. We owe it to our children and future generations to find a better way.

Thank you,

Mark Whitaker

Resident of NE Portland

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Marlene Winn

**Comment:** Widening the freeway at the Rose Quarter will only create a bigger amount of congestion, pollute the area more, and cost a fortune. Definitely a bad idea. Marlene Winn

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 Marlen Warren

**Comment:** Okay. My name is Marlon Warren. I'm a long-time resident of Portland, 63 years. And I used live on Dixon, right near this project area with my grandmother back in the early '60s. And we used to play out front and everything like that. To make a long story short, the air now - the air quality in this area is even better now than it was in the '60s. Because we used to go to the Broadway Bridge and watch parades and stuff. The air was pretty bad. Now when I walk across the Broadway Bridge, the air is fresh, it's clean. It's not bad and it's improved since the '60s. Also ODOT has done a good job of closing down, like, Harbor Drive. They built the



Tillicum crossing bridge, and eventually they're going to make less lanes on the Naito Parkway. And I mean, they have done so much for cyclists. And I mean, you look at the Rosa Parks Way, I mean, you know, to make a long story short -- how much time do I have? Oh, one minute. Oh, I'm fine. So I'm saying that we all need to work together here and find solutions and not just stay in your own box, because Portland is growing. We got a new stadium that's going to come on line. People have to drive there, or walk there, bicycle. We just need to come together as long-term Portlanders and solve this because it's not going to go away. If we don't solve it today, it's going to be here in 50 years. And also, no one has addressed the earthquake conditions of the current overpass. When I look at those pillars, if there's a long earthquake, tough road for anyone, that's going down. So we're going to have to rebuilt it either now or tomorrow. Anyway, thanks for listening and I hope we can find a solution so we don't end up like the Columbia River crossing where no one came together. Thank you.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0225 Marni Cohen

**Comment:** The idea of expanding i5 is messy at best. Portland has an increasing traffic problem, and adding a lane to the highway won't fix anything. The only thing it will do is speed up our contributions to global warming. The money should be invested in public transportation.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0305 Maro Sevastopoulos

**Comment:** I am a daily driver. So is my spouse, especially on I-5. We see every day the affects of population increase on our commute. And we STILL oppose this project. It's the wrong direction for us to take in the face of a dauntingly short window to reverse climate change. It's the wrong direction for us to attempt to relieve congestion (study after study show that it will not). It's the wrong direction for Portland. We need better, more affordable, more expansive public transport both within and connecting between urban areas. We need to continue to support biking (something I don't do, and probably never will again, but applaud others for doing). Yes, we need to invest in infrastructure, but not this.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 Marsha Hanchrow

**Comment:** Marsha Hanchrow, I'm from Portland. I'm an employee in the area district, and I say the no-build option is the better option. Since they say that carbons are going to go down because of all these electric cars are going to be the road, when they go down, use that time to start tolling, decongestion pricing, congestion pricing, whatever you want to call it. Discover that you don't need to do this. Take that money and fix the orphan highways, prepare them to give them to PBOT. The state doesn't want them. The city wants them. The only thing that's holding them back is that they are not to city standards. They are to state highway standards.



**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0326 Marsha Hanchrow

**Comment:** Don't tell me with straight faces that this widening will lessen emissions. Since you're basing that on the premise that cars are getting cleaner, let me remind you that the Trump administration is relaxing all the environmental standards it possibly can. Cars are unlikely to get cleaner, and many old cars are and will be on the road. I just sold my 34 year old car to someone with better mechanical skills who will keep it running for many years in the future.

Close an entrance or exit or two, and most of the delays and merging conflicts will disappear. Or, accept some slower speeds to get the benefit of safety. I was caught in a traffic jam in this area last Sunday afternoon when I was coming home from Seattle. Yes, traffic was slow. I was considerably safer at those low speeds than I was coming out of Seattle with drivers tailgating at 60 mph and making lane changes with one car length of space between vehicles.

Put your money into Portland's orphan highways instead and save a lot of lives. If this half billion is specifically and irrevocably going to the location you're planning for, put it into a properly built cover that can support multi-story buildings and tall trees and an effective filtration system. ODOT owes North Portland a lot for having ruined neighborhoods with the freeway in the first place. Take advantage of the funding that has been allocated, and do some good for those neighborhoods.

Marsha Hanchrow

Employee in the district, breathing emissions from I-5 for 45 hours per week

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0313 Marshall Goldberg

**Comment:** I oppose the Rose Quarter freeway expansion. Thanks, MC Goldberg

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Marshall Mcgrady

*NECA-IBEW Electrical Training Center*

**Comment:** I commute through Portland daily. I would like to see the money allocated to this pit in place to ease traffic congestion.

Marshall Mcgrady

NECA-IBEW Electrical Training Center

16021 NE Airport Way

Portland, Oregon 97230



**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Marshall Steeves

**Comment:** No comment Provided

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0226 Martha Van Dyke

**Comment:** No more freeway expansion anyplace please. Aren't we killing the earth fast enough on auto fumes? Plus there are so many Oregon places where that money is needed to help this planet and it various creatures.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Martin Frazier

**Comment:** MAKING SPACE FOR MORE AUTOMOBILES POLLUTES MORE  
PLEASE POLLUTE LESS

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Martin Highwolf

**Comment:** To whom it concerns

The last thing we need is expanding the freeway. The construction will be a nightmare and a lot more carbon will be produced with this proposal. This is a bandaid solution to a serious problem. We could spend the money instead to expand light rail or streetcars and would probably be much better off.

Thank you

Martin Highwolf

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Mary Baumgardner

**Comment:** Our state should be leading the way forward to reduce dependence on the very outdated, single-car transit system. There are multiple, cleaner, sustainable and forward thinking options.



Please reconsider this, part-of-the-problem approach and end march to increase traffic capacity on Oregon's highways. Our children and their children will thank you.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0325 Mary Davies

**Comment:** I am opposed to the expansion of Route 5 in the Rose Quarter. It will not ease traffic congestion and it will add to air pollution next to the Harriet Tubman Middle School, which already has compromised air quality.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Mary Locke

**Comment:** Hello,

Please, please, please do not widen the I-5 in Portland. This will not make traffic more manageable and will greatly decrease the quality of life in my neighborhood and beyond.

Please, please, please do not widen the I-5 in Portland.

Warm Regards,

Mary Locke

Portland, Oregon

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Mary Lou Soccia

**Comment:** I am totally opposed to the freeway expansion. It won't work and it will create more congestion, traffic and air pollution problems in the years ahead. You can't solve a problem by throwing more of the same problem as an absurd solution.

1. This project was cause increased air pollution both in the construction and aftermath for a middle school attended by low income children which have been historically and systematically underserved.

2. \$500 million can go a long way to address transportation need in East Portland, another historically underserved community and support increased public transportation.

3. Decongestion pricing should be instituted before a boon doggle massive concrete project.

Please agree to a full environmental impact statement before proceeding with this project.

Oregon should be able to do better.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0329 Mary Ramsay

**Comment:** ODOT - I'm writing to express my sincere concern over the planned Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion. As soon as I heard that this project is based on an assumption that the Columbia River Crossing will still be built, my concern was raised to outright distrust in the process that this proposal is built on. Please pause and take into account a more reasonable assumption based on current status of the Columbia River Crossing. In addition, I'm strongly opposed to the impacts on the pedestrian areas of the East Bank Esplanade. Please consider sharing more information around the impacts and gathering input and feedback from the community to this specific change to our pedestrian options.

Thank you,

Mary Ramsay

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Mary Vogel

**Comment:** Please see the ATTACHED version of my comments as some the formatting has disappeared in the inline version below.

COMMENTS OF MARY VOGEL/PLANGREEN on the I-5 Rose Quarter Environmental Assessment March 31, 2019

I'm Mary Vogel, self-employed planning consultant with my WBE, PlanGreen, whose mission is to address climate resilience through a climate justice lens. I'm also active in the Congress for the New Urbanism, an international multidisciplinary organization that has made its reputation, in part through advocating the removal of freeways that disrupt urban neighborhoods. CNU researchers, along with many other urban researchers, have never found that expanding a freeway reduces congestion, e.g.:

Chart from CNU Journal, Public Square article by Norm Marshall 8/3/17  
<https://www.cnu.org/publicsquare/2017/08/03/why-urban-freeway-expansion-futile>

Of course, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the folks who wrote the I-5 Rose Quarter Environmental Assessment (EA) know that widening a freeway has never reduced congestion and has often INCREASED it by inducing demand. So ODOT does not call this a freeway-widening project, rather a safety improvement project. That's dishonest, even shameful!

To quote economist Joe Cortwright:

People are dying. They are dying on ODOT roadways. They are dying in increasing numbers. And yet ODOT is shamelessly trying to use safety as an excuse for squandering half a billion dollars on a freeway widening project where there is little if any threat to human life or well being. It's simply wrong and unjustifiable. . . But there's a time to stand up and say that a public agency, one that is funded by taxpayers, and is expected to work in the general interest, has an obligation to tell the truth, and not routinely engage in deceptive, misleading and dishonest attempts to characterize its pet highway project as a safety priority, while studiously ignoring



those parts of the roadway system it manages which kill and maim Oregonians in growing numbers.

3/19/19 [http://cityobservatory.org/odots\\_big-lie/](http://cityobservatory.org/odots_big-lie/)

I am distressed by this and other dishonest aspects of the EA as well--such as the traffic assumptions being based on a supposition that the Columbia River Crossing has already been built. That's dishonest, even shameful!

Finally, ODOT's failure to include congestion pricing in the EA is a violation of NEPA's requirement to fully consider reasonable alternatives and not discard them without a clearly identified reason. Again, quoting Joe Cortwright:

That's tragic, because ODOT's own studies show pricing would be unusually effective in reducing traffic congestion and speeding transit and freight, and reducing emission and would do so at a cost far lower than expensive construction.

3/29/19 <http://cityobservatory.org/the-week-observed-2019-march29/>

At a time when Oregon's Global Warming Commission warns that we are not meeting the State's goal of reducing carbon emissions by 20% of 1990 levels by 2040, solely due to the increase in driving, I am truly baffled that ODOT would put out such an inadequate EA and expect Oregonians to trust them. I really don't trust them--do YOU?

**Attachments:** [2019 0401 Mary Vogel ATT](#)

## 2019 0401 Mary Wahlquist

**Comment:** I am opposed to the freeway expansion. I believe this money could be better spent on climate change issues. Portland certainly doesn't need more traffic congestion & carbon monoxide pollution. Please reconsider this expansion.

Thank you

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Matchu Williams

**Comment:** Re: Oregon DOT I-5 Rose Quarter Expansion

Release a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Rose Quarter I-5 expansion. The impacts are multiple and have not been fully disclosed within the Environmental Assessment. I respectfully request that three scenarios of analysis be conducted.

- 1) Analyze what impact value pricing will have on traffic demand projections on I-5, I-205, and I-84 under a no build scenario of the Rose Quarter expansion.
- 2) Analyze transit prioritization throughout the Rose Quarter including dedicated rail/bus lanes along Broadway and Wielder within the Portland Street Car A Loop and B Loop.



3) Analyze removal of I-5 south of the I-84 interchange including termination of the Marquam Bridge span across the Willamette and route alignment of I-5 within a buried or tunneled I-405 with full caps through downtown Portland.

Improve outreach and information sharing with community partners to reduce negative impacts to disproportionately affected populations. Informed decision making results in better project outcomes. Agency coordination with Metro will strengthen project design and produce results that are inclusive of all uses within and through the Rose Quarter. Coordination with Metro Government is encouraged in addition to the existing partnership with the Portland Bureau of Transportation. Coordinate with Portland Public Schools to reduce the impacts of increased emissions to vulnerable, developing schoolchildren at Harriet Tubman Middle School and reduce classroom disruptions due to increased noise exposure. Current project plans include the addition of auxiliary lanes and will impact the Eastbank Esplanade beneath the interface between I-5 and I-84 eastbound. Invite Portland Parks and Rec to strategize beforehand what impacts sun obfuscation will have upon the plant life along the impacted segment and work together to mitigate the harmful impacts of reduced sunlight, increased emissions, and heightened noise.

Thank you for the work into making the Rose Quarter Expansion a world class project that future generations will warmly look back upon. I look forward to the full Environmental Impact Statement and eagerly await the results that increased outreach with community partners including Metro will produce.

Sincerely, Matchu Williams

2019 April 1st

**Attachments:** [2019 0401 Matchu Williams ATT](#)

## 2019 0326 Mathew Lippincott

**Comment:** I am writing to oppose the Rose Quarter Freeway expansion. Expanding opportunities to drive

through downtown will significantly increase exposure to particulate pollution and increase the carbon intensity of Portland's transportation system without any fact-based benefits predicted. Before moving forward, a full environmental impact review must be released to the public examining how increased emissions will effect local residents and the students at Harriet Tubman Middle School.

No other city has managed to reduce congestion through freeway expansion, and believing Portland can buck this trend is not sensible. Your own consultants at WSP predicted no benefit.

The unpredictable nature of traffic exerts economic costs that must be abated on all roads into



Portland. I do a multi-modal commute to Tualatin from Northeast Portland by bike and bus (the 96). It is a 45-minute commute if there is no traffic, but can stretch to an 1:15 or 1:30 when the roads are clogged with single-occupancy vehicles. Expanding the freeway at the Rose Quarter will do little to alleviate the congestion on my commute. The expansion will disrupt my bike route during construction, and likely permanently increase my time to downtown by eliminating the Flint Avenue crossing.

Decongestion pricing is the answer; charge road users for their road usage. The people stuck in traffic (like myself) during rush hour have higher than average incomes, and can afford to pay to get to their destinations not just quickly, but predictably.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Matt Glidden

**Comment:** I'm a homeowner in North Portland who gets around by driving, biking, walking, and using public transportation. I am against the I5 Rose Quarter expansion project.

I believe this money would better serve Oregonians and Portland residents by investing in non-car transportation enhancements. Let's toll I5 around Portland (at all exits and at the state border, to not add cut-through traffic on city streets) before, or instead of, adding capacity to the freeway. Decongestion pricing could be an effective deterrent to non-essential driving.

Adding capacity to the freeway will only induce more drivers to use it, as demonstrated by every other highway expansion project around the country. More driving will increase our carbon emissions from transportation, which are already way too high. Instead of spending hundreds of millions of dollars to damage our environment, this money could make a huge impact in improving other modes of transportation that could be made safer and more reliable, while being much less carbon-intensive. Generations to come will thank us.

The enhancements for bicycle riders and pedestrians included in the project are lackluster. Removing the Flint Ave crossing while spending large sums on new poorly designed bridges that will be under-used is a waste. Much more effort should go into making these modes of transportation easier, and significant improvements could be made to our public transit system to make buses and trains work faster and more reliably.

Making lids over the freeway is a great idea, but as proposed, building them without the ability to place new development on top is a huge missed opportunity. Albina Vision represents a look at this future part of the city. The I5 Rose Quarter project makes that impossible.

Expanding the freeway to further cover over parts of our cherished Eastbank Esplanade is unacceptable. This vital route for transportation and recreation while enjoying nature would be irreparably tarnished by having even more loud freeway noise, air pollution, and ugly shadows cast over people enjoying the Esplanade.



As the public comment period has gone on, details from the Environmental Assessment slowly trickled out, as experts and researchers finally gained access to more information. This is unfortunate, and has been inadequate to get a real look at what the project is really proposing. I think we need a full Environmental Impact Statement to fully analyze the positive and many negative aspects of this project as currently designed. Let's not rush this project that residents and taxpayers will be stuck with for decades to come.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0326 Matt Kelly

**Comment:** I am deeply opposed to this project. It saddens me to see us invest in a project that will further climate change, slow transit, encourage more single-occupancy driving, and pollute our air.

Decades of experience indicate that additional driving lanes (regardless of whether they are auxiliary lanes, add-drop lanes, ramp-to-ramp lanes, or whatever you call them) encourage more driving. This will negate any time savings that could potentially result from the added lanes.

I understand that this project is also intended to improve travel safety. Safer travel is a laudable goal, but the project area rarely experiences crashes that result in serious injuries or deaths; meanwhile, we have many streets (including others owned by the Oregon Department of Transportation) with outdated designs that kill or seriously injure people on a regular basis.

I am also unpersuaded by the proposed freeway lids. If we are serious about reconnecting the community split by Interstate 5, we should completely enclose (or eliminate) the freeway so that Portland's city grid can seamlessly flow across the highway. As proposed, the disjointed, jigsaw-puzzle lids provide little opportunity for reconnecting the community.

A full Environmental Impact Statement should be completed given the issues raised by this misguided project. Thank you.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 Matt Kindall

**Comment:** Have any of you people ever even driven I-5 in the afternoon? \$500,000,000 and you aren't even going to TOUCH the area north of the Fremont where the REAL traffic starts. I'm no rocket surgeon, but that doesn't add up.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Matt Lucas

**Comment:** The environment impact statement indicates that vehicle emissions will go down by widening the interstate to ease congestion. Did this analysis consider the concept of "induced demand" which posits that an expansion of the roadway will spur an increase in vehicle traffic?



**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0325 Matt Meskill

**Comment:** Highway expansion is climate denial. Put this money toward dedicated transit lanes, more transit, cycling and pedestrian improvements, etc. We need to get people out of cars not expand a highway!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0307 Matt Morrissey

*Eliot Livability Team*

**Comment:** This project is not worth the cost or the construction-related congestion. IT's a short-term solution to a long-term problem. We need dedicated bus lanes and tolling. I will actively resist this foolish project.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0322 Matt Ransom

*Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council*

**Comment:** Oregon Department of Transportation

C/O Megan Channell

123 NW Flanders Street

Portland, OR 97209

Comment delivered via email on March 22, 2019

RE: COMMENTS for I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project Environmental Assessment

On behalf of the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC), which serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for Clark County, Washington, I am submitting the following comments in response to the published I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project Environmental Assessment.

RTC endorses the development and implementation of the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project which has been evaluated in the Environmental Assessment. As proposed, the project improvement is forecast to provide compelling safety, travel time, and multi-modal improvements within the project limits. The project outcomes can serve to benefit regional transportation system mobility within the Portland/Vancouver bi-state metropolitan area.

Beginning with the Portland/Vancouver I-5 Trade Corridor Study (1999) and reinforced in the Portland/Vancouver I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Strategic Plan (2002), regional leaders and public and private partners have endorsed Plans and supported strategies which address regional bottlenecks along I-5. Specifically, these precedent Regional Plans identified a



need to pursue a phased approach to addressing freight and passenger mobility in the I-5 Trade Corridor. Each Plan identified the need to eliminate two-lane bottlenecks at numerous locations along the I-5 corridor. Since that time, regional partners have completed commitments to eliminate 2-lane bottlenecks at locations in both Washington, such as I-5 between 99th Street and I-205 Interchange, and in Oregon on I-5 at Delta Park.

Now, the region has the opportunity to improve another regional bottleneck at the I-5/Rose Quarter vicinity. To that end, the RTC is supportive of ODOT's current effort to fulfil these regional Plan implementation commitments.

Sincerely,

Matt Ransom

Executive Director

cc: RTC Board of Directors

**Attachments:** [2019 0322 Matt Ransom ATT](#)

## 2019 0327 Matt Roberts

**Comment:** This project is a bad idea and won't benefit anyone. There are a lot of different ways to make our city and its traffic better and this is not it. Go spend my tax dollars on something better.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Matt Stewart

**Comment:** To Oregon Department of Transportation,

Please cancel all plans to continue with the I-5 Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion in Portland.

There are so many reasons to not move forward on this project. In all of your public meetings you've seen the outcry from the community who does not want, does not need, and will be actively harmed by this project. Please listen to us.

We have 11 years to substantially reduce our carbon emissions, and investing in infrastructure that incentives more Vehicle Miles Driven is the opposite of this goal.

Freeway widening has never decreased travel times, it only amplifies congestion.

Congestion and the associated pollution will only worsen the air quality around Harriet Tubman Middle School. The PPS Board has made it clear that they do not want more traffic near this important and underserved school. The cost of air quality filtration systems means less money can be spent on helping these students.

Furthermore, ODOT as an institution has been hiding the data necessary for the public to make an informed decisions. On this 45 day public comment period, the full Environmental Report



was delayed for weeks. Now with only a few days left, and only under threat of a lawyer, have you release the architectural drawings you claimed did not exist.

These renderings show additional construction impacts to the Willamette River, and a severe lack of planning to accommodate non-freeway travel.

Please begin to consider Decongestion Pricing long before you implement any more investment that will harm our planet and our communities.

Thank you

Matt Stewart

Portland, Oregon

National Board Certified Science Teacher – PPS

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0305 Matt Swetnam

**Comment:** I'm writing to oppose the widening of I-5 at the Rose Quarter. At a time when public infrastructure funds are scarce and needs are great, this project simply doesn't make sense. Study after study has shown that these type of freeway expansions aren't solutions to traffic -- just look at the massive widening of I-405 in Los Angeles, which hasn't reduced traffic even in the few years immediately following the project's completion. Beyond this, investing in automobile infrastructure will actively set back Oregon's efforts to reduce carbon emissions. Finally, if an automobile-centric project must be completed on I-5, the obvious choice is a replacement of the Interstate Bridge, including a light rail link to Vancouver, which would both repair an unsafe bridge and give commuters from Clark County a real alternative to driving. Just imagine how absurd it would be if Oregon expanded I-5 in the Rose Quarter, only to watch the Interstate Bridge crumble in an earthquake a year or two later -- then all of that investment would be truly wasted.

There are so many other worthy projects that would reduce traffic, reduce emissions, increase transit access to underserved communities and thus promote equity, and help maintain the quality of life that people love about the Portland area. Given this, the I-5 widening project should not move forward.

Thank you for your consideration,

Matt Swetnam

Portland, OR

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0331 Matthew Arnold

**Comment:** I am writing to express my grave misgivings regarding the proposed freeway expansion projects in our region, including that of Interstate 5 in the Rose Quarter. I do so as a former Chair of the City of Portland's Bicycle Advisory Committee, a former member of the N/NE Quadrant Plan Steering Committee, and a former member of the I-5 / Rose Quarter Project Community Liaisons Group. (Although my company has not taken a formal position on this matter, I should also state as a means of further establishing my own credentials in this matter that I am the Director of Urban Design + Planning for SERA Architects, Inc. based here in Portland.)

In my previous testimony (both written and verbal) to this Council, I have never formally endorsed these freeway projects, but working from the assumption that the freeway investments were a fait accompli had encouraged both Council and City staff to focus on those aspects (particularly of the I-5 / Rose Quarter project) that would improve livability and alternative mobility options for Portland residents. At the times of my previous testimony even as a member of one or more of the aforementioned public committees I was not in possession of the research findings regarding the air pollution and congestion that will result from these projects. Nor was I fully aware as we should now all be of the full and impending dangers we face from climate change. It was enough for me during those times to focus on the bicycle and pedestrian improvements that I believed would be of benefit to our community.

While I still believe and perhaps believe even more strongly today that investing in our bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure should be of paramount importance, I no longer feel that those investments should be tethered to or contingent upon roadway projects that themselves will be detrimental to the health of our citizens and our community. (I am also very, very concerned that were the I-5 / Rose Quarter project to proceed the bike/ped infrastructure will be the first to be value-engineered out.)

I understand that there is immense pressure on you from a variety of stakeholders and interests including from the State or Oregon and the freight community but I urge you to reject expanding our freeways and instead to invest your time and creative problem solving on those things that will truly improve the quality of life for Portlanders.

Thank you for your consideration,

Matthew Arnold

cc: Roger Geller, City of Portland Bicycle Coordinator

Michelle Marx, City of Portland Pedestrian Coordinator

Jessica Horning, ODOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Manager

**Attachments:** [2019 0331 Matthew Arnold ATT](#)

## 2019 0325 Matthew Celentano

**Comment:** Greetings -



I write to register my opposition to ODOT's plan to widen freeways through the Portland metro area, among other projects.

Widening our freeways will not improve congestion. I have been a Portland resident for 25 years, and commute to work in Tigard. I take I-5 through the Rose Quarter every weekday. I would love congestion relief on my drive home, but adding lanes to the road will not accomplish that goal. Congestion pricing is interesting, but I am concerned about issues of equity in that scenario.

I would like to see the money ODOT has planned to use for expansion to be spent on improving public transit in the region. Not just the city but the region. Improved bus service would be at the top of my wish list.

Thank you.

-Matt Celentano

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Matthew J Hall

**Comment:** This EA does not adequately address the issue of air quality around Harriet Tubman. Additionally, I only this last week learned that the rosy-eyed traffic projections for this project assume that the Columbia River Crossing will be built, and that is by no means assured. This whole process has been a deceitful boondoggle, one that will not help us achieve the goal of reducing traffic, but for a few months after its completion. Once induced demand sets in, \$500 million dollars that could have been spent doing LITERALLY ANYTHING ELSE will essentially have been flushed down the drain. This is a waste of time, energy and money.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Matthew J. Brown

**Comment:** To Portland and Oregon Leaders.

I am emailing you today to express my opinion of the ODOT I5-Expansion project.

I DO NOT support this project in its current form.

A full environmental evaluation needs to be conducted on any expansion of the I5 corridor through Portland so we as a community can understand the impacts.

I ask you to not support this expansion project.

Thank you.

Matthew J. Brown

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0313 Matthew Kane

**Comment:** I'm concerned about the negative impact this project will have on the air quality for the neighborhood, especially for the children. Please consider the health of the human beings, plants, and animals that this project would be negatively impacting

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0402 Matthew Loudermilk

**Comment:** The NE Portland community has already endured a long history of discrimination and negative impacts of various freeway expansion projects -- many have resulted in issues which the city is only now working to mend. Among other issues, the freeway expansion will inevitably result in an increase in air pollution -- an issue especially critical considering the proximity of nearby schools and community amenities.

Freeway expansion routinely results in similar levels of congestion while only adding more cars - - and more emissions -- into the communities and the environment. If Portland is truly going to continue to live up to the idea of being a leader in urban transit, it is imperative we find more effective, accessible, and sustainable ways to navigate our city -- not just fill it with more cars.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0225 Matthew Meskill

**Comment:** It's ridiculous. The thought that widening a highway will reduce emissions is just plain stupid. And the thought that this will do anything (rejuvenate the neighborhood, improve cycling and pedestrian facilities) other than widen a highway is just shameful. You're just putting lipstick on a pig. In the 21st Century highway widening should never be on the agenda.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0328 Matthew Miller

**Comment:** It has become increasingly clear that both the public process and the technical analysis of the proposed 'improvement' have critical flaws. Flaws that make ODOT legally liable for deficiencies in public process, and it's consultant for technical analysis. ODOT has not been compliant in releasing information necessary for public comment, and persons in positions of authority (and reasonably expected knowledge) have been duplicitous about the existence of certain critical data-sets that it required the threat of legal action to secure the release of. Nor has the technical analysis been of an acceptable standard: it reflects neither the state of the art, nor the state of the practice. The state of the art (Ewing et al 2014: Structural Equation Model of VMT in US Urbanized Areas) clearly demonstrates a strong correlation between freeway lane miles and vehicle miles traveled. Regarding the State of the Practice, the shape of the VMT line in the graph makes it appear alarmingly clear that ODOT's consultant has simply projected forward VMT counts on a single facility, without accounting for diversion to other routes, other



times, and other modes. This is exactly the sort of technical issue that travel demand models were developed to overcome. That only hourly traffic volumes, rather than industry-standard AADT volumes were reported supports this conclusion.

Regarding the assumed bridge noted by City Observatory (<http://cityobservatory.org/theres-a-3-billion-bridge-hidden-in-the-rose-quarter-project-ea/>) and the State of the Practice: While it is reasonable and proper to include the effects of other transportation improvements in the analysis (such as a certain bridge), it is also reasonable to include proper characteristics of those improvements. I.e., a tolled versus untolled bridge.

I note with some concern ODOT's failure to engage in 'value engineering'. Rather than minimizing the required right of way and associated bridge construction costs through the use of narrow shoulders, ODOT has instead based its analysis on wide shoulders. Given a long history of the conversion of shoulder space into 'auxiliary' lanes over time, it seems suspicious that ODOT is providing ROW in excess of projected need, at substantial public cost.

Respectfully,

Matt Miller

Transportation Planner

PhD Student, Metropolitan Policy, Planning and Design.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Matthew Moore

**Comment:** Hello,

As a human being and soon-to-be engineer I beg you to please heed the voices of reason and logic. A freeway expansion is a bad idea for the all the reasons you have heard and read. From the most basic perspective single-serving car commuting is such an incredibly inefficient mode of transportation for a high-population city. There are so many examples of working infrastructure that should be considered before jumping into a disaster such as this.

Please do not betray us all!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0328 Matthew Subotnick

**Comment:** I absolutely SUPPORT the freeway expansion!! It's long past due. As vehicles turn to electric and transition to autonomous, we will need the roadway and especially freeway capacity to allow trade to flow through the I-5 corridor.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0401 Matthias Arnason

**Comment:** I am a Portland resident residing in the Hollywood area that uses the highway segment where expansion is planned on a regular basis. Although well intentioned, I oppose undertaking the highway expansion (including "ramp to ramp" lanes) for a variety of reasons:

- the environmental assessment is plainly misleading, and the expansion would worsen conditions for a middle school where air quality is already unacceptable
- expanding the freeway will simply induce demand, putting us back where we started and worsening conditions in other parts of the highway system
- the goals the project seeks to achieve are better realized with simpler, less expensive methods like congestion pricing
- the expansion would significantly degrade the quality of the East Bank Esplanade, currently a treasure

In the situation we find ourselves in, it is frankly irresponsible to further focus on private, individual vehicle transport.

Thank you for your time and attention.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Maureen Andersen

**Comment:** Things I think need to happen as this proposal moves forward:

ODOT needs to do a full environmental impact statement on the project.

Shouldn't the emphasis in this city be on smart transportation like light rail and bus lines rather than bringing more single commuter vehicles that will get caught in traffic jams and then need to park? The environmental impact needs to be examined in a meaningful way.

Thank you.

Maureen Andersen

97213

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Maureen O'Neal

**Comment:** 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.\*



**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 max ogrady

**Comment:** as someone who drives on this part of the highway regularly I really think this is one a terrible solution to the problem. to combat congestion we shouldn't be promoting more driving, anyone who honestly wants to fight traffic instead of just lining their pockets would be trying to increase funding of public transit. all this sounds like is a bad joke.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0219 MB

**Comment:** The resolution for the congestion and crashes on I-5 is to make it a standard interstate highway like all other cities. What other city has a major interstate that has only two lanes in its densest area? None! From Swan Island through the 1-205 connector near Nyburg, I-5 needs to be three lanes. From Swan Island until past the Terwiliger Curves, at a minimum, I-5 needs to have a beltway with a three-lane highway. You can accomplish this by either a double-decker highway over the existing I-5. This would keep the existing I-5 for surface street access to the Rose Quarter/Downtown Portland area. The upper deck would serve the majority of the thru-way traffic that has no reason to stop in the Rose Quarter or Portland. The current highway creates these ridiculous bottlenecks for this reason (in addition to death-defying entrance/exit ramps that are too close together that you will be addressing). I've never seen these kinds of ramps and I've driven in metro areas in 44 states.

What other city Portland's size or larger has a major interstate that has only two lanes? All of the crazy 'Exit Only' lanes force drivers to merge into two lanes. I've never seen this before and it's dangerous and creates a lot of pollution for all the stuck traffic. Please examine cities like Cincinnati, Des Moines, Atlanta, Indy and others that use a beltway or circular loop to divert thru-way traffic. Sorry, Portland, but I rarely have a need to visit you or the Rose Quarter. I always get stuck sitting in this traffic when I need to go well beyond downtown Portland, and this is true for the majority of the drivers.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0219 MB SG

**Comment:** Hello Project Managers,

The resolution for the congestion and crashes on I-5 is to make it a standard interstate highway like all other cities. What other city has a major interstate that has only two lanes in its densest area? None! From Swan Island through the 1-205 connector near Nyburg, I-5 needs to be three lanes. From Swan Island until past the Terwiliger Curves, at a minimum, I-5 needs to have a beltway with a three-lane highway. You can accomplish this by either a double-decker highway over the existing I-5. This would keep the existing I-5 for surface street access to the Rose



Quarter/Downtown Portland area. The upper deck would serve the majority of the thru-way traffic that has no reason to stop in the Rose Quarter or Portland. The current highway creates these ridiculous bottlenecks for this reason (in addition to death-defying entrance/exit ramps that are too close together that you will be addressing). I've never seen these kinds of ramps and I've driven in metro areas in 44 states.

What other city Portland's size or larger has a major interstate that has only two lanes? All of the crazy 'Exit Only' lanes force drivers to merge into two lanes. I've never seen this before and it's dangerous and creates a lot of pollution for all the stuck traffic. Please examine cities like Cincinnati, Des Moines, Atlanta, Indy and others that use a beltway or circular loop to divert thru-way traffic. Sorry, Portland, but I rarely have a need to visit you or the Rose Quarter. I always get stuck sitting in this traffic when I need to go well beyond downtown Portland, and this is true for the majority of the drivers.

Sincerely,

MB

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Meara Reed

**Comment:** Me and my husband HATE the Rose Quarter Expansion. It will only pollute our city more bringing more noise and fumes. Induced demand has been studied for more than half a century, how is it that ODOT does not grasp this concept? We will make sure to vote against Kate Brown and Ted Wheeler from now on if this project goes ahead.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Meg Cotner

**Comment:** I oppose the Rose Quarter freeway expansion. It's an open secret that adding more lanes will not reduce congestion. It will add noise, air pollution, and takes away from quality of life. Other options should be considered, like decongestion pricing. And making alternative transportation easier for all. Let's be smart about this - don't make the same mistakes so many other cities have made. Thank you.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0311 Meg Ruby

**Comment:** ODOT,

Dear Madams/Sirs of ODOT,

I am writing to express my concern in opposition to the proposal to expand I-5 By adding one lane of traffic.



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

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

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

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

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

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

Meg Ruby

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0222 Megan Horst

**Comment:** The truly best environmental action to take is to REDUCE car use. We do not achieve this by making it easier to drive. ODOT should be investing its money in urban infill, transit, and walking and biking- not in expanding freeways.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0326 Megan Leatherman

**Comment:** I live in Portland and am opposed to the proposed expansion of I-5. I moved from Eugene a few years ago and currently live right next to I-205. Every day, I feel concerned about what I'm breathing in and what I'm subjecting my two year-old daughter to by living here.

As a parent and someone deeply concerned about climate change, I urge the leaders at ODOT and the Portland City Council to take a long-term view and really consider what it is you would be implementing with this freeway expansion.

My daughter doesn't need a bigger freeway. She needs a city with clean air to breathe.

Thank you,

Megan Leatherman

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0223 Megan Pearson

**Comment:** I am a medical transportation provider living in Portland and working in Milwaukie, and I don't own a car. What I do every day at work is drive youth and adults, many who would be unable to use public transit. I can get around without a wider freeway, and so can Portland. I myself do not own a car. Living in Portland is easy without one. How long are public funds going to be put without public approval into processes that speed the degradation of our natural systems, increasing the frequency of extreme weather events like wildfires. Have you been living in this cloud of smoke that descends over our valley year after year in summertime? Rethink this investment; there will be no public outcry if this project does not go through. The public will be forced to adapt to our need to reduce emissions; we have the choice to facilitate that transition or wait, but we do not have a choice to continue increasing emissions without consequences. Rethink the project. Thank you.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0307 Megan Stratman

**Comment:** Hello, I fully support this project as proposed. It is essential to ease congestion on the freeway to keep cars on the freeway inst of cutting through the neighborhoods. The neighborhoods have become very unsafe due to aggressive drivers trying to avoid congestion on I-5. This makes alternative modes to driving (Eg, biking and walking) feel extremely unsafe. If the cars stayed on the freeway, I would be far more likely to bike commute. As of now, I simply don't feel safe. I drive I-5 between North Portland and the Lloyd district every work day. It's clear to me the congestion is driven primarily by the interchanges and off/on ramps. The proposed auxiliary lanes should really mitigate this and make the freeway more accessible and used by commuters, which will take them off the local streets and make those areas once again safer for cyclists and pedestrians.

The proposed caps and additional bike lanes and sidewalks will make inner NE much more user friendly for peds and bikes. Right now, it's extremely chaotic. The proposed extended on ramp to I-5 south is great as that will further reduce aggressive driving on Broadway/Weidler. Right now, there's simply not enough capacity for cars to get on and off the freeway, and to commute at a reasonable speed on the freeway.

Keeping cars moving will also keep carbon emissions down due to less idling. Also, the state's forthcoming carbon cap and trade will spur additional electric cars, making the concerns about CO2 even less relevant.

Please continue with the proposed enhancements to this area. This is a critical part of the city and desperately needs updates to accommodate the significant growth in population in recent years and the fact that Portland is along a major north/south freeway connecting the west coast.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0316 Meggan K Odell

**Comment:** Hello,

I am a parent, homeowner, and PSU student in Portland. I vehemently oppose the freeway expansion. It will not help traffic and it will put more cars on the road. Invest this money in public transport!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Meghan Hawkins

**Comment:** The Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion should not happen and frankly should never have been seriously considered in the first place. The air quality issues in Portland combined with the fact that no highway expansion EVER has solved the issue of congestion make this a big NO. The easier you make driving, the more people drive, so congestion issues remain. We are at a time in history when it is our responsibility to do things differently or die. 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. Additionally, I want to see a full Environmental Impact Statement before I would even begin to consider a proposal like this.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0321 Melanie Parker

**Comment:** Expanding the freeway through the Rose Quarter won't fix the congestion. Fixing public transit and expanding service from buses and the Max will do more than adding lanes.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0301 Melba Dlugonski

**Comment:** It's clear we can't reduce traffic by making more space for it. Money should be spent instead on reliable public transit. In planning these projects, does anyone calculate how this looks in another decade, when climate change will have reset every metric we're using? If we exhaust our budgets for business as usual, we will be left without the infrastructure to live more locally and equitably.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Melba Dlugonski

**Comment:** I understand that to mitigate climate change enough to maintain civilization, we have to make extreme changes in the way we do everything. Climate change must be considered first when solving other problems.



To respect our leaders and their experts, ordinary people need to see plans that are deeply considered at all levels not handed off to engineers and number crunchers.

I think there are many more useful things to spend money on than more of what's killing us.

By the way concrete is the second most carbon intensive human activity.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Melelani Sax-Barnett

**Comment:** Dear ODOT, etc.

This project would be a massive waste of money that would be better spent elsewhere, where we really need it: new sidewalks and better active transportation infrastructure in poorly-served parts of the city. Instead, this makes pollution worse and makes congestion worse (both during the inevitable long construction period as well as afterwards), close to an area that has a vulnerable community of kids. Please don't do it!! There are so many better ways to spend this money, and it goes clearly against the city and region's environmental goals. As a parent, I fear every day for my child's future if we don't change how people get around -- and this project just encourages more of the wrong behaviors.

Thank you,

Mele Sax-Barnett

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Melissa Haggerty

**Comment:** I am a Portland resident writing with some questions and concerns about the Rose Quarter project.

I am expecting my first child this month and my worry is that this project will bring more traffic and pollution to the central city in his lifetime.

I request that ODOT perform a full environmental impact statement.

I would also like to hear back from ODOT on the following items:

- how did you decide this project would not have a disparate impact on disadvantaged communities?
- why hasn't your model for future traffic patterns expressly included the induced demand that projects like this result in?

Thank you,



**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Mercedes Elizalde

*Central City Concern*

**Comment:** Central City Concern is a nonprofit organization that provides housing, health care and supportive services to people impacted by homelessness. The Madrona Studio apartments (10 N Weidler Street) and the Hooper Detoxification Center (1535 N Williams) are co-located on the same lot and will be highly impacted by this project. While finalizing designs we encourage the process to consider how persons with mobility difficulties and commuters using bike paths interact when crosswalks and sidewalks merge and cross one another. Hooper is a medical facility and will also need to maintain street connection in the event emergency medical response vehicles are needed to respond to the center. Current designs appear to show Hooper potentially cut off from direct street access and this could cause problems for patients and first responders. Emergency response vehicles should have direct access to the facility without having to invade the sidewalk or park in a bike lane. Please keep this in mind during final design concepts. We also want to appreciate the staff of this project for coming to do direct presentations to the apartment building. Thank you

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Micah Meskel

**Comment:** I support this project because of it's clear and demonstrable safety improvements, congestion relief, re-connection of the neighborhood, decreased air pollution, and

.....

April fools!!!!!!!!!!

Oh wait, actually all of these "improvements" that ODOT has promoted through their sham EA have been debunked by local community experts and even other local agencies.

Please select the NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE.

ODOT has failed over and over to make the case for why a half of billion dollars should be used to expand a freeway in an era when we need to be making every effort to dismantle fossil fuel infrastructure (which includes freeways) to ensure we have a livable future to pass on to the next generation.

And just to make it clear that I do NOT support this project (as I wouldn't put it past ODOT at this point to count this as a comment in support of their boondoggle project). Below, I've listed my OPPOSITION to this project as many times as the money from this project could provide a full month of free transit to all of Trimet's system. ODOT, if you'd rather not read to the bottom, as you'd hope the public hadn't with the EA, that's 45 times, at \$10 million a month.

Thanks

Please select the NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE.





Please select the NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 Michael

**Comment:** Thanks. Thanks for the chance to speak. I didn't have time to prepare anything but I am just here to express my opposition to the project. I think that the explanation for how this money arrived in ODOT's hands is fairly obvious. I think it's intuitive to most people that more freeway lanes will lead to faster travel and more mobility. I think that all of the evidence that has been presented tonight is likely a persuasive argument that's just mistaken intuition. And I hope that we won't throw dollars down the road of mistaken intuition, when we know that the solution is to spend this on mass transit that becomes more efficient rather than less efficient. More pleasing when we can spend it on safety and greater mobility for people who are facing deeper challenges on 82nd Avenue and Powell Boulevard and other streets in the metro area every day. I hope that you can think about your children as I will think about my child and the children of many other people when we weigh the effects of the dollars that we're spending now on the lives that they and their children will live. I'll be thinking of that as I do most days as I see this process move forward. Thank you.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0328 Michael Andersen

**Comment:** ODOT's proposed Rose Quarter project might not be a bad idea, all things considered, if it were free.

Freeway expansions only move bottlenecks to new locations and induce more driving until their benefits vanish. But maybe that effect would be reduced if the change is mostly better travel-time predictability rather than more capacity or throughput.

Freeway expansion in the middle of a prosperous city, in this case Oregon's most important economic engine, is generally terrible for the more unique and essential urban functions of walking and slow-moving vehicular traffic. But maybe the proposed freeway caps and new connections will actually wind up being designed (despite appearances so far) to be more pleasant for humans and slow-moving traffic than the current Rose Quarter.

ODOT has lied to or misled the public repeatedly while trying to muscle this freeway project to completion; most recently, its spokesman told *The Columbian* that a larger I-5 bridge wasn't "baked into" the Rose Quarter plan one day before the agency was forced to confirm that the figures behind its Rose Quarter impact projections assume a larger I-5 bridge. But maybe ODOT's projections are right anyway, and maybe we will soon build a different freeway expansion that was abandoned six years ago after decades of debate.

ODOT's freeway expansion proposal is opposed by the Albina Vision Trust, the most prominent Black-led concept for redesign and reinvestment in the area. But maybe they don't speak for other Black Portlanders whose families were displaced by the unending series of attempts to make this area conform to more influential Oregonians' desire to go briefly to or through it.

Freeway expansion only deepens our multitrillion-dollar investment in personal autos, an inherently energy-inefficient transportation mode, at a time when we desperately need to be using every available dollar to permanently improve energy efficiency in the transportation sector, or condemn our children and grandchildren to ever-deeper environmental catastrophes and battles for scarce resources. But maybe electric cars and smart grids will finally transform the sector and nobody will have to change their automotive habits after all.

If the project were free, maybe all those maybes would be worth the risk.

Unfortunately, the proposed Rose Quarter expansion is not free.

Spending \$500 million to slightly improve travel-time reliability on a small stretch of Portland freeway and create a few public spaces of dubious quality is nowhere close to the list of Oregon's most important transportation needs. That \$500 million would completely transform ODOT's urbanized orphan highways like Powell and 82nd - streets where cars kill, maim and crumple with far more impact than the occasional fender-benders on this little stretch of freeway. The \$500 million could be the local match to major investments in bus transit -- a mode that gets more efficient, not less, as more people use it. It could prepare crucial bridges to better withstand our coming earthquake -- for example, the Interstate Bridge whose seismic safety ODOT was so concerned for a few years ago.



In every other context, \$500 million is a mind-bogglingly large sum of money that Oregonians would dream of using for more important things that would make larger differences to our lives and those of our children.

In many other contexts, \$500 million would move our planet slightly closer to the peace and prosperity I want my son and his peers to enjoy in their lifetime. Instead, this \$500 million will probably move our planet slightly further toward war, despair and centuries of recriminations against this generation of humans.

To focus on climate change for a moment: it's heartbreaking to me that so many state and local officials must understand this last part, but have come up with rationales for pushing this project forward anyway. I wonder if they've considered the permanent damage these pen scratches and keystrokes might be doing to their own souls.

No more freeways. Please.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Michael Barrett

**Comment:** Please complete a full EIS and not the abridged version. The potential impact to Harriet Tubman Elementary, current bicycle infrastructure and pedestrian paths is not fully developed.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Michael Espinoza

**Comment:** I am a regular user of I-5 and I'm very concerned and in opposition to what the Rose Quarter Project proposes. It's so called "improvements" are not improvements for everyone. Our money would be better spent on improving public transportation, walk-ability, and bike-ability. Those factors are what make for a great community - not cars and trucks driving through. Freight has the option to drive around on the I205- designed as bypass that doesn't go through the city. Congestion as it is can be frustrating but it also encourages people to consider other modes of travel. With improved highways- comes increased use through induced demand. We want to make our city better not more polluted with sound, noise, reduced air quality. I am in favor of tolling I-5 to reduce demand and solve our traffic woes.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0225 Michael Fanuzzi

**Comment:** I am writing to express my opposition to the highway expansion project for several reasons. But first, you should know that my family and I do own a car and use I5 and 84 very frequently. Any alleviation of the traffic we have to endure on those roads would be most



welcome. An expansion is not going to achieve this, as both your own research, as well as evidence from other analogous projects across the country can show. Indeed, we moved here from a place that completed a massive highway expansion a few years earlier (Staten Island, NY). Not only did this run massively over budget and cause years of widespread pain, but it did not even accomplish what it intended to. The highway remains clogged as ever; the choke points have simply shifted slightly. It is unreasonable to expect anything different from this.

And in the meantime, you will be removing one of the most important bike lanes for inner east side commuters: Flint. I biked this route every day for years, even if it was perhaps less direct than Vancouver or other alternates, it was undoubtedly the safest option due to its relatively protected and sane intersection at Broadway. Maybe an alternate will eventually be created, but these are the things that tend to get lost in the shuffle, and frankly I am not convinced the seriousness of this is understood or prioritized. Again, here the prioritization of car users is inequitable.

And all of this is coming in a time when we cannot ignore the realities of climate change. Car transit is a legacy of the past that we need to move away from. And yet. We are in one of the many pockets of Portland that are just far enough from a MAX station to make it impractical. How many new MAX stops could \$500 million build?!? If people such as myself in a very affluent and close-in part of the city are still not being properly served by transit, what hope is there for those who live further out?

Driving into the city during off-peak times is a breeze. This would lead me to believe that the majority of traffic is from daily commuters. The fact is, there is no major city in the world in which commuting via driving is easy. This is by design! The solution to commuter traffic is not to make driving easier, it is to give commuters better transit, that enable us to create the city we want to live in, for those who actually live in it. There are so many other things that need to be prioritized: expanding public transit, upgrading out bike infrastructure, creating actual human-scale solutions for the 21st century. This plan does none of that, and I urge you to reconsider.

Thank you.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 Michael Fyffe

*UBC member*

**Comment:** My name is Michael Fyffe. I'm a carpenter in the UBC, but I also have an engineering degree from Oregon State. Highway construction was one of the classes I had to take in my curriculum I was born on Earth Day and I'm a big environmentalist. The problem that people are not really addressing is the pollution problem that's coming from the internal combustion engines. It's got an expiration date on it. Tesla is coming out with their cars I even got preliminary drawings for converting all internal combustion engines with electrical vehicles.



If we look a hundred years out in the future, that's what we need to be seeing, that this particular project is still going to be needed for congestion when everything is electric and not an internal combustion engine. Is it a perfect project? No. No project is perfect. But does it address some concerns? Is it balanced? Is it a dichotomy of what was needed for both sides?

I've heard wonderful things from both sides of the arguments for this project. But I mean, I like the idea of covering all of I-5, or even the tax, the toll tax. Those are all great ideas from both sides, but preventing this project from going forward is like preventing the first step in fixing it all. You can't fix it all at once anyway. That would be cost preventative. So I like the arguments on the other side of not building the project, but they shouldn't prohibit this project from being the first step in fixing it.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0317 Michael Hashizume

**Comment:** I strongly oppose ODOT's I5 expansion project, and hope that the agency will invest its resources in other projects that better match the priorities and values of ODOT and the people it serves.

ODOT has been given a powerful mandate to use decongestion pricing to manage traffic on its highways. I think that the agency should seriously consider implementing decongestion pricing before moving forward with this costly I5 expansion project.

Every day I see more news stories about how climate change is becoming a more and more urgent problem; about how its effects are more dire than we first thought, about how little time we have, and about how it will be irreversible. At all levels of government, we need to do what we can to draw down fossil fuel infrastructure. Expanding I5 will not serve that purpose.

ODOT has done and will continue to do good work. The resources that would be spent on this I5 expansion project would be much better spent on other projects that better reflect ODOT'S priorities and values.

Thank you,

Michael Hashizume

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Michael Hutchens

**Comment:** This is a really poor use of state money. In order to temporarily increase traffic throughput (primarily of trucks not doing business in Oregon), increasing freeway size will worsen air quality for the Willamette Valley, increasing health expenditure, worsen educational prospects, reduce access to housing, increasing homelessness statewide, and take away critical development territory, reducing tax revenue. Why would the state do this?



**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0402 MichaelKale

**Comment:** Hello, please do not widen the freeways. Wider freeways are a 20th century solution to a problem when we need to be focused on the alternative transportation systems of the future. We need a lower carbon way of moving people and goods around to remain competitive as a region deep into the 21st century and wider freeways are not it. Thank you for listening. - Mike

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0322 Michael Klennert

**Comment:** I agree with your principles, but disagree with the opposition to this project. I grew up in this area then spent a few years in Seattle and 3 years ago returned. The kinds of traffic struggles in Portland are absurd. My commute from Tacoma to downtown Seattle (34 miles) takes the same amount of time it took my wife from Downtown Vancouver to Downtown Portland (9 miles) and the biggest issue is that I-5 going from 3 to 2 lanes near the rose quarter. My wife is in sales and has to drive to various companies in NW and NE and the bus/max lines are not effective enough for her to do her job. Add the volume of people moving here and what happens is people attempting to crowd the city to reduce this affect (my wife and I moved to North Portland primarily because of traffic) housing prices increas, housing crisis continues, gentrifications happens, which I recongnize I'm part of that problem. My point is this is all tied, so I agree with the points about HTMS and air pollution, and that needs to be addressed, but if we don't address real traffic congestion from the metro to Portland, we will just see rising home prices and more wealth inequality from metro to city and those most affected are the poor who have been pushed to the metro. Finally, Seattle attempted a toll lane on 405 and the truth of what happened is that those with money pay the toll those without get pushed into even worse traffic.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0219 Michael Limb

**Comment:** Recently moving into the neighborhood of St. Johns, I understand and experience the problems of traffic on I-5 every day. It's terrible. However, since I moved into the neighborhood, I've driven my car more, walked less, and taken public transit way less than I did when I lived in SE.

Thinking about this, the solution seems clear: people (like me at least) don't want to take public transit, or walk in these areas, because walkability, public transit, and other modes of transit besides driving a car are just not present in these neighborhoods. This leads to more use of cars, which increases congestion on the freeways.



With this freeway expansion, this won't reduce congestion. People will drive more often, and more cars will visit the freeways (causing more pollution). What we need is more investment in alternative transit options (light rail between Portland and Vancouver?) in the neighborhoods of North Portland, and as stated before, more transit options for people commuting from Washington to Portland and back every day.

Please consider this, as larger freeways will just cause more congestion, more cars, and more pollution.

Thank you for taking the time to read this!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0326 Michael Morrison

**Comment:** This is a project that prioritizes auto throughput over bicycle and pedestrian safety, while providing no environmental benefit. Recommend the no-build option.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0304 Michael O'Brien

**Comment:** I am writing to express my opposition to widening I-5, until congestion pricing has been implemented. Congestion fees should be tried first.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0219 Michael Orr

**Comment:** I'm usually wary of arguments that begin "Imagine how much we could do with that amount of money used in xyz different arena," as money has not been and likely would not be allocated that way (Mount Hood Freeway example notwithstanding). But I can definitely say that spending \$500m on a project that will a) only affect a tiny section of road, b) dramatically increase pollution immediately adjacent to a middle school, c) make traffic miserable for years during construction, d) ultimately induce more cars and therefore worse traffic/congestion, does not seem like a worthwhile endeavor.

Of course I would love to see \$500m directed toward public transit, or education, or literally almost anything else, I'm mostly writing here to oppose the use of that much money to support the expansion of the freeway system. It will not only not help, we'll be spending to make things worse.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0327 Michael Owens

**Comment:** There is no public benefit to this freeway expansion project. Increases in freeway capacity through projects such as this create greater demand rather than reducing traffic congestion. The result will be greater emissions of air pollutants and greenhouse gasses. The city and state should be spending money to improve the quality of life for residents, including through pedestrian, cycling, and transit projects. Of course, the process toward approving this project has been riddled with disinformation and dissembling from the Oregon Department of Transportation, but even transparent, ethical procedures could not have saved an idea terrible since its inception. I hope the state accepts reality and abandons it.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0313 Michael P

**Comment:** I would surely hope that the groups who think against this project realize that there are many other aspects to be considered that environmental critic groups have clearly failed to consider and think logically when it comes to a freeway expansions impact. One big aspect is the fact that cars are being made more efficient than ever before. There's even full electric vehicles that have been made with even better ones coming in the future that will greatly help reduce emissions. Whether emissions are increased or not from the highway expansion, A highway left bottle-necked should NOT be a way of controlling emissions, That should be done on the level of vehicles manufactured themselves with them being made more efficient. This highway expansion is needed considering many people do use it whether its a business or a person whose only method of travel is driving. Not everyone is able or wants to take transit or ride a bike. Driving is and will still be a mass used way of transportation for most people. Another aspect is safety. Highways that are backed up will cause many to avoid highways and use side and neighborhood streets to save time. Considering those who do not follow speed limits or rules, it increases the risk to normal Portland residents to the increased traffic of drivers who will try anything to shave off minutes to get around a highway that is unusable due to how badly clogged it is. Expanding the highway will decrease the frequency of this occurring and keep drivers on the highway. People will try anything to get to their destination and I would think keeping high traffic off local city streets would be the more logical course to think of. It also means high emissions in those areas considering the increased constant traffic from those who travel in those areas instead of staying on the highway.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Michael Parkhurst

**Comment:** I am writing to urge you to do all you can to convince ODOT to reconsider the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project. ODOT needs to abort this ill-considered project, and fundamentally re-think how it can contribute to Portland's (and the larger metro-area's) real transportation needs and priorities.



Briefly, this project would be a colossal waste of money with no tangible benefit, and will likely make Portland a worse place. ODOT's own numbers confirm critics who argue that the project won't reduce congestion, and won't have a meaningful impact on safety. I know traffic engineers and transportation planners understand the concept of induced demand because I learned it from them. If you think wider freeways will ease congestion, you may want to visit cities that have tested that path like Dallas or Los Angeles.

Even if the project did achieve its alleged benefits, there are far more effective and less costly ways to accomplish those two goals, with broader benefit. If there were political will, there are many other ways to address real transportation and safety needs in Portland and the state. A short, obvious starter list: improve transit, create safer and more pleasant connections for people on foot or on bicycles, and (not least) maintain what we have already built! (The Fremont Bridge is an appalling sight and a real embarrassment to the city why in the world would a person spend years and half-a-billion dollars tinkering with the I-5 interchange when the bridge just to the north is starting to look like the set of a post-apocalyptic zombie attack?).

ODOT should know better and do better!

The mentality behind the proposed changes is stunningly blind to everything we've learned about urban mobility and the impact of freeways on cities in the last fifty years, and it's completely at odds with the state's and the city's values around climate change and livable communities. The proposed widening of the freeway doubles-down on the deep injury done to North/Northeast Portland, and brings the freeway up to the threshold of a middle school serving that community. It also seems really misguided to tear down the North Flint overpass, which is an important connection from the neighborhood north of Broadway, especially for bicyclists.

One good way to highlight how indefensible the project is: flip the question around and ask metro-area residents, "Hey would it be ok if we imposed a couple minutes' delay on people driving through the center of Portland, and in return gave taxpayers back \$500m, or spent that \$500m on improvements that will save lives and make it easier for people to choose ways of getting around that don't involve driving their own car?" Does anyone say no to that deal? You have a chance to make just that decision.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 Michael Ryan

**Comment:** My primary concern is climate change. This project will only add a huge negative to the climate change issue. It has been amply demonstrated over the decades that if you build it, they will come, i.e., add more freeways and the public will respond by driving more miles, more often. We need people to face up to reality, and drive fewer miles. If future generations are to experience anything close to a decent lifestyle, we must simply alter our present lifestyle to preserve the environment.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0304 Michael Westling

**Comment:** To those at ODOT making decisions about the future of our city and the people who live here,

I am writing to strongly oppose the construction of auxiliary lanes on I-5 through the Rose Quarter. I am extremely concerned about the effort to forge ahead with this huge investment in fossil-fuel infrastructure without first pursuing congestion pricing. The fact that ODOT officials have said that congestion pricing was not factored into the environmental analysis for the auxiliary lane project is irresponsible, considering the role tolling would have in reducing congestion in this exact stretch of highway. If you implement congestion pricing and then continue to see traffic jams and crashes along this stretch, then you can come back to the public to ask for support for more lanes (spoiler alert: you won't need to).

As the son of two young children, I grow more concerned each day as public officials continue to ignore the reality of climate change and continue planning for infrastructure projects that will expand reliance on personal vehicles. The fact that ODOT is moving forward with this project is an insult to the next generation who will be asking why, in 2019, the state of Oregon spent \$500 million to add lanes to a freeway. Before you move forward, think carefully about whether 30 years from now, you'll be able to honestly tell my kids this was a good idea. Actually, can you honestly tell them now that it's a good idea?

And beyond these clear problems with the project, the plans include freeway caps that will not support new construction, a sad excuse for placemaking that will do little to improve pedestrian connections and livability in the Rose Quarter. Instead of taking an opportunity to rectify the harms of past urban renewal projects, this project pretends to make pedestrian connections with steep grades, grass pads along busy roads, and concrete paths to nowhere.

Please take the \$500 million for this project and spend it on safety improvements in East Portland. Or give it back to the federal government. Just don't spend it on auxiliary lanes in the Rose Quarter.

Sincerely yours,

Mike

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Michael White

**Comment:** The state highway building agency proposing to expand a freeway in the Central City in order to serve freight interests and exurban commuters despite it demonstrably increasing air pollution for inner city middle schoolers (literally expanding the freeway to the edge Tubman School) is laughable. If this were a movie I'd dismiss it as too unbelievable. It's almost cartoonishly evil.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0401 Michael White

**Comment:** I am a City of Portland employee who proudly uses transit as a means of daily commuting to and from work as well as using it to move from CoP office to CoP office to service technology needs.

What I see for the metro area is a need for at least 10-20+ percent of daily commuters to clear the roads and commit to changing the environmental landscape in some scant hope of alleviating the climate change coming. Incentives for people to continue to drive through the heart of this city does not meet this vital goal. We cannot on one hand try to open up transit options with the Southwest Corridor plan and contradict that with more freeway lanes on I-5. We must as a city, metro area, and state tow the line and sat not one lane more. Please end freeway expansion here and for all time. If not for us, consider it for generations to come and those who dream of living sustainably in the region for decades to come.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Michela and David McMahon

**Comment:** WE strongly oppose the freeway expansion at the Rose Quarter. Air quality, congestion, further disruption to the neighborhood. And the impact on Harriet Tubman school. And cost.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Michele E Reeves

**Comment:** I am a national economic development and land use consultant. I happen to be based in Portland, but I work all over the country in every sort of commercial district that exists. There are a few observations I would like to make in ABSOLUTE OPPOSITION to the widening project.

First, I am sure you have been inundated with induced demand statistics. I am not going to repeat those statistics. Rather I just want to say that traffic in places where I work with the widest freeways, such as Southern California and Texas, is absolutely terrible. There are no examples where you build yourself out of congestion. Not a single one. So for people like me who travel around the country, I see the widening mistake in action again and again and again.

Second, freeways are almost always detrimental to the economic health of the commercial districts adjacent because they prioritize pass through traffic and discourage circulation traffic. Almost all types of commercial districts in our city that would be impacted by this project are dependent upon people circulating, not people passing through. Many of these districts are filled with local businesses. For local and in-city commerce, the slower the traffic goes, the better for local biz. The more the traffic is local and circulating, the better for business. And, if



more of that traffic is of the pedestrian or bicycle variety, the better for local business. The proposed changes to the Rose Quarter district will make the areas around it less successful economically, as well as make them worse places to live, all impacting local business.

Third, noise and air pollution are very big issues in cities, and aside from the obvious concerns for residential uses and schools, they also have a detrimental impact on businesses that are trying to take advantage of and serve the local economy because noise and air pollution discourage pedestrians, discourage outdoor seating, discourage biking, and the discourage the use of green spaces. More lanes equals more traffic equals more noise and pollution. Center city Portland does not need this.

Fourth, The Rose Quarter is a neighborhood that is in the center of the city adjacent to one of our highest income neighborhoods, Irvington. By geography, it should be a vibrant and high value place in the city. Yet it lags behind its geographical expectations because it has suffered at the hands of almost every possible transportation planning fad through the years -- freeway insertion, large event venues with parking craters, on ramps, off ramps, and one way couplets galore. It's actually a poster child for "How to destroy a neighborhood through transportation planning." Widening the freeway would be many steps backward from the progress the district has finally made over the last decade.

Fifth, the freeway was placed through diverse neighborhoods in Portland because it was easier than putting it through white neighborhoods. (To see this in action, look at the difference between Good Samaritan hospital in NW Portland and Emmanuel in the Albina neighborhood. The former bowed to pressure from rich white neighbors and were forced to expand up, not create super blocks, and share their parking with the neighborhood. The latter, in Portland's African American neighborhood, bought up property, didn't build, created terrible parking craters, and expanded in a sprawled suburban manner, destroying much of the original commercial district that was around it.) Can we please stop doing this? As a city and as a state we should be entirely abandoning this idea of widening, and instead be putting our resources into creating more economic and housing opportunities for those impacted and displaced by racist land use policies in Portland's past.

Sixth, if we make it easier to take transit, walk, bike, or scooter than drive, then people will do all of those things. This is good for business. Good for health. Good for neighborhoods. Good for community. Good for the planet. And maybe people will keep building more housing for all income ranges in the city to meet demand. But, if we make it easier to drive, we will get more people sprawling around our region, driving to work. We have to stop, and now is the time.

NO WIDENING.

--

Michele E Reeves

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0329 Michele Miller

**Comment:** I am writing to oppose this freeway expansion because it will hurt the students at Harriet Tubman Middle School by dramatically lowering the quality of the air these students breathe. Let's look into putting our public funds into alternative transportation that does not hurt our kids and contribute to global warming!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0326 Michele Price

**Comment:** I fully support NO MORE FREEWAYS and highly recommend that Portland strives to become a model city for other US cities—fewer freeways, increased public transportation throughout the Portland area, safe walking and biking. On some days, commuting in Portland is as bad as commuting in Los Angeles. More freeways will not help but will increase congestion and reduce air quality and quality of life. Portland needs to act courageously and with real vision and not make the mistakes other US cities make. I've lived abroad and never missed my car because I simply didn't need it. Portland needs to think long term and not bend to the power brokers who want more freeways. Sincerely, Michele Price

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Michelle

**Comment:** I strongly oppose freeway expansion because there's not one single good reason to do it. Cities all over the U.S. have shown that building more freeways means even more traffic, pollution, and harm to the climate. Please take the smart, sage, forward-thinking, healthy, sane, and just route and invest our money into our public transportation system. This is what the community wants to do with our money.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0219 Michelle DuBarry

**Comment:** As the mom of a toddler who was killed by a careless driver in 2010, I want to urge ODOT to consider the impact of inviting MORE cars into the communities where families live, walk, and bike. For our safety, for the future of our planet and our communities, please do not spend money on widening freeways. Instead put that money toward improvements in public transportation, and building safe, walkable communities.

My son died less than 2 blocks from our home, while out on a walk to the grocery store with his dad. Please don't sacrifice the safety of our communities to accommodate more cars. Thank you.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0329 Michelle Marx

*Portland Pedestrian Advisory Committee*

**Comment:** Portland Pedestrian Advisory Committee

1120 SW 5th Avenue, Suite 800

Portland, OR 97204

Chair

Brenda Martin, Co-Chair

Members-At-Large

Marcella Crowson

Jim Fairchild

Evelyn Ferreira

Kevin Glenn

Matthew Hall

Patricia Jewett

Brian Landoe

Elaine O'Keefe

Josh Roll

Ashley Schofield

Zoe Klingmann

Recused

Josh Channell, Co-Chair

MEMBERS

March 29, 2019

Commissioner Chloe Eudaly & Portland City Council

1221 SW 4th Ave

Portland, OR 97204

Megan Channell, Project Manager, Oregon Department of Transportation

123 NW Flanders St

Portland, OR 97209

CC: Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with M



Portland Planning & Sustainability Commission

Chris Warner, Interim Director, Portland Bureau of Transportation

Joe Zehnder, Interim Director, Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Oregon Transportation Commission

Metro Council

Re: ODOT I-5 Rose Quarter Environmental Assessment

As members of the City of Portland's Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC), we are submitting this letter in response to the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project (I5RQ) Environmental Assessment (EA) published on February 15, 2019. Following review and discussion of the Environmental Assessment (EA), as well as a briefing by ODOT and PBOT project managers, the PAC has identified several significant concerns.

#### Cumulative Impacts on Active Transportation & Low Mobility Users

The proposed surface street improvements do not provide safety or connectivity benefits for pedestrians and bicycle users. Rather, due to the increase in signalized crossings, longer travel distances, and less direct access, non-vehicular trips (including public transit trips) would experience increased delays compared to current conditions. The local street designs also include numerous vehicle-centric features which present risks to the safety of active transportation users, including double turn lanes, expanded freeway ramps, and wide curb radii at intersections. These designs deprioritize pedestrians and bicycle users, which is in direct conflict with the City's Vision Zero, mode-shift, and carbon emission reduction goals.

The project proposes removal of the Flint overpass, one of the busiest bicycle routes in the city due to its low traffic volumes and direct connection to NE Broadway, west of I-5. Neither the proposed Hancock-Dixon Crossing nor the Clackamas Bicycle & Pedestrian Crossing offer comparable connectivity to preferred bicycle or pedestrian routes. According to the EA, the Clackamas Crossing would actually increase bicycle delay to the Steel Bridge and the Eastbank Esplanade, a signature bicycle and pedestrian route.

The PAC is particularly concerned about the proposed Hancock-Dixon Crossing's estimated 9-10% grade, which is not ADA compliant. The steep incline renders the bridge permanently inaccessible to pedestrians using mobility devices or those with limited mobility. The EA does not propose sufficient mitigations for this impact. Further, the construction of new non-ADA compliant facilities sets a negative precedent that rates access for vulnerable and low-mobility road users below that of vehicles.

The proposed changes have significant design flaws that do not promote walking in what the committee aspires to be a dense, walkable neighborhood.

Air Quality & Public Health



The PAC is concerned about the adverse public health impacts this project will have on those who live, work, and travel in the Rose Quarter. Multiple studies have found that pedestrians are significantly more affected by air pollution from engine combustion than those in vehicles. City plans, including the Albina Vision, call for dense residential and commercial development in the project area. The committee does not believe the EA fully addresses the potential that exposure to decreased air quality will have on pedestrians in this urban neighborhood expected to grow substantially in the coming decades.

The proposed project area includes Harriet Tubman Middle School, a recently reopened elementary school in a neighborhood which has historically been negatively impacted by urban renewal projects, including the construction of I-5. The school's student body is 43% African-American and more than 70% underserved. The committee is concerned about the significant near and long-term public health impacts the proposed project will have on this particularly young and vulnerable population. An independent analysis conducted by Portland State University<sup>1</sup> warns that the air quality will be so dangerous as a result of this project that students should not be allowed to play outside. The EA does not adequately consider these impacts, nor does it identify sufficient mitigation measures to avoid long-term and irreversible harm to public health.

#### Gaps in Safety Analysis and Associated Methods

One of the I5RQ project's primary goals is to improve safety in the project area. The Transportation Safety chapter of the EA cites ODOT crash analysis methods including the SPIS. The committee thinks that this methodology should be reviewed more closely. ODOT does not use the latest methods from the Highway Safety Manual, namely the use of an Empirical Bayes method, for understanding current safety conditions that help control for random events like crashes. Application of these methods would allow project staff to employ crash modification factors to show the change in crashes, by severity, expected in the Build Alternative. This would allow the public to understand how cost effective this project will be at reducing fatal and severe injuries and either justify or oppose the use of safety as a primary goal for this project.

Additionally, it is of this committee's perspective that the current safety conditions are not severe enough to use the improvement of safety as the primary goal of the project. From 2011 to 2015, only one fatal injury involving a pedestrian crossing I-5 (1,114 statewide in that period) and six severe injuries (4,691 in that period) have occurred in the project area. The committee does not agree that these numbers warrant safety as the main project goal.

Finally, the EA does not consider the safety impacts of traffic generated from this project to conditions on surface streets. Any increase in traffic in the study area would lead to an increase in traffic on facility types. Any possible changes in fatal or severe injuries on these facilities should be accounted for in the EA. The committee believes that the project should use the 2016 ODOT crash file, the most current crash data available.

#### Exclusion of Congestion/Value Pricing

The committee was surprised to find that the current EA excludes the potential impact on safety and operations from congestion/value pricing. ODOT and regional partners have been studying



the impacts of congestion/value pricing on Oregon Highways, including the Interstate-5 corridor. Information from this work should be included in the EA, to determine how this policy could meet operations and safety goals. It is also important to consider how this project might influence any of the current congestion/value pricing options being considered.

Given these concerns, in particular the potential for long-term harm to vulnerable and historically marginalized populations, the PAC recommends ODOT complete a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). A full EIS will help the region better understand the public health, traffic safety, and environmental justice impacts of the project on local communities and identify effective mitigation options.

As the City's appointed advisory committee, tasked with providing input and perspective on how best to improve the pedestrian experience, the PAC requests representation on any steering committee established to inform the design of the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on the Environmental Assessment for this project.

Sincerely,

Brenda Martin

PAC Co-Chair

1:[https://www.pps.net/cms/lib/OR01913224/Centricity/Domain/4/PSU\\_Tubmanfinalreport.pdf](https://www.pps.net/cms/lib/OR01913224/Centricity/Domain/4/PSU_Tubmanfinalreport.pdf)

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0330 Michelle Medler

**Comment:** I hear the extreme environmentalist point of view about expanding freeways not helping with pollution. I want to agree with them, but I cannot.

Portland's freeways (through the rose quarter especially) were built for a small city. We are no longer a small city & we need to grow up and get big city freeways! I have watched the traffic changes here since 1987 when I moved here from Seattle (who had over budgeted & had tall ramps leading to nowhere for my entire childhood, yet they also had the express lane system in place (where an entire freeway level was northbound in the evening & southbound in the morning to accommodate for rush hour coming into Seattle from the north)).Portland's freeway through downtown felt like (& still does) it was going through a town the size of Roseburg Now it feels like we are squeezing the traffic of 1980's Seattle through.

I am so tired of budgeting an extra hour every time I want to Vancouver. It's not even predictable like rush hour used to be in the 80's. It's seemingly random when traffic will bottleneck.

Please follow through with this. We need it! I am highly interested in improving our environment, but that can be done in other ways. The technology for automobiles is ever changing and should be the place where environmental protections occur (electric cars etc). We will still need the roads!



Thanks for listening,

~Michelle Medler

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0311 Michelle Poyourow

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

I am writing to express my desire that ODOT not proceed with the I-5 project through the Rose Quarter. Instead I wish to see my tax dollars spent on smaller-budget and more cost-effective safety and travel time improvements for people traveling on these roads and other roads throughout the Portland metro area, and for improvements to freight mobility that do not also induce more non-freight VMT.

The freeway, its ramps and its connecting streets aren't congested because of the freeway width bottleneck; they are congested because driving is the only reasonable way to get around for too many people. They are congested because designing freeways to move people fast has induced people to travel farther, and has therefore increased demand for road space out of proportion to our population growth.

Reducing the congestion through this bottleneck will only make longer commutes faster again, which will again induce people to make longer commutes, which will put us right back where we started. Only with even more cars on Portland's local streets, accessing the freeways. And more greenfield land plowed under in distant Washougal and Camas because they are again a bearable drive time from downtown Portland. So I take it back - it will put us worse off than we started.

Enough with engineering our roads for fast, free-flow conditions. We've been doing that for decades and it isn't working. It's time to design not for fast but for close. Which also means that its ok to design for slow. Keep I-5 and I-84 through Portland slow.

There are so many better ways to spend several hundred million dollars in the Portland metro area, such as freight mobility solutions that do not also induce an increase in personal car traffic, or a rehabilitation and improvement plan for the major orphan highways. Or improvements to safety and travel times for vulnerable road users and public transit.

The orphan highways in Portland are getting in the way of a growing city, because they are still managed by ODOT for freeflow speed rather than for urban life. We need them to function better for short local trips and to be less of barriers to multi-modal transportation along them and across them. We also need them to support much higher densities and a great deal more transit service, which probably means they get Fs Fs Fs all over for ostensibly "failing" intersections that move vast numbers of people short distances on foot, bike and bus, and that support dense mixed use neighborhoods where people simply travel less. That's the plan I would be happy to contribute tax dollars towards!

Thank you,



Michelle Poyourow

SE Portland

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Michelle thomas

**Comment:** Subject: Please move forward with i-5, 84 project

I work in the portland area, and would love to see this s\*\*\* intersection fixed! Thank you very much!

Michelle thomas

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0305 Michelle Zellers

**Comment:** As a disabled, transit-dependent person, I want to see resources devoted to improving and promoting a public transit system that's accessible to all and sustainable for our planet. Freeway expansion comes at a staggering cost and moves us in the wrong direction.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Mikayla Maki

**Comment:** No amount of expansion will help with congestion! Usage increases to fill all roadspace and so we need deconstruction and congestion pricing to fix shattered communities and cut down on emissions, traffic, and everything else.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Mike Faden

**Comment:** Hi there

Thank you for soliciting feedback re this project.

After reading the materials I have these comments:

1. The analysis doesn't appear to take into account the proposed congestion pricing, which would presumably change traffic patterns quite a bit. I understand it's difficult to take every single factor into account, but I think in this case the congestion pricing should be considered because of the scale of the proposed freeway change investment (\$500 million plus)
2. The on-ramp and off-ramp changes seem useful but will make a relatively small difference to traffic flows. It's not worth the huge investment, especially since this will cause huge disruption to the neighborhood and the whole area for many years
3. The changes will increase air quality and noise problems for Harriet Tubman and the park at that location



Thank you

Mike Faden

**Attachments:** N/A

### **2019 0303 Mike Kehoe**

**Comment:** Please move forward with spending money on the freeway expansion at the Rose Quarter. Traffic in Oregon is some of the worst in the country! We need to add freeway lanes and freeways. Thank you.

**Attachments:** N/A

### **2019 0328 Mike Landauer**

**Comment:** I am firmly opposed to this idiotic expansion. Incentivize public transit and alternate modes of travel over fossil fuel reliant, inefficient cars. Let the kids at Harriet Tubman breathe!

**Attachments:** N/A

### **2019 0402 Mike Lettunich**

**Comment:** I could not agree more with Rukaiyah Adams when she said that this is "a once in a generation opportunity to build over the I5 and re-connect neighborhoods to the River." The federal interstate system was undoubtedly a huge success for the country but its glaring error was how it cut up the heart of countless cities. Many have and are trying to fix this - Boston, Seattle, Dallas... - see Pew articles from 4/2/18. It is very expensive but it is critical as cities compete for talent and living wage jobs in the ongoing, worldwide migration to urban centers. If \$500 million is already earmarked - I challenge ODOT and the City of Portland to claw tooth and nail to find more to cover as much of I5 as possible. Covering I5 would be totally transformative to the Eastside.

**Attachments:** N/A

### **2019 0319 Mike O'Brien**

**Comment:** If we correctly understand your argument that adding capacity to the freeway will not draw additional traffic, that does not square with experience. When drivers see that traffic is moving, they will join the stream. So the freeway will in a short time be clogged again. We want to see solutions that support our state's climate goals by reducing carbon emissions. Spend the \$500 million on innovating ways for us to travel more sustainably. It's time.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0000 Mike Orr

**Comment:** I'm usually wary of arguments that begin "Imagine how much we could do with that amount of money used in xyz different arena," as money has not been and likely would not be allocated that way (Mount Hood Freeway example notwithstanding). But I can definitely say that spending \$500m on a project that will a) only affect a tiny section of road, b) dramatically increase pollution immediately adjacent to a middle school, c) make traffic miserable for years during construction, d) ultimately induce more cars and therefore worse traffic/congestion, does not seem like a worthwhile endeavor.

Of course I would love to see \$500m directed toward public transit, or education, or literally almost anything else, I'm mostly writing here to oppose the use of that much money to support the expansion of the freeway system. It will not only not help, we'll be spending to make things worse.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Mike Schepps

**Comment:** To Whom It May Concern,

I am a Portland resident, home and business owner who lives and works Downtown. I am writing to express my opposition to the I-5 widening project. In a time of climate change it is irresponsible and immoral to spend money towards enhancing car transportation and the increased downtown pollution is a genuine health hazard.

Michael Schepps

Portland, OR

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0402 Mike Warwick

**Comment:** As one of the duly appointed representatives of one of the affected neighborhoods I want to confirm my continued opposition to this particular project. During the NE Quadrant Plan process we were assured any funds earmarked for this project could be used on other regional transportation projects, which would be my preference. This position was the same for ALL neighborhood representatives then, and still! ODOT/PDOT continuing to pursue this project is a breach of their agreement with the affected Neighborhood Associations!

Despite what a neophyte reporter at the WW said, NO neighborhood supports the "lids." It was clear during the Plan process building on the southern lids would be problematic and impossible on the northern ones. Similarly, there is no need, NOR DESIRE within the Eliot Neighborhood to "reconnect" via a Hancock overcrossing nor remove the Flint overpass. None! Nada! Zero! The



desire to "reconnect" is based on misplaced guilt by white, mostly young people with no knowledge of either neighborhood history or geography or ability to read old maps. There WAS NO connection at Hancock previously. In fact that area was essentially a swamp as is noted in the recent edition of the Architectural Heritage newsletter. The reason for this is that there is a BLUFF there. That is why the railroad and highway were located there. DUH! The proposed overcrossing will only serve as a by-pass for congestion on Broadway and Weidler. It will also require confiscation of property on the west side of I-5 that is opposed by those property owners.

Finally, the project rests on assumptions that are not only faulty, but fabricated. First, the "accidents" it will prevent are largely outside the actual project area as was revealed during the NE Quadrant Plan. This project will do nothing to prevent accidents on the approaches to Water Avenue and I-84 or to the Fremont bridge and I-5 north. Your claim is a LIE! Second, the alleged "environmental improvements" are based on assumed fuel efficiency expectations that were a) eliminated by President Trump, and b) will be offset by the shift in vehicle ownership from sedans to SUVs. Future gas use per vehicle will be HIGHER than you assumed. Without that, emissions will be no different or worse. Moreover, the "reduction in idling time" is a joke. EVERY freeway widening project there has ever been has increased traffic and it is obvious when traffic increases so does congestion. Third, the level of pollutants currently (which won't be reduced per above), is so bad that the school district had to install air filtration systems on Tubman School that required ductwork that doubled the height of the building! Sadly, kids still can't play outside due to the pollution now, and in the future. So that is also a LIE!

Finally, you assume a \$500 Million budget and 4-year construction schedule. During the NE Quad plan process the actual construction timeline, with potential delays, assumed project completion in 10-years (less without any, which obviously won't be the case). And, as was pointed out repeatedly, ODOT has NEVER brought a project on this scale in on budget (or time). Realistically, this is a BILLION dollar project that won't be complete until 2030. In the interim, construction will starve businesses in the Broadway District as slow residential development in the Lloyd District and Eliot neighborhood, as well as redevelopment in the Rose Quarter and east Broadway Bridgehead. As a result, the "real" social cost of this project will be BILLIONS of dollars in wasted tax funds and private sector incomes.

If you think I am wrong, and want to prove to me all of the other critics of this project your assumptions about traffic flow and accident rates are correct, you can do so by simply closing the Broadway/Weidler ramps for a year and monitoring traffic speeds and accidents. If speeds increase and accident rates AND severity go down, it will be difficult to object at that point.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Mike Wieteki

**Comment:** Please see my comments below. 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 independently verify. ODOT still hasn't released numerous data sets and appendices that would allow 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 dubious claims. 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. Perform 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. ODOT MUST fully study alternatives (including decongestion pricing!) to this expansion with a full Environmental Impact Statement. Sincerely, Mike Portland

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0316 Mikhaila Bishop

**Comment:** Build a passenger railway!! Do NOT built an I-5 expansion. The data is available and undeniably linked to Poryland's Climate impact. This decision makes No sense, would lose the city money, and would increase air pollution, which is already terrible in comparison to other US cities. If you care about the well-being of the city, use it for community & low-income housing developments. Use it for sidewalk repair, for solar installation. It makes no fucking sense why you continue to endanger our lives.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Mikhaila Bishop

**Comment:** I am a student at Portland State University and I am opposed to the I-5 expansion. When I lived in Wilsonville, they attempted something similar where they increased the on and off ramps and widened the roads for more accessibility. It backfired, and now the traffic there is consistently the worst traffic on I-5 in the area.

If you want to stop congestion, encourage people to not use cars! Increase biking roads, send money to public transport, etc. Building a bigger highway is a strategy of avoiding this, so car companies can continue to profit off of material that directly exploits the earth.

I am also very concerned and involved with climate change action, and this is a step backwards in infrastructure planning. We need to make new courses and plans to shift into a greener society. PLEASE DO NOT BUILD THIS EXPANSION.

Thank you

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Mila Mimica

**Comment:** Widening highways does not work, and has never worked. Your own consultants have agreed - they say this project won't address recurring traffic congestion -- in fact, it will contribute to making traffic even worse.

Portland is supposed to serve as a reflection of our country's brightest -- and greenest -- minds. Spending \$500 million to expand this tiny section of highway will lead to further spending to expand our highways. Just ask Los Angeles.



This project is an embarrassment to our city, and a gross misuse of millions of dollars at a time when we should be contributing to environmentally-friendly transportation projects. Not projects that increase pollution and encourage further use of single-use vehicles.

Please, please rethink what you're doing to the future of our city.

-Mila Mimica

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Mitchell HuffMenne

**Comment:** Adding freeway capacity does not reduce traffic congestion due to induced demand. This expansion will result in more cars and more jams on our roads.

We do not want to live in a city full of cars, or where a car is the primary mode people use to get around. Rather than expanding the freeway, we should expand the light rail system, reserve dedicated lanes for busses, add physically protected bike lanes, and close roads to cars to boost walking. A city where people can rely on transit or their own human power to get around is a much more livable and nicer city to live in than one full of cars.

The freeway expansion project will add much more pollution to our city.

The freeway expansion will encroach on the Eastbank Esplanade, a school, and other areas I would much rather dedicate space to than cars.

Do not expand the freeway. Instead, expand transit and infrastructure for biking and walking.

Thank you,

Mitchell HuffMenne

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Molly Dwyer

**Comment:** The purpose of this letter is to express my disappointment in the process of presenting the I-5 expansion project and my concern about its impact going forward. It goes without saying that accurate data must be used to explain or in this case "sell" a project. It is unethical to act as though we have a bridge expansion when we don't and by all indicators will not in the future, in order to make this I-5 expansion project appear more appealing.

I have lived in the Eliot neighborhood for over 15 years. I am aware that our air quality is lower than other areas of Portland due to the freeway proximity. This is particularly true for Harriet Tubman Middle School, where my son with attend. The I-5 expansion would only make that worse. That is my concern for the immediate future. Our long term goal ought to be to reduce the use of fossil fuels, not encourage them. It is my understanding that freeways are little like



Kevin Costner's baseball field "if you build it they will come" lots of cars in this case. I say all of this as a car commuter. There is no public transportation route that is remotely convenient between my home in Eliot and my work in Beaverton. If there were, I would use it. Investment in public transportation is both wiser and more ethical.

Lastly, this is an environmental justice issue. The long term residents of Eliot (longer than me and my family) have suffered one injustice after another at the hands of City planners and local politicians. I don't need to recite that history here. However, as gentrified as this neighborhood is now, it is still one of the more diverse in the city and the two school that lie right on this stretch of freeway, educate more kids of color than any others in Portland. It is unconscionable that their young bodies be jeopardized in yet another way (I'll let you look up the health disparities between white people and African Americans) for a short-sighted project such as this one.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Molly Henty

**Comment:** Hi,

I'm writing to express my opposition to the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion.

There are so many reasons why this isn't a good idea, and I'm sure you have already heard them all. My biggest concern is climate change, and think the money could be sused more wisely on ways to get less people using cars rather than more. I think road pricing is a good place to start, and the money should be spent to invest in additional public transportation systems and creating more walkable and bikable communitis, as well as improving what we currently have.

Thank you for listening.

Molly Henty

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Molly Porterfield

**Comment:** NO

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0326 Mona Derby

**Comment:** As a federal fisheries biologist with specific knowledge of water quality and non-point source water pollution, I was happy to see the improvements for treatment of water runoff from 30 acres of the API and surrounding impervious areas (Aquatic Biology, Environmental Consequences, Build Mitigation, Sub-section 3.3.2.2, pg 28). The three treatment facilities will bring the busiest section of any Oregon highway into compliance with the Clean Water Act (Water Resources, Existing Conditions, 3.16.1, pgs 80-81). I would suggest connecting this water quality improvement, through the treatment of runoff, as an ameliorated state for the



Portland Waterfront section of the Willamette River. Since all Willamette basin anadromous fish (most being ESA species/populations) must swim through the multiple Superfund sites that are the Portland section of the Willamette River, improving water runoff is a major plus for this project. The six acre increase in impervious surface area is more than offset by treating the roads' sediments, oils, surfactants, diesel particles, etc. while also decreasing total input of pollutants from idling vehicles sitting on the currently congested roads. I would emphasize the increase of the ODOT project on the Willamette River's water quality and make pleas that this could set the example for other future road improvements.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Monica Kishore

**Comment:** I don't think that it is a good idea to build this improvement. There is no data in support that widening lanes improves congestion, quite the reverse. In fact, it looks like it will negatively impact bicyclists and bus users. Why not make bus dedicated streets on alberta or improve bus transit to places people are trying to go on the east side? Why spend this money on something that will negatively impact transit and commutes?

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 Monique Gaskins

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

I am a resident and homeowner in the Eliot Neighborhood.

ODOT brought 2 people to present about the I-5 Rose Quarter project last night, March 11, to the Eliot Neighborhood Land Use Committee meeting. The male presenter (Doug) kicked off the presentation and stated that it was meant to be interactive with questions answered throughout his presentation.

On a slide discussing the historical impact of I-5 cutting through a historically Black neighborhood (Eliot), I asked how the proposed project is not a continuation of that historical precedence. Doug responded by saying my question was rhetorical, inappropriate, and he did not answer me. I was the only Black person attending the meeting, and was offended at how rudely he dismissed me and my question. Doug did not address any other person in this meeting as harshly or curtly as he did me.

Later in the presentation, I again asked my question and Doug's female colleague respectfully answered my question to the best of her ability.

My opinion is that this proposal continues to push harmful environmental impacts onto a historically black neighborhood and a vulnerable public school (Tubman) and it is important for ODOT to acknowledge the negative impact of widening a highway through this neighborhood.

I'm aware that this is uncomfortable, but if ODOT's outreach professionals are not able to respond professionally to these issues, perhaps they should be on a different project.



Thank you for your time,

Monique Gaskins

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0325 Monique Gaskins

**Comment:** Dear ODOT and elected representatives,

I ask that you please stop pursuing the proposed I-5 expansion through Eliot neighborhood and the Rose Quarter for the following reasons:

### Environmental Justice

Constructing I-5 was a symptom of a racist society that destroyed a black neighborhood. The neighborhood has struggled for years and now has something to be very proud of, Harriet Tubman Middle School. Unfortunately this school with a 40% minority student population, is subjected to limited outdoor time and low air quality due to the proximity of I-5. If we cared about mitigating the effects of pollution for this vulnerable population, we'd be discussing tearing out this freeway. Expanding it will only bring in more cars and worse air quality as every other urban freeway expansion has shown us.

### Climate Change

The IPCC says we have 11 years now to dramatically shift how society does things if we're going to have any meaningful chance of addressing climate change. An investment in widening our freeways is an investment in promoting cars and single occupancy vehicles which is exactly what we don't need.

### Safety

From how ODOT pitches this project, it seems the main intent is to move vehicles quickly through the Rose Quarter whether they're on the highway or on the surface streets. We know that cars moving quickly is what kills and leads to an unsafe neighborhood. This project should prioritize safety and not speed. Two Harriet Tubman students have already been hit this school year.

Additionally, the removal of Flint bridge looks like it is going to put bikes onto either a very steep road or mixing with vehicles. I'm aware the designs are not finalized, but it appears bikes are an afterthought and will be squeezed in where it is possible at the last minute, leading to an unsafe outcome.

### Fiscal Responsibility

\$500M is a lot of money. This is not where we need it most. The proposed goal of this project is safety. ODOT owns a lot more roads where safety is a bigger concern. Folks keep getting hit by cars and dying 82nd and also on Powell. If safety is really the priority, we should be spending this money on streets in East Portland which could be fixed for much cheaper than \$500M.



### No Actual Local Improvements + The Gimmicky Lids

This project is clearly a highway widening project and all the "local improvements" are an afterthought. The current ped/bike infrastructure in the area is pretty good. From what has been shown so far, I have little faith that after this project is completed it'll be up to the level that things are now.

Additionally, the lids are gimmicky and I can't see any reasonable use for them. We are not going to want people hanging around on the lids b/c the air quality is going to be terrible on top of them. The on-ramps/off-ramps are going to have more lanes so it is going to be unsafe walking around the area so if small buildings are put in, they will be dangerous to access.

### Misalignment with Portland's Goals

Portland has adopted Vision Zero. Portland has adopted the climate action plan. Portland has adopted mode-split goals. This project goes directly against all of them. This project is a single occupancy vehicle first, everything else last, project. That will lead to more vehicle miles traveled, which we know is highly correlated with traffic fatalities. More VMT also will lead to more emissions which goes against our climate change goals. Making it faster and easier to drive will lead to more driving which goes against our mode split goals.

### Sloppy EA and Lack of Consideration of Congestion Pricing

The EA was sloppily executed with missing data. Some of it will supposedly be shared soon, but at this point it is too late to meaningfully address it before the close of the EA.

Also, congestion pricing is reasonably foreseeable. This should have been included in the modeling when considering both the build and no-build scenarios and should be utilized before even discussing a \$500M freeway investment.

Thank you for your time and consideration and I hope you will all do what's best for Portland, the environment, and the future, and stop this project from moving forward.

Monique Gaskins

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Mont Chris Hubbard

**Comment:** I wholeheartedly oppose the proposed I-5 expansion, and indeed any spending on fossil fuel infrastructure, when it is clear that:

- 1) Climate change threatens our lives in this VERY generation
- 2) Expanding freeways encourages people to drive
- 3) It is well established that freeway expansion don't even solve congestion problems, but rather INDUCE DEMAND



Moreover, the specifics of this project, like most fossil fuel infrastructure, disproportionately affect our poor communities and people of color sending MORE exhaust-spewing cars and trucks past Harriet Tubman Middle School would be unconscionable.

Sincerely,

Mont Chris Hubbard

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0402 Montserrat Shepard

**Comment:** Please do not expand the highway. This project proposal makes no sense and has no community support.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0323 Morgan Johnson

**Comment:** Please make the freeway wider and with more lanes able to deal with congestion. The insanity of not updating our freeway system is beyond comprehension.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0323 Morgan Johnson 2

**Comment:** Make the freeway wider and more able to handle traffic. No to tolls!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 MORGAN MAIOLIE

*Walker Macy*

**Comment:** Hello,

I love what this project does for bikes and development in the area. As a forward-thinking look at our mobility; I would also like it also to serve transit better and de-emphasize single occupant vehicles. I support a Bus Rapid Transit lane as part of the project.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0310 Mr Sparr

**Comment:** Please consider implementing congestion pricing WITHOUT widening the freeway.

Widening the freeway will not relieve congestion, it will only incentivize more people to drive into downtown, making congestion worse.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0312 Ms Herout

**Comment:** I'm a parent at Harriet Tubman Middle School that was just opened last year and over \$18 million was spent mitigating the current pollution as it stands. That said, there are 500 students at Harriet Tubman Middle School, 70 percent of whom are children of color. Today there's an article put out by Jonathan Lambert from NPR, and the title is "Study Finds Racial Gap Between Who Causes Air Pollution and Who Breathes It." The first line of the article says "Pollution, much like wealth is not distributed equally in the U.S. PSU recommended limiting exercise outside Harriet Tubman Middle School for all students, and specifically during hours of commuting. If construction goes forward, when will it be safe for students to be outside? Because during construction there will be a huge increase in the traffic and increase in air pollution and particulates. And I really urge you to take into consideration the 500 students, again, 70 percent who are kids of color and have not been served adequately by Portland Public Schools.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 Ms. Iannarone

**Comment:** Good evening. Thank you for listening to us. Hello Commissioner Eudaly. Happy to see Portland in the room. My friends and colleagues gathered here have been working really hard. It's obvious when you look at the amount of time and energy and attention they put into a very, what I would call, insufficient environmental assessment from ODOT. They asked you for information that has not been forthcoming, which I think is quite tragic. Because when you think about the role that deliberation and careful deliberation plays in these processes, and the expertise you have packed in this room, for these people to be even taking time to make testimony here based on incomplete information for you, it's a travesty. So that's very disrespectful to our community, in addition to this project being an entire boondoggle. Okay. So I'm just going to lay that out. We want the information that we requested and we want it in a timely fashion. That said, my job for the last 10 years has been sharing Portland's sustainability story with visiting world leaders who come here because they heard we stopped Mt. Hood freeway. They heard we took out Harbor Drive and built a park. They heard we told the federal government, hey, keep your highway money, we're going to build light rail. And they ask me how do we do that? We want to be like you. We want to do what you're doing. And you know what I've been saying the last two or three years? I don't know. I don't know what to tell you. Because it seems to me that in many ways we have lost our way. And I am very happy that you are the transportation commissioner, Commissioner Eudaly, because I know that you have courage, and I know that you have vision, and I know that you have an innovative staff. And I echo the sentiments of my colleagues on the Bicycle Advisory Committee that we will have your back if you stay with us on this. And to ODOT, it's just not going to happen. We'll lie on the highway before we let you build this.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0326 Muylysa Melco

**Comment:** Hello, I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed freeway expansion. As a North Portland resident who would be impacted by this project, I am concerned about air pollution, equity and environmental sustainability. This project would be a big step back in those areas. I would like to see funding and our efforts go towards public transit, making our city bike friendlier, lowering carbon emissions and building community in meaningful and inclusive ways. I have developed asthma since moving to this neighborhood a decade ago. I'm dismayed at the air quality here, disappointed in our elected official's lack of action on air quality issues and worried for my young son. I don't want more freeways! Of note: "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." Please scrap this project and work with the community to make Portland a truly green and livable city. Sincerely, Mulysa Mulysa Melco, M.Ag. Landscape Designer Resilience Design

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0328 Murphy Terrell

**Comment:** I say NO

More highways are not a good answer. Look at I5 in Seattle

Get people out of cars

Thanks

Murph

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0305 Mykle Hansen

**Comment:** We did not elect our city council to barter our community's values for federal highway funds! No short-term economic benefit to the city is worth the permanent loss of opportunity and clean air that would be this project's legacy..

Portland needs to demonstrate leadership at the state and national level, and advocate for smarter, sustainable transit solutions nationwide! Our position on the expansion of I-5, and how we talk to the rest of the country about it, will drive that discussion. Our leaders need to do the brave thing and say no, eloquently, to throwing public money at expensive non-solutions.

We should also demand an investigation of ODOT's financial practices before trusting them with any state money for any reason! Can anybody who's familiar with their record of cost-overruns

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with M



truly plan for this project to cost only as much as they predict? When has that ever happened before? At this point, it is simply a dereliction of fiscal responsibility to take ODOT's word on the cost of one of their highway projects.

**Attachments:** N/A