



# Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with R

*Ordered by first name*

## Contents

2019 0327 R Mumford .....	6
2019 0312 R.J.Sheperd .....	6
2019 0401 Rabbi Ariel Stone .....	6
2019 0401 Rachael Banks .....	7
2019 0226 Rachel Adler .....	8
2019 0401 Rachel Alder .....	8
2019 0315 Rachel Brunner .....	9
2019 0304 Rachel Elizabeth .....	9
2019 0327 Rachel Hanes .....	9
2019 0322 Rachel Hunter .....	10
2019 0401 Rachel Hutchison .....	10
2019 0308 Rahcel Slocum .....	11
2019 0328 Rachel Thieme .....	11
2019 0326 Ralph Cohen .....	12
2019 0305 Ralph M. Cohen PE .....	13
2019 0215 Ramtin Rahmani .....	13
2019 0326 Ramtin Rahmani .....	13
2019 0326 Ramtin Rahmani 2 .....	14
2019 0326 Ramtin Rahmani 3 .....	15
2019 0327 Ramtin Rahmani .....	16
2019 0402 Ramtin Rahmani .....	17
2019 0327 Randall Taylor .....	18
2019 0304 Randall Webb .....	18
2019 0313 Ray Anderson .....	18
2019 0325 Ray Atkinson .....	18



2019 0315 Raymond Piccolotti .....	19
2019 0226 Rebecca Canright .....	19
2019 0330 Rebecca Canright .....	19
2019 0402 Rebecca Matsumoto .....	20
2019 0326 Rebecca Rosenfelt.....	21
2019 0331 Rebecca Rowhm.....	21
2019 0312 Rebecca Small.....	21
2019 0401 Rebecca Spain.....	22
2019 0331 Rebekah Loughlin .....	22
2019 0331 Rebekah Loughlin .....	23
2019 0327 Reece Nitschke.....	23
2019 0313 Reed Buterbaugh.....	23
2019 0313 Reed Buterbaugh.....	23
2019 0314 Reed Parsons .....	24
2019 0401 Regina Tricamo.....	24
2019 0401 Reid Blomquist.....	24
2019 0401 Ren Stein .....	24
2019 0330 Rene Pyatt .....	25
2019 0402 Renee M Jankord.....	25
2019 0329 Rev Robyn Hartwig .....	26
2019 0401 Rhett Lawrence Doug Moore Nicholas Caleb Meredith Connolly.....	26
2019 0401 Rich and Betsy Reese .....	29
2019 0228 Rich Franklin .....	33
2019 0331 Rich Prosert .....	33
2019 0401 Richard Byron Gay.....	34
2019 0329 Richard Gorringer.....	34
2019 0329 Richard Johnson .....	35
2019 0331 Richard McNeil.....	35
2019 0313 Richard Nunno .....	35
2019 0304 Richard Posert .....	36



2019 0226 Richard Weinhold.....	36
2019 0330 Richard Weinhold.....	37
2019 0226 Richard Wood .....	38
2019 0331 Rick .....	38
2019 0327 Rick C .....	38
2019 0226 Rick Christman.....	38
2019 0000 Rick Kappler.....	38
2019 0331 Rick Kappler.....	39
2019 0226 rick rappaport .....	39
2019 0219 Rick Ray.....	39
2019 0326 Rick Ray.....	40
2019 0327 Rick Seufert .....	40
2019 0326 Ricky von Hulha .....	40
2019 0326 Riley Peck.....	41
2019 0401 Rita Webb .....	41
2019 0312 Rithy Khut .....	41
2019 3022 Rithy Khut and Elliot Akwai-Scott.....	42
2019 0319 Rithy Khut Elliot Akwai-Scott.....	46
2019 0322 Rob Falk.....	49
2019 0315 Rob Haley .....	49
2019 0226 Rob McRae .....	49
2019 0329 Rob McRae .....	50
2019 0329 Rob Parker .....	51
2019 0401 Robbi M. Brewer .....	52
2019 0401 Robert Bullard .....	52
2019 0215 Robert D Rowen .....	53
2019 0331 Robert Galanakis .....	53
2019 0331 robert gantz.....	53
2019 0310 Robert Hemphill .....	53
2019 0327 Robert Hunter .....	56



2019 0328 Robin.....	56
2019 0304 Robin Gray.....	56
2019 0329 Robin Scholetzky .....	56
2019 0328 Robyn Klopp .....	57
2019 0329 Rod Lundberg .....	57
2019 0329 Roddy Erickson.....	57
2019 0322 Rogan Motis.....	58
2019 0313 Roger Alley .....	58
2019 0402 Ron Alexssen.....	58
2019 0315 Ron Arp.....	59
2019 0312 Ron Buel .....	59
2019 0312 Ron Swaren .....	60
2019 0314 Ron Webster .....	60
2019 0328 Ronald C Alexander.....	61
2019 0327 Ronelle Coburn.....	61
2019 0225 Rosanna Henderson .....	61
2019 0304 Rose.....	62
2019 0000 Rose Swartz.....	62
2019 0224 Ross Filice .....	62
2019 0218 Ross Winsor.....	62
2019 0401 Rowena Paz Norman.....	63
2019 0226 Roxane R Auer .....	63
2019 0330 Roxanne.....	64
2019 0401 Roy Huggins .....	64
2019 0329 Roy Y .....	64
2019 0401 Roy Zhang .....	64
2019 0402 Roya Amirsoleymani.....	65
2019 0401 Rubilei Diaz.....	67
2019 0305 Ruby Oland.....	67
2019 0329 Rukaiyah Adams.....	67

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with R



2019 0318 Russ Grandgeorge.....	68
2019 0328 Russell Senior.....	68
2019 0326 Ruthie.....	69
2019 0000 Ryan.....	69
2019 0329 Ryan.....	69
2019 0401 Ryan Linville.....	69
2019 0326 Ryan Mosier.....	69
2019 0308 Ryan Moskal.....	70
2019 0331 Ryan Schenk.....	70



## 2019 0327 R Mumford

**Comment:** This is a terrible idea. \$500,000,000 which is never the final cost. Let's spend it on improving transit, improving cycling, buses, max rail, but please not for single occupancy vehicles.

The most important reason for my child and wife is climate change. This freeway expansion will only exacerbate the problem.

A win-win to the freeway and climate change is removing a portion of the vehicles by investing in congestion tolling, bike-bus-light rail infrastructure. Even scooters please! Reducing car use will solve congestion.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 R.J.Sheperd

**Comment:** Thank you very much. R.J. Sheperd, Overlook neighborhood. On February 24 of this year, Juana Francisco, a sophomore at Madison High School was struck by a driver as she was walking home from the bus stop. Today she is still fighting for her life. I just want to ask for a few moments of silence, just send your thoughts to Juana. And remember the 467 people were killed on Oregon roads just this last year.

(Moment of silence.)

I am so proud to be here today to stand with No More Freeways, Light Rail PDX, Harriet Tubman Middle School students and my north Portland neighbors who have turned out to stop the largest freeway expansion Oregon has seen in the last 30 years. Well, our planet has already warmed by three and a half degrees Farenheit. ODOT is proposing to expand fossil fuel infrastructure. ODOT has refused to release the data their climate and modeling show -- and their climate modeling which shows that they are not acting in the best interest of our plant. Meanwhile, ODOT has neglected the roads that desperately need investment. ODOT roads, many of the high-crash corridors, including 82nd Avenue, Lombard and Killingsworth, ODOT's urban highways have had more deaths in the last year than this section of highway has had in the past 10 years combined. It should come as no surprise that the Madison High School student, Juana Francisco, was struck by a driver on ODOT's 82nd Avenue, walking home from the her bus stop. Commissioner, please stop this freeway expansion and implement congestion pricing.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Rabbi Ariel Stone

**Comment:** I stand with those community organizations which have already pointed out that this expansion will not alleviate congestion. It will worsen pollution in a way that will have a racist impact even it that is unintended. It will lead Portland in the wrong direction at a time when



action on climate change is urgent. It will encourage cars when we should be doing anything else for our own health and that of the planet. Freeways are not free.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Rachael Banks

*Mult Co Health Dept*

**Comment:** Multnomah County Health Department requests additional time to review the Environmental Assessment (EA) prepared for the I-5 Rose Quarter project. An investment of this magnitude deserves close study and a high degree of confidence in projections of likely impacts to the community. This is especially true for impacts that may disproportionately fall on low-income populations and communities of color. We are aware that Portland Public Schools and other community organizations have called for further study, and we are supportive of a more detailed analysis.

Our concerns about the project relate to potential impacts on human health in the short and long term. We are especially concerned about air pollutants near Harriet Tubman Middle School and impacts during construction. ODOT did not model changes in criteria pollutants in the EA. This class of pollutants are among the more commonly known pollutants, including fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), ozone, and carbon monoxide (CO). Instead of quantitative modeling, the EA includes a qualitative discussion of trends in the metro area, concluding that National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) are unlikely to be exceeded as a result of the Rose Quarter project. NAAQS compliance can be achieved for the entire airshed even when there are localized high concentrations of pollution. Without more detailed modeling we cannot confidently state whether concentrations near Tubman would increase or decrease relative to the no-build option. Additionally, compliance with NAAQS does not necessarily protect from all health effects. For some criteria pollutants, such as lead and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, there are no known safe levels of pollution. We request that for both criteria air pollutants and air toxics, ODOT conduct dispersion modeling that takes into account local topography, meteorology, and the influence of structures such as sound walls and freeway covers.

As you may know, Multnomah County and the City of Portland adopted Clean Air Procurement Standards in 2018 in recognition of the harmful effects of diesel particulate matter. We also recognize that there are unacceptable disparities in exposure to these pollutants, finding in 2014 that Black and African American residents are exposed to diesel particulates at levels three times higher than in predominantly white neighborhoods

1. We agree with the EA finding that air quality near Tubman could improve because of changes to the vehicle fleet, but we are unable to determine from the information in the EA whether there are localized effects from the project. Additional study is needed to ensure that the project does not exacerbate existing disparities or cause significant health impacts.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project and we look forward to working with ODOT to ensure that the project promotes health for all.



**Attachments:** [2019 0401 Rachael Banks ATT](#)

## 2019 0226 Rachel Adler

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

I am a resident of Portland, Oregon writing to state my opposition to the proposed expansion of I-5. It has been well documented for decades that expanding capacity for vehicular traffic only leads to induced demand. The idea that adding a lane would lead to decreased congestion and travel times is incorrect something I'm glad ODOT's own consultation concluded.

We need to be taking immediate action against climate change and reducing our carbon emissions. Not only can we not accommodate more cars in our city, we have to start passing likely unpopular legislation to limit the use of cars, especially for able-bodied folks making unnecessary single passenger journeys. Tolls, decongestion pricing, and increasing the cost of owning and parking cars will have to be countered with bold, progressive legislation that prioritizes affordable, equitable transit and vastly improved infrastructure for cyclists and pedestrians.

Expanding I-5 would be an expensive, critical mistake that generations ahead of us will be paying for with their health. I urge you to move forward with the plans for improving the Rose Quarter without expanding I-5.

Thank you for reading my comments, and taking them into consideration.

Best,

Rachel Adler

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Rachel Alder

**Comment:** Hello,

As a citizen of Portland, I deeply disapprove of expanding the I-5 freeway. Larger freeway infrastructure won't solve the communities most pressing issues like air pollution, climate change, and increased congestion. It will make Portland a less livable city and I won't allow a change like that in my home. Please, please do not move forward with this project. I do not want a larger I-5 and Portland neighbors feel the same way.

Thank you,

Rachel

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0315 Rachel Brunner

**Comment:** Please listen to Portlanders on this. I grew up here and know that a slightly wider, much more expensive freeway in part of the city is not even on the top 500 most important things that the city needs. If we want to reduce congestion, we should use congestion pricing or, even better, subsidize effective public transit.

Younger Portlanders (30 year old homeowner here) are overwhelmingly not interested in this project. The proposed project is a huge waste of public funds, especially as it won't make much of a dent in our congestion problems.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0304 Rachel Elizabeth

**Comment:** I live only two blocks away from I5 North. The air in my neighborhood is contaminated with diesel particulate matter along with other pollutants. I object to the concept that widening the freeway will ease traffic and congestion. The only way to combat air pollution and traffic jams is to strengthen state law and local laws regarding air quality and eliminating the most offensive and polluting vehicles.

Also, put tolls on the roads. Especially at peak traffic hours. Promote electric cars, more alternative forms of clean transportation and instead of building bigger and wider freeways think about ways to reduce the need to drive.

A wider freeway will cause greater environmental harm. Lets put our resources into eliminating and fining corporations who are the biggest polluters. Require much more stringent guidelines regarding all of the toxins and particulate matter that currently pollute our air.

Expanding the freeway is the wrong approach. It just encourages more driving and more pollution. Lets clean up our air and water together so that people can enjoy being outside. The other issue which is another reason to not expand the freeway is that it will also create more noise in all of the neighborhoods affected. This is an additional harm for human and animal / wildlife health.

Stop building bigger freeways. Expand and improve laws to protect the environment and start using the laws effectively to shut down polluters forever.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Rachel Hanes

**Comment:** As a teacher in Portland Public Schools I cannot support a project that will make worse the already horrible air quality for students attending Tubman Middle School. 40% of



Tubman's students are Black, and 73% are identified by PPS as vulnerable populations. This is a clear example of environmental racism. Increasing traffic and pollution is unacceptable.

Secondly, we need to make systemic and meaningful action to address the very serious issue of climate change. Investments should be made in reducing our dependence on cars and fossil fuels. We should be investing in public transportation, bicycle infrastructure and safe walking routes, not creating more access for more cars.

This is a horrible idea and a wasted investment that goes counter to our goals as a community. Voters overwhelmingly supported the Clean Energy Fund and disinvesting in fossil fuels. Stop this short sighted project and start to prioritize reducing carbon emissions.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0322 Rachel Hunter

**Comment:** Before moving to Montavilla, I was a longtime Boise/Eliot resident and was, and still am, a regular bike commuter.

This proposed freeway expansion is completely irresponsible. It's been made public that ODOT's own hired consultants have said that traffic won't improve in the long term, and this should be the end of the story. There is absolutely no reason to move forward with this project when the data shows it will be ineffective, considering the damage it will do to an already marginalized community and a school where students can't even have recess outside.

As citizens of this city, with a public university that prides itself on its sustainability focus, and as decent human beings with a responsibility to future generations, we cannot in good conscience move forward with a project that won't improve traffic and that will have such an intense impact on pollution, when it is OUR responsibility to lessen the impact of climate change in the next 10 years.

If Oregon generally and Portland specifically is committed to making this a city that values accessibility and equity, it will invest in expanded public transportation and incentivize its usage. When 40% of our pollution is generated by cars, I know I would much prefer to take a bus to work if it didn't require changing three times and take an hour and a half. Portland can invest in improving this system. More people in buses getting where they need to be is without question a better solution than expanding a freeway so MORE CARS can be on it.

ODOT is not thinking strategically, responsibly, or compassionately. I urge them to drop this project.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Rachel Hutchison

**Comment:** Please do not waste more taxpayer money on a misguided project that will make Portland not dangerous, more polluted and further contribute to global warming while failing to actually solve some traffic congestion. This is an awful project and needs to be halted.



**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0308 Rahcel Slocum

**Comment:** Dear ODOT i5 Rose Quarter staff:

I oppose the expansion of i5 in the Rose Quarter on the basis that it will not improve safety, will diminish air quality and will increase greenhouse gas emissions.

There is substantial evidence showing that when you expand a highway in an urban area, you invite cars to fill that space. Congestion is not reduced and air quality gets worse. Furthermore, the IPCC has given us a foreshortened window “now 11 years” to decarbonize our way of life or face catastrophic warming. Expanding a highway when transportation emissions represent the largest percentage of Oregon’s total emissions is precisely the opposite direction to be taking the city, county and state. While the state may claim a desire to lower emissions, its commitment to highway expansion is evidence to the contrary. Decongestion pricing is a far better route to confront air pollution and congestion, and one that can be done equitably, unlike highway expansion. The state supposedly cares about racial justice. Expanding a highway uses public funds to enable the wealthy who are disproportionately white. The wealthy, after all, have jobs, are more likely to drive to work, and are less likely to take transit. Ultimately every time the state enables cars, it encourages (SOV) driving, which undermines the social and financial viability of public transit. Undermining public transit hurts those dependent on it. Since the poor are disproportionately people of color, the expansion of I-5 promotes institutionalized racism.

Sincerely,

Rachel Slocum

\*\*\*

Lecturer

PSU Urban Studies and Planning

ResearchGate

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0328 Rachel Thieme

**Comment:** I am strongly against expanding I-5 at the Rose Quarter and urge ODOT to cancel this project and focus budget and efforts instead on projects that will improve livability for Portland residents. In 2019 I find it highly irresponsible to widen a freeway in the center of the city which will inevitably encourage more cars on the road. With all we know about climate change and the impacts that vehicles have on increasing carbon in our atmosphere, it is backwards to spend this money and efforts to encourage vehicular travel. This should be



redirected to make transportation easier for people traveling by public transportation, bikes and on foot, which could have a much more meaningful effect to decrease congestion. Oregon is a leader in sustainable development, but this project tarnishes that reputation and will set us back.

My family of three uses a variety of methods to get around town, including our one car, public transportation, bike and on foot. We live two blocks from I-5 (further north from the project location) and do not wish to see additional demand and thus further air pollution which will inevitably increase with this project. Beyond impacts to my own family, I am horrified by the impacts on the students of Harriet Tubman Middle School if this project moves forward. These vulnerable students do not deserve to have any further decreases in air quality as they attend school. The state of Oregon and the city of Portland have made countless decisions over the years which have negatively impacted the Black community in this area, and I am concerned that this project will just continue this legacy for the students of Harriet Tubman Middle School. I want these kids to have clean air now and I want to leave them a healthy planet where they can grow up and thrive.

Thank you for including my comments and I urge you to reconsider this project.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0326 Ralph Cohen

**Comment:** I am in support of the anti-Rose Quarter I-5 expansion advocates ([www.nomorefreewayspd.com](http://www.nomorefreewayspd.com)). In addition to the reasons provided by this group, I am adding a few additional points:

1. There is something fundamentally flawed with paving the way to passing even more vehicles through the heart of Portland. Is there no concern for the livability of the city? The noise, the pollution, the blight?
2. We could better use that money on earthquake hardening the Burnside Bridge and the SW Corridor light rail project - two projects that will be costly and for which funding is not yet secured.
3. Why expand the highway before the Columbia Crossing bridge is implemented; this expansion will just make the bridge backup worse.
4. Why expand the highway before time of day tolls are implemented and the effect evaluated?
5. Why is PDOT ignoring what every other highway expansion has proven - that more highways bring more vehicles? If I-5 needs to be expanded, perhaps it should be done right with another city bypass.



**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0305 Ralph M. Cohen PE

**Comment:** After hearing a presentation by Joe Cortright at PEO on why this expansion won't solve the congestion problem, I am convinced that PDOT/Oregon/ODOT should first implement tolling as has been successfully done elsewhere. Further, this measure does nothing to reduce emissions and the money could be better spent on mass transit e.g. along Barbur Blvd and SW Portland or upgrading the Burnside bridge to withstand a major earthquake and function as a lifeline across the Willamette. Once a replacement bridge across the Columbia is sited, a comprehensive highway approach can be considered.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0215 Ramtin Rahmani

**Comment:** Hello,

Your PDF is not text to speech accessible. You need to fix this issue and delay the 45 day comment period until everyone of differing abilities can read this. I believe as a state agency you must follow ADA laws.

For the able bodied, you can't even search and find in the PDF. If you posted this in good faith and expect people to provide detailed comments, they should be able to search the many documents. Very few people do this as their main job - I do not - and I have limited time to go through the documents.

Cheers,

Ramtin

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0326 Ramtin Rahmani

**Comment:** A report was just released that the greatest portion of super commuters are those who take public transit. A Super Commuter is someone who spends 90 minutes or more in one direction commuting. This project makes bus times longer. We know that all incomes and types of people in Portland take public transit but lower income community members predominantly rely on public transit to get around. This project goes directly against ODOT's state goal of preventing their past wrongs in Albina area.

Governor Kate Brown has reaffirmed the need for climate action and for Oregon to lead the way. This project only serves emission spewing vehicles. Even the "bread crumbs" meant to placate the community such as freeway lids will not benefit anyone. The project forces pedestrians and bike users to fight for ROW while an extraordinary amount of surface street space is devoted to vehicles. One one road, 20 ft is devoted to bicyclists and pedestrians while



car users get 2 turn lanes, and 2 through lanes. Over 50ft for vehicles and scraps for pedestrians and bike users to fight over? Why does ODOT treat everyone not in a car as a second class citizen? This is directly against the City of Portland climate goals and their transportation system plan. The width of the bike lanes would actually decrease on Williams after this project. The surface street improvements are a wash at best, and at worst make it less safe for vulnerable road users. I urge you to reject this project and spend \$500 million in Region 1 building sidewalks for everyone or making ODOT owned roads safer for vulnerable road users. This is a poor use of \$500 million. There have been no deaths on this stretch of highway in 10 years but people are dying on ODOT owned surface streets in Region 1. This is an unjust and inequitable distribution of money.

Reject this Project, Select No Build, and Demand a full Environmental Impact Study.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0326 Ramtin Rahmani 2

**Comment:** I am firmly opposed to this freeway expansion. I live in Tigard, Oregon. I am a suburban resident opposed to this project. I rely on my car but can see why driving, car infrastructure, and emissions are hurting all of us both acutely and chronically.

ODOT has acted in bad faith in releasing an environmental assessment that lacked full information. The comment period should be extended and the federal authority reviewing these replies should deny ODOT the authority to move forward. How can ODOT argue it is acting in good faith when it failed to release all the data. On Day 1 of the Comment Period, ODOT released the EA in a non-ADA accessible format and only fixed it at the request of the public. However, they again failed to extend the Comment Period to accommodate their failure.

After pleading, calling, and multiple requests by many organizations, community members, and more, ODOT continued to act in bad faith and refused to release all the data associated with the Environmental Assessment. I am not referencing additional data, but the basic figures and data listed in the appendices uploaded. They were missing! At a public hearing, Commissioner Eudaly, a City of Portland elected official, promised that ODOT will release the information. ODOT never formally apologized, nor did it ever intend to fix its errors were it not for Commissioner Eudaly.

Then, a community member requested the technical drawings for this project to which ODOT replied they do not exist. However, a few weeks later, after Commissioner Eudaly forced ODOT to release all information, it was revealed that the technical drawings do exist and were available to send. ODOT has continued to act in bad faith, against the guidance of NEPA. I recommend you reject the EA and force a full EIS or an outright rejection of this project. Select No Build.

How are we supposed to evaluate this project if the Agency does not provide all information for analysis? I showed my work in math class and ODOT should too. It shouldn't take lawyers and



public officials to force ODOT to provide information. On this basis alone, the project should be rejected.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0326 Ramtin Rahmani 3

**Comment:** I am firmly opposed to this freeway expansion. Regardless of what ODOT, elected officials, or project managers attempt to sell, the ROW for car travel is expanding on the freeway and on the surface streets. This goes directly against the City of Portland's Vision Zero goals. There are many issues with this freeway expansion so let's start with the first:

Oregon Department of Transportation acknowledges that I-5 destroyed African American neighborhoods in the past and that it was a poor decision. They wrote this in the Environmental Assessment. They said that this project will help "alleviate" this; however, the Albina Vision Trust, the neighborhood communities, the Parent Association of Harriet Tubman, Portland Public School Board, and others are all against this project. What kind of community engagement has ODOT done if everyone has told them "no thanks". but they have only heard "yes"

It is revolting for you, ODOT employees and leadership, PBOT leadership, and Commissioner Eudaly, to say that this project heals the wounds the State of Oregon and City of Portland have caused. This project places a highway directly in the backyard of Harriet Tubman Middle School, a school with a very high minority rate and a high rate of lower income families. I was fortunate enough to go to a school with a large campus to play and grow. I cannot imagine, as a child, being denied the opportunity to go outside because of the air quality and this project will only make it worse. Recess was serene. We ran in the woods, watched the birds, and played on the playground. How can ODOT say this improves any aspect of a child's education at Harriet Tubman education? This will actively contribute to asthma and other lung issues for children at Harriet Tubman. The Department also acknowledged they did not study or model air quality at the school itself.

What will happen long term to residents health? We need a full Environmental Impact Study to understand how this highway is currently negatively affecting residents and how this expansion will make it worse. It is well established that car emissions have acute and chronic negative impacts on human health. This project helps no one living near the project. It only serves to move vehicles through this area faster to the detriment of its residents.

My family relies on cars, but they see why cars destroy. The car is a tool because we have no other option. My mother is in her late 50s and has told me she wishes she had safe streets so she could bike to friends and the grocery store. Every time I go outside on my bike, she says a prayer that I don't get hit and worries until I come home. Given the transportation hierarchy, does ODOT truly believe this is the best use of \$500 million? My grandpa feels like a burden on my family because he cannot drive. His freedom is gone. He is reliant on me or my mother to take him to the places he wants to go. We are happy to do it, but why should someone lose their



independence because they cannot drive? ODOT should fund safer streets led by NACTO designs and Vision Zero principles. The surface street changes ODOT is proposing to the Rose Quarter area do none of this. They are intended to placate the community while ODOT chases its tail endlessly expanding freeways and claiming victory. 500 million dollars could expand transit in the Metro area so my grandfather doesn't have to feel like a burden and so he can regain his independence. 500 million could build hundreds of miles of sidewalks so our children and elderly can walk safely. 500 million could build hundreds of miles of safe biking infrastructure so my mother can comfortably ride instead of drive; she is currently too afraid. Instead, we are spending half a billion dollars on a short sighted project that solves a nonexistent issue and caters to vehicles.

ODOT has termed this to be "bottleneck relief". But by design, these bottlenecks are never ending. When one area is "relieved" of the congestion, it only shifts to the next area, making this a never ending task. When will we stop expanding our highways and acknowledge that this will not work? There will always be a bottle neck to chase. We are running after our tails.

A highway expansion has never solved congestion. Why did this study not include induced demand in its model? Why did this study no include the federally approved congestion pricing in its model? Why did ODOT refuse to provide the community with the full Environmental Assessment until forced to by elected city leaders? Reject this project, select No Build, and lastly, demand a full Environmental Impact Study.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Ramtin Rahmani

**Comment:** ODOT has presented arguments in bad faith during the enticement Comment Period, during public testimony, and in presenting the Environmental Assessment. Joe Cortright and other members of the community found that this project models assume the completion of the Columbia River Crossing "a new I 5 bridge across the Columbia between Vancouver and Portland".

Why did ODOT in its model assume the bridge is built; however, consistently has said it did not need to include congestion pricing in its model? The federal authority has already provided the go-ahead for ODOT to study congestion pricing towards implementation. There is currently no plan for the CRC yet it was included, but congestion pricing, which has a concrete plan, was not. This is not a fair presentation of the data, and I am requesting a full Environmental Impact Assessment which includes ODOT led congestion pricing, Oregon Metro Council cordon pricing, the full expansion of the SW Corridor MAX transit, and induced man. On the last point, ODOT included a nonexistent bridge and nonexistent plans for a bridge, but failed to include a bedrock of transportation modeling: induced demand. This is a failure of accurately presenting information to the public and is made in bad faith. It reads as a biased presentation not a neutral assessment.

To The Columbian, ODOT said that the CRC expansion isn't present in the model. To OPB, they said it is included. ODOT is lying to one of these newspapers. Why is it giving different



information to different news organizations? This goes to reaffirm the bad faith presentation of information by ODOT. I am requesting a rejection of this project-No Build- and a full EIS.

<https://www.columbian.com/news/2019/mar/25/500-million-odot-plan-addresses-rose-quarter-bottleneck-issue/>

<https://www.opb.org/news/article/odot-used-long-dead-i-5-bridge-replacement-to-plan-rose-quarter-upgrade/>

The City of Portland and ODOT a few decades ago agreed that I-5 should be moved eastward. Why wasn't that studied as part of the various build option? What is I-405 and I5 was removed and I-205 was renamed as I-5. If ODOT can reason that the model should include throughput based on the construction of a nonexistent bridge, the CRC, then it should fully examine all options including closing this section of I5.

Lastly, this project will destroy the serenity of the Eastbank Esplanade. It is already loud being adjacent to a freeway, but having a ramp go over the Esplanade will make this Portland treasure unbearable. Please do not ruin our parks. I walk across the Darlene Hooley bridge weekly. It goes across 14 car lanes. It is horrendously loud. This project will ruin the Eastbank Esplanade, and create a ped/bike bridge that no one wants. A 10% incline over lanes and lanes of vehicles is not pleasant. This project only serves vehicle and I urge you to reject it, select No Build, and demand a full EIS.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0402 Ramtin Rahmani

**Comment:** I recently learned, as of last week, that this freeway expansion will also partially cover the Eastbank Esplanade. This information was not volunteer by Oregon DOT, but came to light due to the threat of FOIA by two community members who then asked a local business to model the expansion over the esplanade. The Esplanade is a treasured community resource. Not only would this resource be temporarily impacted during the construction period, it would be permanently altered due to the expansion. Resources like these, completely motor vehicle free facilities, are the only places my family feels comfortable enough to ride bicycles. We also have so few of these facilities available to us. This project would significantly damage the value of this community resource. There are other portions of the trail alongside the Eastside of the river that have the highway going overhead--they are horrendously loud and uncomfortable to walk under. This freeway expansion would hurt our public park more than the currently-present highways have already done. Please conduct a full EIS so we can know how our people, natural resources, and more will be affected by this freeway widening. This study does not adequately address how people not in cars will be affected by this freeway expansion project.

Active Transportation goes hand in hand with reducing serious and fatal injuries on our streets--a topic ODOT is supposed to be focusing on. All projects should make walking, biking, and public transit more appealing, not less. This project seems to only cater to motor vehicles drivers. Please study how the various arms of this project will alter all modes of transportation, not just motor vehicle movement.



**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Randall Taylor

**Comment:** I'm writing to oppose the Rose Quarter freeway expansion project. At this time, Portland needs more investment in clean-energy transportation infrastructure, and resources should not be funneled toward expanding freeways that contribute to climate change and environmental damage, including air pollution. This project will not improve congestion, will negatively impact the Portland community, and is widely opposed by Portlanders. I strongly oppose this expansion.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0304 Randall Webb

**Comment:** We must take global climate change seriously, and this means ending our heretofore endless support for fossil fueled vehicles and focusing on public transportation and electric cars.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0313 Ray Anderson

**Comment:** I oppose the I5 Rose Quarter freeway expansion, or any freeway expansion for that matter. More cars and more freeway is not what Portland, or the world, needs. It is laughable to think that less than 2 miles of an extra lane in that area will make any difference, and practically criminal to think that even if it did make a short term difference it would be worth \$500,000,000 (and inevitably much more). Urban density problems, and especially climate change, are NEVER going to be solved by more cars. And Portland has a real advantage here. For such a active, vibrant and interesting city, Portland is very small. Alternative environmentally sustainable transportation is a real viable option, not just a dream. Please invest in the future, and not in perpetuating the mistakes of the past.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0325 Ray Atkinson

**Comment:** 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.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0315 Raymond Piccolotti

**Comment:** Hello,

I how else to submit my comment, if there is a better contact please forward it to me.

I am a home owner in Portland - 7005 NE Oregon St, Portland, OR 97213.

I am strongly opposed to the proposed freeway widening project.

Thank you for taking the time to ready this.

Raymond Piccolotti

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0226 Rebecca Canright

**Comment:** Hi there,

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

Sincerely,

Rebecca Canright

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0330 Rebecca Canright

**Comment:** As a lover of the outdoors, and a young person, I respectfully ask for a full Environmental Impact Statement on this freeway expansion project. I am worried that ODOT's truncated Environmental Assessment document simply isn't focused enough on the significant impacts to health and public safety this project represents. I hope we can instead more fully study alternatives (including decongestion pricing!) to this expansion with a full Environmental Impact Statement.

Thanks so much,

Rebecca



**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0402 Rebecca Matsumoto

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

I strongly oppose the proposed freeway expansion. Making more lanes of traffic encourages more people to drive, thereby creating more carbon emissions at a time when our survival depends on us cutting our carbon emissions in half within the next 11 years. I am deeply horrified by the toll climate change is taking on humans and animals. It is not just a couple of species in jeopardy but, 50-75% of the animals on earth. And humans are suffering from climate change-fueled water shortages, floods, wildfires and more. Increasing the number of cars on the road has a direct impact on climate change.

I spent two years living in Japan, and in that country it was rare for someone to own a car. What we need are transportation solutions that make public transportation more convenient, expedient, widespread and accessible.

I suggest:

1. Expanding the reach of public transit lines to make more destinations accessible.
2. Rather than an extra lane, a carpool lane that actually encourages people to carpool.
3. Express buses and light rail routes that can take people from one hub to another without making a lot of stops in between.
4. Improved parking and access to MAX stations. The parking lot for my closest MAX station is full by 8 am, and others have extremely tight spaces and highly punitive parking fees.
5. If something could be done to increase the number of MAX trains running during busy times, that could make a more pleasant riding experience.

In conclusion, our transportation choices are irrevocably affecting the livability of our planet. Our carbon emissions affect our forests, our recreation, our fishing, our agriculture, and the ability of our children, elderly, and outdoor workers to avoid harm from dangerous weather. Nearly half (40%) of Oregon's greenhouse gas emissions come from transportation. Any option that increases driving is completely unacceptable.

As a preschool teacher and nurturer of children, I realize that with only 11 years to change our pollution habits, the children I teach now will be turning 16 when it becomes too late to reduce carbon emissions to a survivable level. Will our addiction to driving condemn these innocents to a planet in turmoil?

I implore you to find a better way.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Matsumoto



Lead Pre-K Teacher

Beaverton, Oregon 97006

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0326 Rebecca Rosenfelt

**Comment:** I live in an adjacent neighborhood and am strongly opposed to the freeway expansion of I-5. It will not help solve traffic problems, and it increases pollution in Portland, which is the last thing we need. We need to be progressive and focus on alternative forms of transit, and sinking this much money into a freeway is moving in the exact wrong direction.

Rebecca

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Rebecca Rowhm

**Comment:** I oppose the plan to expand the freeway in Portland. I have lived all over the country with varying levels of congestion. It has been my experience that more freeways do not mean better traffic flow. Toll roads do not reduce traffic congestion. That only spreads out the congestion and pushes it out into residential neighborhoods. It also increases the cost of commuting for low income residents.

There are other solutions that we can work towards. We need to get cars OFF the road. That alone will greatly improve congestion.

Spend the money building more MAX lines that reach more neighborhoods (especially those in areas greatly underserved by light rail).

The state could incentivize local employers to allow telecommuting. Less cars = less traffic.

An expanded freeway will not solve our problems. It is the same as buying a bigger house because you need more space. Eventually you fill that space with more stuff and your problem resurfaces. It is a never ending cycle.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 Rebecca Small

**Comment:** Good afternoon. My name is Rebecca Small. I am from Portland, Oregon, and my opinions are my own. I am deeply concerned about the inadequacy of this EA. How can so many words say so little. There's a number of topics in here I could go into on detail on a lot of them, but I particularly care about safety so I'll just focus on that. The project states that the



overall project purpose is to improve safety and operations and I-5 in the vicinity of the Broadway/Weidler change, and I am extremely concerned that a project of this complexity, the safety analysis leaves so much to be desired. In part two slows east through this high traffic area, the vast majority of these collisions do not result in serious injury or fatal crashes. The main document does not discuss fatal and serious crashes, nor does it provide an analysis of the factors that contribute to these crashes. Any mention of the most serious safety concerns for the entire project area are buried deep in one of the six appendices to an appendix. Fatal and serious crashes are the most important crashes to examine if we're sincerely interested in improving safety on I-5 as the EA states. But ODOT presents no separate analysis of these crashes. ODOT's crash analysis shows a single fatality in the five-year look-back period from 2015 to 2011. I pulled up these records and found that if they look back a little bit further to 2007, and found that there have been a total of four fatalities in those years. And three out of four of those deaths were pedestrians. The leading cause of death in the study area has not been adequately addressed or investigated. What were pedestrians doing on the freeway? How did they get there? And in what ways will the proposed expansion prevent this kind of fatal crash from happening again in the future? It's not mentioned, let alone discussed. Without a clear assessment of the fatal and serious crashes and their contributing factors, there's nothing in this EA to show how the proposed Rose Quarter widening will mitigate the existing safety hazards. The crash reports on the most serious crashes you have suggest a different kind of problem in this area altogether that's not even addressed.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Rebecca Spain

**Comment:** Please reconsider widening the I five highway at the Rose quarter. Why didn't highways simply leads to more congestion. I advocate trying easily implemented and easily reversed if necessary actions like a congestion charge to see if those can be effective. Also investing in public transit and alternative transit like bicycles is an excellent way to reduce traffic.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely, Rebecca Spain Southeast Portland

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Rebekah Loughlin

**Comment:** I do not support this project. We are at a point where we need to act NOW on climate change. We should be investing in transit and ped/bike facilities and not more fossil fuel infrastructure.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0331 Rebekah Loughlin

**Comment:** We should be investing in transit and ped/bike facilities and not more fossil fuel infrastructure.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Reece Nitschke

**Comment:** I moved to Portland from Australia at the beginning of 2018. I am 30 years of age and have a 4 year old son. Since moving to Portland I have still have not found the need to own a vehicle. My son and I have used Portlands amazing biking network and amazing public transportation system. The thought of Portland investing in the expansion of roads and highways seems counter intuitive. This cities identity should be build on progress and challenging the status quo. Inspiring people to think progressively.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0313 Reed Buterbaugh

**Comment:** Hello,

My name is Reed Buterbaugh, I live at 4729 N Willis Blvd in Portland.

I object to this highway expansion. ODOT has not been honest with the public about its environmental impact. There has never been a highway expansion project that solves congestion. ODOT should implement decongestion pricing which would force polluters to pay their fair share and cut down on the harmful emissions that currently blanket the neighborhood.

We have 12 years to dramatically cut down on our carbon emissions, expanding a highway is the equivalent of going to an all-you-can-eat buffet the day before a weigh in where you're overdue to lose 10 pounds.

Thank you,

Reed

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0313 Reed Buterbaugh

**Comment:** ODOT should implement decongestion pricing which would force polluters to pay their fair share and cut down on the harmful emissions that currently blanket the neighborhood.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0314 Reed Parsons

**Comment:** Having grown up in San Francisco and San Diego and watched major road expansions do nothing to alleviate traffic. I must add my voice in objection to the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion. The money set aside by HB 2017 can be much better used to increase public transportation, and road repair.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Regina Tricamo

**Comment:** I strongly oppose this freeway expansion. There is abundant evidence that widening freeways does not help traffic. Why on earth would we spend this kind of money on a project that won't do what it is purported to do?

There are so many other reasons that I oppose this plan as well. I have deep concern for the worsened air quality which will affect communities of color disproportionately. And I can not understand why this kind of money would be invested in a mode of transportation that we are going to have to render near obsolete in the near future if our planet is to survive. Please, improve the public transit that I take daily. Make it safer for me and my fellow residents to walk and bike more places. THOSE are goals to focus on.

Thank. I hope you take these comments into account.

Regina Tricamo

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Reid Blomquist

**Comment:** This strategy seems wholly preposterous and deceitful. We need fewer cars not more. Please implement congestion pricing and higher taxes on vehicle as well as promoting carpooling and making it easier (fiscally or otherwise) for people to reduce their impact on our environment. This money could go to so many better things - like expanding max lines, bus routes, implementing more (and safer) bike infrastructure... the list goes on. Don't need it, don't want it.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Ren Stein

**Comment:** I take the bus. I bike. I want more bike routes and bus lines and better, more comprehensive MAX routes. High way expansion means more cars, means Portland becomes more dangerous to bikers. Where are people gonna park all these dang cars? We're building so many new expensive apartment buildings but nowhere to park anyone's cars. Let Portland lean



into being the great walking/biking/pub transit city it is. Build another bridge to Washington. Build more protected bike lanes. No high way expansion!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0330 Rene Pyatt

**Comment:** I'm a native Oregonian who has lived in the Willamette Valley for more than 40 years. I've traveled the world and there is no place else quote like Oregon. We were once a leader in for environmental agency. I remember Smokey Bear and The Bottle Bill and Woodsy Owl. We taught our children and our new comers about becoming stewards of our neighborhoods and forests. What we are living with now is a result of our past actions.

Let's keep our priorities, and while we welcome new comers, let's save what makes Oregon a paradise. Investing dollars in expansion of our current transportation grid is short-sited and not in alignment with what being an Oregonian means. We want clean air and water, more bike and walking paths, more frequent and accessible public transportation, and less suburban sprawl. We do not want more freeways.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0402 Renee M Jankord

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

Regarding the proposed expansion of the I-5 Rose Quarter expansion, I have several concerns.

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. As a Portland Resident living in East Portland, I can attest to this. Many of our communities don't have sidewalks. Roads have more potholes than roads. I live on SE 132nd which doesn't even have a road between Bush and Powell - Powell is a major artery and there is no way to access it from the road I live on.

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.

In addition, there are MANY other things that ODOT should work on like retrofitting bridges so the city isn't completely divided when "the" earthquake hits.

Sincerely,

Renee M Jankord

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Rev Robyn Hartwig

**Comment:** I strongly urge you not to expand the highway. This is the wrong solution to a serious problem. Expanding the highway will exacerbate injustice, harm the most vulnerable, increase carbon emissions when we desperately need to reduce them. Please insist upon a full environmental impact study which will demonstrate that this is true.

We need to be incentivizing people to get out of their cars through decongestion pricing, not expanding freeways to encourage them to drive, pollute, and waste time. Please invest in renewable energy infrastructure and financial incentives that get people out of their cars and into healthy means of transportation for them, our community and the planet.

Thank you!

Rev. Robyn Hartwig

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Rhett Lawrence Doug Moore Nicholas Caleb Meredith Connolly

*Sierra Club; Oregon League of Conservation Voters; Center for Sustainable Economy, Climate Solutions*

**Comment:** Note, see Attachment -----From: Rhett Lawrence, Conservation Director, Oregon Chapter, Sierra Club; Doug Moore, Executive Director, Oregon League of Conservation Voters; Nicholas Caleb, J.D., LL.M. Staff Attorney - Climate Justice Program, Center for Sustainable Economy; Meredith Connolly, Oregon Director, Climate Solutions

Subject: Public Comment on I-5 Rose Quarter Freeway Project: Request for Congestion Pricing Study and Implementation on I-5 Rose Quarter before Proceeding with Freeway Expansion



Our organizations wish to thank the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) for the opportunity to provide public comment on the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project. Our organizations worked diligently with state legislators and advocates to pass House Bill 2017, which allocated funding for this proposed project. HB 2017 was a transformative, bipartisan legislative victory for investment in

transportation infrastructure across the state, directing over \$5.3 billion in funding. Our organizations are proud of our role in the passage of this bill - HB 2017 is directing hundreds of millions of dollars to fund a substantial increase in the provision of public transportation across the state, new revenue to build safe routes to school, incentives

for electric vehicles, and bike/pedestrian infrastructure in cities across Oregon. These investments are crucial to Oregon's commitment to providing congestion relief to commuters stuck in traffic, decarbonizing our state's economy, fulfilling our statewide land use planning goals, and reducing air pollution. We find it gratifying to watch the numerous components of the Keep Oregon Moving legislation move forward, and our

organizations share a sense of ownership and obligation in ensuring these projects and proposals are thoughtfully implemented through meaningful public engagement to

ensure the intent of the transportation bill is realized in our community.

Value Pricing a Core Component of the HB 2017 Legislation Among the key components of the HB 2017 bill that our organizations prioritized in our advocacy was the inclusion of policy language asking ODOT to move forward with the study and implementation of value pricing in the Portland Metro Region. Value Pricing, (also known as Congestion Pricing or Decongestion Pricing), is a cost-effective, innovative, and demonstrably powerful policy mechanism that is now available at our disposal to manage traffic on our state's busy roads. Dr. Alex Bigazzi, a professor at the

University of British Columbia, recently concluded after an exhaustive review of sixty different peer-reviewed studies on the subject that road pricing is the most effective

strategy to reduce emissions (both air pollution and carbon pollution) and traffic.<sup>1</sup> With HB 2017, the Oregon Legislature directed ODOT to move forward with a study to determine the efficacy and value of establishing Value Pricing on stretches of I-5 and I-205 through the Portland Metropolitan Area. ODOT's Value Pricing Stakeholder Advisory Committee concluded in the Spring of 2018, and the agency received federal approval this past December to move forward with implementation of value pricing on stretches of I-205 and I-5, including the entire stretch of the Rose Quarter Freeway on which ODOT is proposing this \$500 million expansion. Studies commissioned by ODOT during the Value Pricing process affirmed what we already knew; congestion pricing is very effective at reducing carbon emissions, reducing traffic congestion, and reducing local air pollution, and it would have a substantial positive impact on traffic if implemented on any stretch of I-5 (all scenarios that included value pricing implemented on I-5 included this stretch of the Rose Quarter Freeway from I-84 to I-405).<sup>2</sup> Our organizations also recognize the potential regressive impacts of value



1. Can traffic management strategies improve urban air quality? A review of the evidence "AY Bigazzi, M Rouleau Journal of Transport & Health 7, 111-124

2 Baseline, significant congestion will exist in 2027 on the I-5 and I-205 study corridors, even with all the improvements...This congestion impacts not only speed, but also the number of vehicles that the facility

can accommodate, with consequential impacts upon quality of life, economic vitality, and vehicle emissions in the region. This quote is from the Portland Metro Area Value Pricing Feasibility Analysis:

pricing if implemented poorly; we encourage ODOT to continue to reach out to frontline populations to ensure value pricing provides mobility and public health benefits for working class and marginalized communities across the Portland region. Concern that Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion Traffic Modeling Does not Include Significant Impacts Value Pricing Implementation will have on Traffic Given the bipartisan support for value pricing, the overwhelming academic literature suggesting its efficacy as a policy mechanism and ODOT's own research suggesting the applicability of this policy initiative to this specific stretch of freeway, we were surprised to learn that ODOT's traffic modeling for the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion were conducted without any consideration as to how congestion pricing would impact these projections. ODOT appears to be moving forward with the next steps of value pricing implementation in foreseeable future. We therefore question the validity of the traffic projections that ODOT is using to justify the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion, given that the EA document projects traffic volumes out to 2045 and does not consider the substantial impacts that value pricing is likely to have on this project.

Its difficult to understand how ODOT can be certain about the accuracy of these traffic projections and this proposed expansion's impact on travel times over the next 25 years without factoring in a forthcoming policy initiative likely to dramatically impact travel patterns. Our organizations would also ask ODOT why the Environmental Assessment project didnt study the impact that value pricing would have on traffic through this corridor if implemented first, without any freeway expansion or auxiliary lanes.

#### Efficacy of Value Pricing to Reduce Transportation Related Carbon Emissions

Round 1 Concept Evaluation and Recommendations Technical Memorandum #3 produced for the Value

Pricing Stakeholder Advisory Committee. The document is available here:

[https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Value%20Pricing%20PAC/VP\\_TM3-Final-InitialConceptEvaluation.pdf](https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Value%20Pricing%20PAC/VP_TM3-Final-InitialConceptEvaluation.pdf)

Meanwhile, in the nearly two years since House Bill 2017 was signed, the international consensus has coalesced around a finding that our planet must lower greenhouse gas emissions to 45% of the 2010 levels in the next eleven years to limit warming to 1.5C. This urgent warning stems from the IPCC report released last October, and this call to action to expedite decarbonization initiatives are growing in



strength locally, nationally, and internationally. Our communities across the state of Oregon have experienced first hand a mere taste of what this new normal might mean - more wildfires, floods, heat waves, water shortages. To quote The Oregonian, The effects of climate change are no longer predicted. They are here today, they are serious, and they are costing Oregonians money and affecting their lifestyles and health. The state is suffering through drought, reduced snowpack, increased wildfire and impacts to fisheries. Larger forest and grassland fires are now more frequent, a consequence of warmer, drier summers. The

fire season begins earlier and ends later. That article goes on to acknowledge that The main culprit is transportation emissions, primarily from trucks and passenger vehicles.

This sector is the largest source of emissions in Oregon, accounting for nearly 40 percent of the total. There are three main ways to lower those emissions: Boost the conversion rate to electric vehicles; substantially increase public transit; and modify urban design over time to support electric vehicles, bikes, walking and public transport.

3 Even with passage of pending Clean Energy Jobs legislation in Salem, Oregon simply wont hit carbon reduction targets without fundamentally reducing emissions from

private automobiles. Value Pricing Implementation Must Be Studied Before Freeway Expansion Given ODOT's own findings that Value Pricing was likely to be more effective in both reducing traffic congestion and traffic-related carbon emissions, it seems self-evident that this policy should be implemented before freeway expansion is

3 With emissions on the rise, Oregon falls well short of greenhouse gas reduction goals The Oregonian, December 15 2018.

[https://www.oregonlive.com/politics/2018/12/with\\_emissions\\_on\\_the\\_rise\\_ore.html](https://www.oregonlive.com/politics/2018/12/with_emissions_on_the_rise_ore.html)

undertaken. We believe that the current Environmental Assessment is inadequate in its lack of analysis of this cost-effective, climate-friendly, demonstrably proven policy alternative included in the bipartisan statewide transportation package. We ask that ODOT undertake a more rigorous Environmental Impact Statement to study the impact that implementation of value pricing could have on carbon emissions, air pollution and traffic congestion before moving forward with plans to expand the Rose Quarter Freeway. This position is wholly consistent with our years of advocacy and engagement

with the state legislature to pass HB 2017 - implementation of value pricing should inform how ODOT moves forward with the Rose Quarter. There are simply too many significant impacts to the local community to not prioritize studying value pricing and understanding its impacts to traffic patterns before moving forward with a \$500 million freeway expansion.

**Attachments:** [2019 0401 Rhett Lawrence Doug Moore Nicholas Caleb Meredith Connolly ATT](#)

## 2019 0401 Rich and Betsy Reese

**Comment:** We disagree with the methodology used, the interpretation and stated implications of findings, the accuracy of findings, and the accuracy of stated facts in multiple parts of the Environmental



Assessment of the Rose Quarter Improvement Plan. Additionally, we find that the EA omits some essential assessment data entirely. In principle, we are not fans of freeway expansion. We share most of the views of those who are opposed to this entire project. Nevertheless, because this project promised to revitalize the Albina/Rose Quarter neighborhood, we have supported it. Our support has gone to the extent of participating in discussions in 2011-12 about entering into a "land-swap" agreement with the City and State that would reconfigure a parcel of land that we have owned for over 20 years through which public ROW acquisition is integral to the project. We do continue to have some hope for this project, but only if significant modifications are made in the design, and a complete Environmental Impact Statement is done that will truly address mitigation of the many adverse environmental impacts of the current plan. As a dramatically affected private property owner, we cooperated with the ROW acquisition of our property because we were led to believe the following:

1. That the reason this area, which is so important to Portland, due to both its wealth of underdeveloped close-in land and its history of successive demolitions and displacements of the African American community that once thrived here, has remained moribund for decades is because no one could agree on what to do about the freeway. We were told that the revitalization and restitution finally could begin with acceptance of the N/NE Quadrant / I-5 Rose Quarter Plan, which was developed over a period of two years by community stakeholders and an ODOT/PBOT partnership. In 2012 that plan was formally approved by City Council, the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, and the Oregon Transportation Commission. The funding in 2017 of the transportation portion of that plan, referred to here as the Rose Quarter Improvement Project, was to be the first step in this revitalization and restitution.
2. That creating a new bicycle and pedestrian ROW through our parking lot connecting Hancock and Dixon Streets was the solution to the notoriously dangerous Broadway/Flint/Wheeler intersection. In addition, two new MUPS, Multi-Use Paths, would be created on ODOT property to maintain the Flint Ave. route for bicyclists and pedestrians.
3. That we would be made whole with land, not money. Land equivalent to that taken from northwest end of our parcel for the new ROW was to be added onto the east side, leaving us with piece of land that had all the characteristics, including, size, shape, access, grade, etc., that would have had as good or better development potential as that which we would have without the taking. This new land would come from the Flint Ave. ROW which was being vacated, or removed, as part of the plan. This is important to us as we want to have a hand in making sure that our property is put to its highest and best use contributing to neighborhood revitalization, such as that described by the Albina Vision Trust.
4. That the areas in front of the Paramount Apartments and the Grandma's Daycare property on the north side of Broadway, would be joined and made contiguous by the vacated Flint ROW. This would create a public space described as "a broad pedestrian plaza", "the center of place in placemaking" of the newly revitalized area. The 1923 Paramount Apartments on the north side of Broadway and the 1923 Left Bank Building on the south side, two of the only 10% of structures still standing of the African American architectural heritage of this community, would be "the twin bookends to this center of place". This plaza would be designated as the 'African American Neighborhood Memorial Plaza, commemorating the neighborhood that was destroyed here.' This plaza would be marked as a testament and reminder so that Portland residents and visitors would not forget this negative chapter in our



city's history. The Environmental Assessment of the current RQIP plan shows a negative alteration or entire omission of all four of these improvements benefiting us and the people of Portland. Additionally, the RQIP deviates dramatically from many other carefully considered concepts and details of N/NE Quadrant / I-5 Rose Quarter Plan. I focus here on two areas: A. Coordination with appropriate land use planning, and B. Development of improved active transportation routes and infrastructure. A few examples: A.a. Protecting existing land use: The EA methodology does not adequately measure the impacts or propose sufficient mitigation required to protect existing land uses. For example, neither the historic Paramount Apartments nor the Harriet Tubman School received a sufficiently detailed analysis and acceptable mitigation plan for both short and long term negative environmental impacts of noise, air pollution, vibration, architectural heritage, social and economic equity and justice, etc. For example, the EA describes how Sound Wall 5 was determined not to be economically warranted during the construction period. The methodology used noise sensors placed inside the Compass Oncology Building located west of the Paramount Apartments. The findings showed that that building would be adequately shielded from the freeway construction noise by the "fourstory apartment building" between it and freeway, therefore the sound wall would not produce significant added noise attenuation for the oncology clinic. The methodology should have placed sound sensors inside the Paramount Apartments, instead of merely considering the Paramount Apartments as a sound wall shielding the oncology clinic. Furthermore, the EA fails to even get the number of stories of the Paramount Apartments correct, let alone do any kind of inspections, testing, etc. for impacts on this soon-to-be-100-year-old historic building that is home to over 80 people. No specific mention is made of adverse health effects or displacement of tenants due to noise, air, vibration, transportation, parking removal, the creation of a new busy street on the north side of the building, etc. during the 5-year construction period, nor of the long-term environmental impacts of these changes. A.b. Supporting future land use development: EA methodology fails to assess the project's impact on future land use development in the project area, nor propose mitigation of those

impacts. For example, the property fragment that will be left to Paramount Parking is rendered inaccessible from the new Hancock/Dixon St. and from its historic access point off Wheeler. The proposed new access to this fragment runs on Flint, the ROW that was to be removed and dedicated to the memorial pedestrian plaza described in #4 above, thus making that plaza impossible. Additionally, Paramount Parking is inaccurately labeled in the EA as "parking for the residents of the Paramount Apartments", when in fact it is independently owned and fully leased to multiple business tenants serving the neighborhood. The RQIP shows the entire Grandma's Daycare property being taken for new public ROW in order to create an ADA-compliant switchback MUP that will be unappealing to both pedestrian and bicyclists. This taking and paving over of land for public ROW eliminates the opportunity for private, public, or non-profit investors to develop their properties to their highest and best use and to contribute to the creation of a thriving new housing and business development at the gateway of the newly revitalized Albina neighborhood.

The RQIP has failed to design freeway lids or covers that are strong enough to create new buildable land that will help knit the Albina neighborhood back together. The lids as currently



designed are ineffective at covering and healing the gash that has torn this neighborhood in two. They are destined to become unmaintained wastelands that will further divide this neighborhood and cut it off from surrounding areas. Project staff, state and city government, environmental assessment contractors, and the people of Portland must be reminded that these transportation improvements were conceptualized in tandem with land use planning for this area by the N/NE Quadrant - I-5 Broadway-Weidler Stakeholder Advisory Committee. These have been but a few examples that show land use being sacrificed for transportation ROW that favors motor vehicle through-traffic at the expense of creating a walkable, bikeable, transit-oriented, renewed neighborhood.

B. Creating safe, comfortable bicycle and pedestrian routes to and through this neighborhood: The EA narrative repeatedly states that the project creates better, safer, more comfortable connectivity for bikes and pedestrians. The data contradict those assertions.

A few examples:

The new Hancock-Dixon St. cutting through our property and promised to be the solution to avoiding the dangerous Broadway/Flint/Wheeler intersection, will now be just an auto thoroughfare. It will have sidewalks and painted bike lanes, but at a 10% grade, this route is now acknowledged by ODOT as being so unappealing to and unused by cyclists and pedestrians that they are no longer even indicating it on the maps they use when presenting active transportation infrastructure upgrades. The original 2012 plan showed two new MUPS that were to effectively replace Flint Ave. Running

on ODOT property connected by the new Hancock/Dixon lid over I-5, the new off-street bike/ped paths were to connect the stubbed-off Flint at Tillamook to Broadway west of I-5.

Of these two proper MUPS, one is completely missing, and the other is not a MUP, but what I call BS, Bikes on Sidewalk. BS is what engineers sometimes propose when they can't figure out what

to do with bikes. This one is an awkward and cramped 5%-grade switch-back that will pit pedestrians and bicyclists against each other, and that few cyclists will use more than once. So instead of a safer and more comfortable bicycle route to replace Flint from North Portland to the Broadway Bridge, it's, 'Nope. Sorry. It's the Vancouver/Broadway/I-5 Freeway intersection for you, bicycle riders.' Yes. The Vancouver route is what we are left with that most bicycle commuters will opt for. It includes a shift of the bike lane from the right side to the left side of the Vancouver, funneling cyclists into a "jug-handle" staging area for a right turn across Vancouver and the freeway offramps. The number of daily bike commuters on this route is the highest in the city. Especially at rush hour, they will have an uncomfortable and unsafe time switching across motor vehicle lanes and making that the 90-degree turn into the jug-handle, crossing over and avoiding cyclists on the through-bike-lane on Broadway, and lining up in the too-small staging area to wait for the light. We

were promised multiple routes that would be improvements over the right turn onto Broadway from Flint that we have now. What we got was only one viable route that is worse. Multiple issues with the RQIP make this area uncomfortable and unsafe for pedestrians. Just one



example is the shaved-off corners at multiple locations that were created to allow large trucks a more comfortable turn at the expense of shorter, more direct, and safer crossings for pedestrians. The plan was supposed to create a walkable neighborhood that would be safe and pleasant to

walk to, from, and through and that would support the current and future land use that that will revitalize the neighborhood. The current plan does not support that, and in many locations directly impedes that vision.

The environmental impacts to the Vera Katz Eastside Esplanade, both short and long-term, are unmitigated and intolerable. This city park and Federal Transportation Corridor cannot tolerate additional exposure to noise, air, and light-blocking from the I-5 freeway. It is an essential transportation route with no nearby detour and cannot tolerate the closures needed during the construction period and for ongoing maintenance which are described in the EA as being periodic

and of unknown frequency and duration. The Esplanade has been closed just twice since it opened 18 years ago, once for exceptionally high water in the Willamette that made the floating bridge joints dangerous, and just this year for extensive and badly needed maintenance. With the current proposal, we are concerned that closures will be more frequent and prolonged. In summary, we challenge the adequacy and accuracy of this Environmental Assessment . We recommend that issues described here, and other issues mentioned by others, be addressed with further design, and only then that an Environmental Impact Statement be done. Thank you for taking our testimony.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0228 Rich Franklin

**Comment:** Who decided to schedule the Public Open House at the Leftbank Annex on the same night as a Trail Blazers home game a block away when every parking lot in the area is charging for parking and traffic is at its worst? Or was that done purposely?

Rich Franklin

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Rich Prosert

**Comment:** Hi, my name is Rich, and I'm a Portland resident in SE.

I may have already submitted a comment, and if so, I apologize. I just need to make sure that my absolute shock that Portland is even considering this project is taken in writing. This is a freeway expansion (even if you deny that, it's true). You're spending a ton of money on fender-benders, while Portlanders using human-powered transit are getting hit and killed every month due to distracted drivers and poor road design. You're tearing out safety features and currently-



used human space on Weidler to make it easier to drive a car through Portland, and that's just unacceptable. And this is barely even a partial list of the things I object to!

It should be getting harder to drive a car in Portland, and everywhere, but you're trying to make it harder to do anything else!

I sincerely hope that you're going to block this plan, or that if you approve it, you're ready for the protests that come next.

-Rich Posert

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Richard Byron Gay

**Comment:** I object to the I5 Rose Quarter expansion. I demand a full environmental impact study and publicly-available report prior to any further steps are taken. I demand implementation of decongestion pricing over a period of 1 year or more before any further steps are taken. The community is against this freeway expansion, and ODOT has thus far not listened to the community to which it is beholden. This project represents \$500M of misspend funds which could find a much better object in terms of transportation improvement, outside of road expansion. ODOT has been disingenuous by hiding data and withholding information from the public within the public comment period and before. The city, state, nation, and world faces a climate catastrophe. Auto transport produces about 40% of carbon emissions in Oregon and we can't afford the contribution by growth of highways and personal vehicle transportation. This highway expansion promises an unacceptable public health threat from air pollution, toward the most vulnerable citizens. Highway congestion will not improve, as induced demand will negate any proposed gains from this construction.

Listen to the constituency, and do not build this highway expansion.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Richard Gorringe

**Comment:** ODOT's projections show a much bigger improvement in trip times from the Rose Quarter project than is actually warranted. The state should instead impose tolling in the Rose Quarter area, which would reduce congestion without the expense of building the freeway.

Richard Gorringe, Ph.D.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0329 Richard Johnson

**Comment:** Very little bang for the buck. The study shows very little change on commute times. "Morning commutes would still be roughly one minute longer through the area for southbound travelers in 2045 if the project is built. Afternoon commuters would see nearly two-minute savings, the report said.

Northbound commuters would see negligible time savings under most scenario."

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Richard McNeil

**Comment:** I oppose this project. It requires more thought and study.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0313 Richard Nunno

**Comment:** 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.

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.

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. As of Friday, March 8, ODOT still hasn't released numerous data sets and appendices that would allow our community groups to independently verify ODOT's assertions that this project would lower carbon emissions, improve air quality or lower traffic congestion. ODOT's strategy is to tell the public "trust us, this is good for the community", and isn't providing any of the materials available for us to double-check their dubious claims. Our coalition wrote a letter on March 4th asking for this information and we still haven't received it. How can ODOT claim to be providing meaningful public engagement with the project when they won't even make the data available for the public to review?

Opportunity Costs: Even \*if\* ODOT can manage to keep this project under \$500,000,000 (pretty unlikely, given the agency's track record), it's an enormously expensive undertaking whereas the revenues could be spent on a litany of other projects and needs across the region. \$500 million could build a lot of sidewalks in East Portland, bus rapid transit lines across town, or be a solid down payment towards the proposed underground light rail tunnel. And unlike a freeway



widening, all of those investments would be better for air quality, carbon emissions, public health, and congestion relief.

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

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

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0304 Richard Posert

**Comment:** I hope that ODOT sees reason and doesn't go through with the freeway expansion. Beyond the fact that making bigger freeways don't solve congestion (induced demand! look at LA!), this money could be used for so much smarter and greener solutions to congestion. What about buying more buses to increase service and making bus-only lanes? What about bike lanes, or better walkability in our city?

At a time when we need to be seriously cutting our carbon emissions as an entire planet, incentivizing driving is a short-sighted action that is deeply disappointing.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0226 Richard Weinhold

**Comment:** I worked in downtown Portland for 11 years (1987-1998). I commuted from Salem in a 4 passenger carpool and later a 15 passenger vanpool. You might say I've had a share in doing my part to reduce congestion, preserve air quality, and saved money too. This sort of ride sharing was my only option since there was no frequent commuter bus service that would have worked for my 9-5 schedule. I felt fortunate that the ride sharing options did.



I know that these kinds of options also operate from Clark Co, as well as frequent bus service.

I also know that I-5 is heavily used by trucks, since it is our major N-S west coast route, and that most of the truck traffic isn't Portland-originating. I also know that there are congestion problems on I-205, and travelers are directed that way as the preferred route to avoid Portland.

Knowing those realities, the next logical way to address the problem is to make the use of these important passage routes more efficient, and that means management of peak flows, and the simplest and least expensive way to do so is to implement congestion pricing and thereby reduce through traffic during peak times.

This is a far better alternative than spending \$500 million to increase peak time freeway traffic in north Portland that disrupts neighborhoods and enables additional air quality degradation.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0330 Richard Weinhold

**Comment:** Hello, I commuted to Portland from Salem for 11 years starting in the late 80s, and another 2 years to Lake Oswego from 1999. Fortunately I didn't have to cope with the bridge congestion to Vancouver, but of course I did experience the congestion from the south end and did my part to save sanity, save money, and reduce environmental impacts by being part of a carpool and later a vanpool. Therefore I am very familiar with some of the issues surrounding the proposed freeway expansion on the north end, especially the impact on community in terms of access/utilization and air quality.

Even then I felt that congestion pricing would have been a real help in combating the difficult daily journey. Carpool and transit lanes would make a big difference, and a pricing penalty for nonparticipants would make the road access fairer for all. Furthermore, restricting truck traffic, whether by pricing or outright prohibition would make a huge effect on traffic volume reduction and reducing air pollution from diesel exhausts. I recognize that transit doesn't work for everyone, since not everyone works in the downtown core or in an area well served by rapid transit options, but still transit is also a key part of the traffic solution. A Max-type connector that crosses the river and goes beyond (say to Ridgefield), and another branch should be constructed to the east side to connect with the Gresham line near the airport. Short range, though, the traffic reduction measures outlined above can be put in effect rapidly and at low cost while longer range solutions (such as Max) are designed and constructed.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0226 Richard Wood

**Comment:** It is more important that Mass transit, shared ride services and fossil fuel emissions harm should drive this conversation. Reducing traffic and not enabling poor behaviours seems a good goal.

Toll roads will not help, they will make some individuals rich while sacrificing poorer drivers ability to get around.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Rick

**Comment:** Dear ODOT,

Please do not build the I-5 Rose Quarter project. It will make a worse situation for public transit, nearby schools, walking, and biking. Freeways divide neighborhoods.

Rick

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Rick C

**Comment:** I support the I 5 rose quarter project

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0226 Rick Christman

**Comment:** yes I would like information sent to me about upcoming meetings and open houses about this issue about a guess the freeway expansion so if you could please get back to me that would be great with the dates times and locations of these upcoming meetings and open houses

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0000 Rick Kappler

*SW Trails Member*

**Comment:** ODOT says this I-5 blunder will make worse public transit. Their report said it will have a negative impact on public transit, which is critical to the environment. This project will remove a north/south overpass over I-5 which is a bad idea. Note that Seattle's I-5 "lid" will simply make a lid over I-5 instead of widening it.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0331 Rick Kappler

**Comment:** Do not make a bigger freeway. Just put a cap over the freeway and remove the weeds. simple as that.

rick kappler

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0226 rick rappaport

**Comment:** Every freeway expansion always claims a less traffic, less pollution future but the opposite always occurs. Einstein said doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results is insanity.

Not so much insanity, too many smart and wily people involved, more like money money money.

This is a failure waiting to happen and basically you're all just trying to come up with a way to sell this. Actually I'm ashamed that this has come this far.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0219 Rick Ray

**Comment:** Hello ODOT staff, We all know that Portland traffic has gotten worse. I drive the I-84 and I-5 interchange every week. However, freeway expansion will not solve our issues.

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

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.

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.

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.



Congestion 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.

Thank you,

Rick Ray

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0326 Rick Ray

**Comment:** 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 fair decongestion pricing, which will enormously impact how many people choose to drive on the corridor and greatly reduce congestion.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Rick Seufert

**Comment:** Every decision we make going forward needs to be informed by what we now know about climate change. Aggressively expand green public transportation options.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0326 Ricky von Hulha

**Comment:** I do not understand why this expansion is being done. Our limited transportation resources should not be spent on a project that prioritizes helping put more single occupancy vehicles on the road. Climate change is real and it is a slowly unfolding crisis. This regressive step to widen a freeway (in an area that has been historically wronged by an earlier freeway project no less) exacerbates not just longer term climate change but also immediately will increase pollution in the area. Instead of pursuing this expansion, investment in large scale public transportation projects and (de)congestion pricing should be considered. This is not something people who live close by actually want! I ask for a suspension of the expansion until a full environmental review and more broad based community discussion can take place. Specifically I think this needs to be voted on by those directly affected by the expansion.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0326 Riley Peck

**Comment:** Hi,

I'm writing to convey my disappointment that ODOT is considering moving on in the I-5 project without conducting a complete EIS. This is a major project that will have profound impacts on Portland and the rest of the state and it would be inappropriate to continue the process without the benefit of an EIS.

Riley Peck

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Rita Webb

**Comment:** No City in the history of cities, has ever solved the issue of traffic congestion on an interstate by adding more lanes.

Los Angeles is a superb example of that.

<https://www.laweekly.com/news/11-billion-and-five-years-later-the-405-congestion-relief-project-is-a-fail-5415772>

as well as

<https://www.latimes.com/opinion/livable-city/la-ol-traffic-toll-lane-freeway-20170303-story.html>

Aside from the links above, which you can also google more in regards to this point by using the search feature; this also put both the Elementary School at risk for toxins and the Eastbank Esplanade in a bad place for similar issues as well. You are putting more people in danger EXPANDING the freeway that do NOT use the freeway than you would by not expanding it at all.

I implore the ODOT to look up other alternatives, especially since Oregon is supposed to be about alternative energy and commuting resources. If we pride ourselves on these, what is keeping us from looking into other options for congestion??

I'm saying NO to this expansion. I will continue to say NO, until the funding for cycling and better mass transit infrastructure and toll roads exist.

Thank you.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 Rithy Khut

*Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee*



**Comment:** Hello Commissioner Eudaly and Manager Windsheimer. My name is Rithy Khut. I'm the chair of Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee. A committee that is tasked with reviewing many of the bicycle projects that go before the city and the city builds. And based on our understanding of the project we don't see the benefit that is laid out in the EA. Most of the benefits for Oregon past Central City in Motion Plan will actually make Broadway and Weidler better than what is proposed in the environmental assessment. But more importantly, I actually want to change tack a little bit. As I was looking through this and going over my research, I stumbled upon House Bill 2846. It is currently in the Joint Transportation Committee at the State. And a key point of that bill is the creation of jurisdictional transfer funds. And what better way to start off that fund than using the funds that are allocated to this project and seeding it. Commissioner Eudaly, you have an energized staff and I know the City has great legislative staffers who go down to advocate for the priorities of the City. Why don't we engage them and engage Senator Dembrow and Representative Keny-Guyer, and work on putting this money towards areas like 82nd, Powell, and any other orphan highways that exist within the state. For me I think that would be a better use of rectifying some of the wrongs that have already been talked about. So hopefully, we'll see what happens. Thank you for your time.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 3022 Rithy Khut and Elliot Akwai-Scott

*Bicycle Advisory Committee*

**Comment:** As a citizen committee representing a broad spectrum of Portlanders advising the City on matters related to bicycling, the Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) is writing to strongly recommend the No-Build Alternative for I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project.

While the project in its current configuration should not be built, the Albina neighborhood is not without need.

Albina Vision, a community-created and led plan to heal the neighborhood devastated by the construction of the I-5 freeway decades ago, should be the starting point for a new vision of a vibrant, prosperous neighborhood between the Willamette River and Lloyd District.

Throughout the I-5 Rose Quarter project, obfuscation and delay in providing information for public review has hampered the ability of the community and stakeholders, including the BAC, to provide meaningful input. This includes key information not released at the beginning of the Environmental Assessment 45-day public comment period. Transportation modeling assumptions were not released until 20 days after the beginning of the comment period. Partial engineering drawings were released yesterday with only 10 days remaining in the comment period, while fully detailed drawings have still not been released as of the writing of this letter. The BAC joins the call for a full Environmental Impact Statement before the project proceeds any further.

Based on the limited information provided, the BAC finds that the Build Alternative would fail to achieve the stated project goals and objectives, especially in critical areas related to bicycling,



but also including the resulting conditions for walking and transit, local connectivity, safety, equity, and climate outcomes. This is in direct conflict with city and state planning goals.

Throughout the I-5 Rose Quarter project area, the Build Alternative would mostly propose rebuilding bicycle facilities on the same streets that already have them, except in some places like the Flint Ave overcrossing, currently used by 3,000 bicyclists per day, which would be permanently removed. During five years of construction, multimodal conflicts could increase [and] bicycle detour options would be limited for the 8,000+ people who currently bicycle through the project area every day, according to the Active Transportation Technical Report. We have serious concerns about whether it is possible to support existing bicycle travel patterns during

construction, as Active Transportation Technical Report Section 6.2.1 identifies:

The CPC [Construction Phasing Concept] Plan does not address the following:

- Design details for temporary pedestrian/bicycle facilities (e.g., facility typologies, widths, and signage)

- Details for maintaining pedestrian and bicycle movement throughout the entirety of the

Projects construction timeline

For people walking and biking the city's Waterfront loop, the Eastbank Esplanade would be closed for an unknown duration to complete work in the Willamette River supporting portions of the freeway that are designated for expansion as part of this project. Requiring bicyclists to leave existing paths or bike lanes to ride in mixed traffic detours during a five-year construction period would increase travel times and reduce safety.

After five years of construction, the Build Alternative would not offer compelling or substantial improvements for bicycling. The predominant bicycle travel pattern through the project area is between downtown Portland and all of North and Northeast Portland north of I-84, via the Broadway and Steel Bridges. Under the Build Alternative, the majority of bicycle trips through the project area would experience increased delays due to signalization, reduced connectivity, longer travel distances, and steeper grades compared to existing routes under the No-Build

Alternative. The removal of the Flint Ave crossing, which currently supports the lions share of westbound bicycle trips from Vancouver Ave and the Tillamook neighborhood greenway into downtown Portland, would have a negative impact on bicycle travel that cannot be replaced by any of the facilities proposed in the Build alternative. The Hancock/Dixon crossing proposed by the project would not include any separate bicycle facilities and would be constructed at a permanently inaccessible 10% grade. The Clackamas bicycle and pedestrian bridge proposed by the project does not support this travel pattern, and would not replace any of the decreased utility of existing bicycle facilities impacted in the project area.

Many existing street design issues facing people bicycling and walking, such as exposure to double turn lanes and wide curb radii at freeway ramp intersections, would not be addressed in



the Build Alternative. These proposed designs rate bicycle and pedestrian movements as a lower priority than vehicle movements, requiring two-stage

crossings and increasing delay. Some facilities planned in the Build Alternative are touted as improvements over existing conditions, but build in problems that cannot be solved by any later design, such as the proposed two-way multi-use separated facility on the rebuilt Williams Ave crossing. Transitions back to one-way facilities on either side of the project area can only be achieved by additional signalization and accompanying increased delay. These design features do not belong on designated Major City Bikeways like Broadway/Weidler and Vancouver/Williams, which according to the Portland Transportation System Plan should be designed to minimize delays by emphasizing the movement of bicycles.

The proposed bicycle facilities in the I-5 Rose Quarter project fail to provide meaningful safety improvements, improve travel times for bicyclists, or encourage the desired city-wide bicycle mode splits. To reach the city's

bicycle mode share goal of 25% adopted in the Transportation System Plan, permanent infrastructure at key regional transportation hubs like Albina must not only support existing bicycle travel patterns, but future growth.

Directly in conflict with the City's goals, the Build Alternative would reduce the existing capacity of the bicycle network in the project area and place a permanent cap on the capacity for bicycle travel between downtown and North and Northeast Portland via the Broadway and Steel Bridges. While the BAC is primarily responsible for advising the Portland Bureau of Transportation and Portland City Council on matters related to bicycling, transportation issues are multimodal, and transportation funding is finite. Walking, bicycling and transit all support each other as complementary modes that increase equity, livability, safety and efficiency. Transportation projects deserve funding based on cost effectiveness at achieving overarching transportation and land use planning goals, which increasingly focus on mitigating climate change.

The BAC also supports the No-Build Alternative for these related reasons:

- Similar to outcomes for bicycling, bus travel times through the project area under the Build Alternative would increase for many routes according to the Transit Technical Report, decreasing the viability of transit in the project area.
- While funding for the I-5 Rose Quarter project was assigned by HB 2017, the project budget is unclear.

There is no reference to the overall project budget in the 38-page Environmental Assessment Executive Summary. Any cost to Portland when the project cost exceeds this amount would reduce the City's ability to build more impactful bicycling, walking and transit improvements.

- Technical Report sections 6.3.2.2, Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions, a required portion of the alternatives analysis for the Build and No-Build Alternatives of the Environmental Assessment, do not include the implementation of value (congestion) pricing on the freeway system in the Portland area. A study of value pricing was included in the same bill, HB 2017, that funded this I-5 Rose Quarter project.



Any analysis is incomplete without considering the effects of value pricing on the project area.

- Areas outside of streets on proposed freeways lids have been shown as green and landscaped public spaces, but lack accessibility. Portland Parks and Recreation has not been included as a project partner for programming and support of these areas after construction. The project has not demonstrated that the freeway lids will be designed to support the infrastructure necessary to meaningful public spaces in these areas, such as the depth of a growing medium necessary to support trees, or irrigation for landscaping.
- The Climate Change Technical Report, which appears to be a limited analysis on only freeway traffic rather than considering the outcomes for climate-friendly walking, bicycling and transit trips that cross it, and based on an unsupported assumption that 2045 traffic volumes will be the same as 2017, projects only a 0.2% reduction in carbon emissions over No Build. This is incompatible with the recent UN IPCC report that found carbon emissions must be reduced by 50 percent by 2030, and to zero by 2050.
- While the I-5 Rose Quarter project has been billed as a safety project, no fatal crashes have occurred in the project area since 2009. The victim of the fatal crash in 2009 was a pedestrian attempting to cross the freeway in an area where no crossings were available. According to PBOT data from 2010-2018, 133 people walking and bicycling have died on other Portland streets since then.

As a regional multimodal hub, the transportation network in Albina is overdue for investment that reflects the city and states current transportation planning goals and priorities. This investment should prioritize equity, active transportation, transit, and safety. Instead, the I-5 Rose Quarter project is a freeway expansion, and a failed attempt to patch local connections, bicycling, walking and transit facilities back together afterward.

For these reasons, we strongly endorse the No-Build alternative for I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project .

Respectfully submitted on behalf of Portlands Bicycle Advisory Committee,

Rithy Khut, Chair Elliot Akwai-Scott, Vice-Chair

Bicycle Advisory Committee Bicycle Advisory Committee

Cc:

Portland Pedestrian Advisory Committee

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



**Attachments:** [2019 3022 Rithy Khut and Elliot Akwai-Scott ATT](#)

## 2019 0319 Rithy Khut Elliot Akwai-Scott

*Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee*

**Comment:** Re: ODOT I-5 Rose Quarter Environmental Assessment - No-Build Alternative

As a citizen committee representing a broad spectrum of Portlanders advising the City on matters related to bicycling, the Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) is writing to strongly recommend the No-Build Alternative for I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project.

While the project in its current configuration should not be built, the Albina neighborhood is not without need. Albina Vision, a community-created and led plan to heal the neighborhood devastated by the construction of the I-5 freeway decades ago, should be the starting point for a new vision of a vibrant, prosperous neighborhood between the Willamette River and Lloyd District.

Throughout the I-5 Rose Quarter project, obfuscation and delay in providing information for public review has hampered the ability of the community and stakeholders, including the BAC, to provide meaningful input. This includes key information not released at the beginning of the Environmental Assessment 45-day public comment period. Transportation modeling assumptions were not released until 20 days after the beginning of the comment

period. Partial engineering drawings were released yesterday with only 10 days remaining in the comment period, while fully detailed drawings have still not been released as of the writing of this letter. The BAC joins the call for a full Environmental Impact Statement before the project proceeds any further.

Based on the limited information provided, the BAC finds that the Build Alternative would fail to achieve the stated project goals and objectives, especially in critical areas related to bicycling, but also including the resulting conditions for walking and transit, local connectivity, safety, equity, and climate outcomes. This is in direct conflict with city and state planning goals.

Throughout the I-5 Rose Quarter project area, the Build Alternative would mostly propose rebuilding bicycle facilities on the same streets that already have them, except in some places like the Flint Ave overcrossing, currently used by 3,000 bicyclists per day, which would be permanently removed. During five years of construction, multimodal conflicts could increase [and] bicycle detour options would be limited for the 8,000+ people who currently bicycle through the project area every day, according to the Active Transportation Technical Report. We have serious concerns about whether it is possible to support existing bicycle travel patterns during construction, as Active Transportation Technical Report Section 6.2.1 identifies:

The CPC [Construction Phasing Concept] Plan does not address the following:

- Design details for temporary pedestrian/bicycle facilities (e.g., facility typologies, widths, and signage)



- Details for maintaining pedestrian and bicycle movement throughout the entirety of the Project's construction timeline

For people walking and biking the city's Waterfront loop, the Eastbank Esplanade would be closed for an unknown duration to complete work in the Willamette River supporting portions of the freeway that are designated for expansion as part of this project. Requiring bicyclists to leave existing paths or bike lanes to ride in mixed traffic detours during a five-year construction period would increase travel times and reduce safety.

After five years of construction, the Build Alternative would not offer compelling or substantial improvements for bicycling. The predominant bicycle travel pattern through the project area is between downtown Portland and all of North and Northeast Portland north of I-84, via the Broadway and Steel Bridges. Under the Build Alternative, the majority of bicycle trips through the project area would experience increased delays due to signalization, reduced connectivity, longer travel distances, and steeper grades compared to existing routes under the No-Build Alternative. The removal of the Flint Ave crossing, which currently supports the lion's share of westbound bicycle trips from Vancouver Ave and the Tillamook neighborhood greenway into downtown Portland, would have a negative impact on bicycle travel that cannot be replaced by any of the facilities proposed in the Build alternative. The Hancock/Dixon crossing proposed by the project would not include any separate bicycle facilities and would be constructed at a permanently inaccessible 10% grade. The Clackamas bicycle and pedestrian bridge proposed by the project does not support this travel pattern, and would not replace any of the decreased utility of existing bicycle facilities impacted in the project area.

Many existing street design issues facing people bicycling and walking, such as exposure to double turn lanes and wide curb radii at freeway ramp intersections, would not be addressed in the Build Alternative. These proposed designs rate bicycle and pedestrian movements as a lower priority than vehicle movements, requiring two-stage crossings and increasing delay. Some facilities planned in the Build Alternative are touted as improvements over

existing conditions, but build in problems that cannot be solved by any later design, such as the proposed two-way multi-use separated facility on the rebuilt Williams Ave crossing. Transitions back to one-way facilities on either side of the project area can only be achieved by additional signalization and accompanying increased delay. These design features do not belong on designated Major City Bikeways like Broadway/Weidler and Vancouver/Williams, which according to the Portland Transportation System Plan should be designed to minimize delays by emphasizing the movement of bicycles.

The proposed bicycle facilities in the I-5 Rose Quarter project fail to provide meaningful safety improvements, improve travel times for bicyclists, or encourage the desired city-wide bicycle mode splits. To reach the city's bicycle mode share goal of 25% adopted in the Transportation System Plan, permanent infrastructure at key regional transportation hubs like Albina must not only support existing bicycle travel patterns, but future growth.

Directly in conflict with the City's goals, the Build Alternative would reduce the existing capacity of the bicycle network in the project area and place a permanent cap on the capacity for bicycle



travel between downtown and North and Northeast Portland via the Broadway and Steel Bridges.

While the BAC is primarily responsible for advising the Portland Bureau of Transportation and Portland City Council on matters related to bicycling, transportation issues are multimodal, and transportation funding is finite.

Walking, bicycling and transit all support each other as complementary modes that increase equity, livability, safety and efficiency. Transportation projects deserve funding based on cost effectiveness at achieving overarching transportation and land use planning goals, which increasingly focus on mitigating climate change.

The BAC also supports the No-Build Alternative for these related reasons:

- Similar to outcomes for bicycling, bus travel times through the project area under the Build Alternative would increase for many routes according to the Transit Technical Report, decreasing the viability of transit in the project area.
- While funding for the I-5 Rose Quarter project was assigned by HB 2017, the project budget is unclear.

There is no reference to the overall project budget in the 38-page Environmental Assessment Executive Summary. Any cost to Portland when the project cost exceeds this amount would reduce the City's ability to build more impactful bicycling, walking and transit improvements.

- Technical Report sections 6.3.2.2, Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions, a required portion of the alternatives analysis for the Build and No-Build Alternatives of the Environmental Assessment, do not include the implementation of value (congestion) pricing on the freeway system in the Portland area. A study of value pricing was included in the same bill, HB 2017, that funded this I-5 Rose Quarter project.

Any analysis is incomplete without considering the effects of value pricing on the project area.

- Areas outside of streets on proposed freeways lids have been shown as green and landscaped public spaces, but lack accessibility. Portland Parks and Recreation has not been included as a project partner for programming and support of these areas after construction. The project has not demonstrated that the freeway lids will be designed to support the infrastructure necessary to meaningful public spaces in these areas, such as the depth of a growing medium necessary to support trees, or irrigation for landscaping.
- The Climate Change Technical Report, which appears to be a limited analysis on only freeway traffic rather than considering the outcomes for climate-friendly walking, bicycling and transit trips that cross it, and based on an unsupported assumption that 2045 traffic volumes will be the same as 2017, projects only a 0.2% reduction in carbon emissions over No Build. This is incompatible with the recent UN IPCC report that found carbon emissions must be reduced by 50 percent by 2030, and to zero by 2050.
- While the I-5 Rose Quarter project has been billed as a safety project, no fatal crashes have occurred in the project area since 2009. The victim of the fatal crash in 2009 was a pedestrian attempting to cross the freeway in an area where no crossings were



available. According to PBOT data from 2010-2018, 133 people walking and bicycling have died on other Portland streets since then.

As a regional multimodal hub, the transportation network in Albina is overdue for investment that reflects the city's and state's current transportation planning goals and priorities. This investment should prioritize equity, active transportation, transit, and safety. Instead, the I-5 Rose Quarter project is a freeway expansion, and a failed attempt to patch local connections, bicycling, walking and transit facilities back together afterward.

For these reasons, we strongly endorse the No-Build alternative for I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project .

Respectfully submitted on behalf of Portland's Bicycle Advisory Committee,

**Attachments:** [2019 0319 Rithy Khut Elliot Akwai-Scott ATT](#)

## 2019 0322 Rob Falk

**Comment:** We should spen our transportation \$\$ on High speed rail and coupling it with local bus and transportation to make it effective and efficient. Also high speed rail to the beach (then folks could use local transportation or rent cars there.). Widening freeways and highways is inefficient

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0315 Rob Haley

**Comment:** As someone who works in the industry, I can assure you that devoting a bunch of funds to a highway system that results in just more heirchical distribution of POV based travel results in no traffic relief. This does nothing to move us in any from of progress in terms of reducing carbon emissions. Instead it wastes funds that could be better used for moving our community away from POVs to modes that have greater community support. We need to keep pretending like we are this progressive community if we are going to keep supporting trash initiatives. There is a reason this proposal is shrouded in secrecy: any effective transportation analyst can tell you it would not achieve the objectives its claiming. This is garbage politics.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0226 Rob McRae

**Comment:** Dear ODOT,

I am a lifelong Oregonian and I am against this project. The benefits for a few minutes of drivers' time are not remotely worth the financial or environmental costs of such a massive undertaking.

The project that I have read about sells the improvement of the interchange as a safety upgrade and addition of a few little parks above a loud freeway. It also adds some vague promises bike and pedestrian improvements that would reconnect the Lower Albina and Rose Quarter area with the rest of the city.



I commute daily through the North Broadway-Weidler interchange, frequently run in the area, and attend multiple Blazers and Winterhawks games each year. There is no trouble accessing this section of the city via any mode of transportation. The infrastructure currently in place, works.

There is no improvement of "safety" with regard to the freeway interchange. It has been widely publicized that there have been no traffic fatalities in the area for decades, and fatalities often happen because of higher speeds. If travel times and speeds are increased - wouldn't that make the interchange less safe? The infrastructure in place is clearly safe.

Expanding this section of freeway also has the problem of making the air quality around Harriet Tubman Middle School worse. It is already unsafe for kids to be outside around this school, cutting the freeway closer to it is not an improvement.

Proceeding with this project would not be an improvement to the people who live, work, and play in the area. It will improve travel times for those passing through the area by a few minutes.

\$450 million dollars is not worth a few minutes of people's time.

Thank you,

-Rob McRae

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Rob McRae

**Comment:** Dear ODOT,

I am a lifelong Oregonian, a daily commuter through this area, and I am supporting the No More Freeways campaign. I have already written one comment directly to your email address, but the sheer volume of misinformation and gaslighting that has been submitted to the public in the form of an Environmental Assessment makes me suspect that my email will be discarded.

The project that I have read about sells the improvement of the interchange as a safety upgrade and minor time savings for drivers on the freeway. However, there is no improvement of "safety" with regard to the freeway interchange. It has been widely publicized that there have been no traffic fatalities in the area for decades, and fatalities often happen because of higher speeds. If speeds are increased - wouldn't that make the interchange less safe for drivers? The infrastructure in place is clearly safer than the \$450 million Build option.

In expanding this section of freeway, there is also the problem of making the air quality around Harriet Tubman Middle School worse. It is already unsafe for kids to be outside around this school, cutting the freeway closer to it is not acceptable to the children at that school and people who live in the area. I commute past this middle school, and each day I see the giant HVAC system recently installed on the roof, it makes me wonder how we, as a community, could even consider their lives to be worth less than a few minutes of people's time on the freeway. Building a \$450 million freeway for people in cars at the expense kids lungs and lives is not ok.



It is hard to believe that an agency from the once proud, environmentally conscious, state of Oregon would mislead the public and lawmakers so dramatically in an Environmental Assessment. It is a tool that is supposed to inform the public of the options available. Instead, the models used to measure traffic were not included in the original report but eventually provided (late in the comment period) and assumed that the \$3 billion CRC was built 4 years ago. The engineering drawings of the changes to surface streets and freeways were claimed to not exist, until they were reluctantly released (very late in the comment period) and show awful infrastructure for users of surface streets. We need a full Environment Impact Statement to understand how a \$450 million investment and years of construction will actually change this area vs. alternatives like congestion pricing and No Build (without the non-existent CRC traffic). We need to transparently inform the public of all the options available.

Thank you,

-Rob McRae

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Rob Parker

**Comment:** I would like to voice my opposition to the I5 expansion project. I am opposed to it for several reasons:

- lack of ODOT transparency
- more freeway will result in more carbon pollution/climate change
- increased air pollution for surrounding neighborhoods, mine included.
- wasteful spending
- this project priorities cars over people

Instead I support:

- spending that supports mass transit/bicycle/pedestrian modes
- congestion pricing

Thanks for listening to my input!

Sincerely,

Robert Parker

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0401 Robbi M. Brewer

**Comment:** Please add my name to those who strongly oppose the proposed ODOT project to expand Interstate 5 between the Fremont Bridge and the Interstate 84 interchange.

You have been thoroughly apprised of the key issues, enumerated by thousands of other Portland citizens and transportation/infrastructure experts. Nearly all of these points are important to me personally, but the monumental expenditure of funds for no meaningful benefit to citizens is most repellent of all. This project must not move forward when so many other transportation needs remain unmet, with harm to citizens and environment in the immediate and greater region.

If you need more contact information for me, please reply by email. Thank you.

Robbi M. Brewer

Portland

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Robert Bullard

**Comment:** To: ODOT

Re: Rose Quarter I-5 Freeway Expansion

Freeway congestion is the primary transportation crisis in the Metro area. We have spent hundreds of millions on studies to increase carrying capacity that have gone nowhere! Meanwhile our community is becoming increasingly less livable because of our inability to transport goods, and people. This process seems to be controlled by a minority of individuals who seem to think that the problem can be solved by adding bike lanes and mass transportation services. It can't.

It's time for ODOT to quit spending all of our resources on these studies and start building some roads so we can get back to work! Please, do your job and expand this freeway, then expand some others and build a new west side bypass and new Columbia River bridge. That's your job!

Sincerely,

Robert Bullard

Bob Bullard DVM

Cornelius Veterinary Clinic PC

1280 N. Adair St

Cornelius, OR 97113



Ph 503-357-2525 Fax 503-357-5230

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0215 Robert D Rowen

**Comment:** BUILD IT AND THEY WILL COME!!!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Robert Galanakis

**Comment:** Please do not go forward with this project. Nothing I've seen presented makes this seem like it creates the type of city my family wants to live in. Invest in our future, not a wider highway.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 robert gantz

**Comment:** While they're trying to expand freeways, will ODOT also be promoting any other horrible, long-discredited "solutions" to problems? Perhaps we should all take up smoking or get lobotomies? Trepanning and exorcism for everyone! There is a myriad of ways \$450 million could be spent working to make transportation safer, cleaner, more efficient, and more equitable, on projects based on actual research and proven results. The proposed I5 Rose Quarter project seems intent on working against those goals, the adopted policies of the state, Metro, and the City of Portland, and the people of this community. This project should be condemned in the strongest possible terms!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0310 Robert Hemphill

**Comment:** Hello ODOT,

My name is Robert Hemphill and I am a resident of the Eliot neighborhood. I am deeply concerned with the proposed RQ freeway project due to its impact on climate change, particulate emissions, and creating worse pedestrian and bicycle connections. I believe your EA to be incomplete, disingenuous, and flat-out false, not understanding basic principles of transportation economics. I ask you to re-check your math and reassess whether other options (congestion pricing) would achieve the same goals set out for this project.

With transportation comprising 40% of the City of Portland's greenhouse gas emissions, any transportation project deserves increased scrutiny for its impact on transportation emissions. In this case, a project that is designed to make transportation more convenient for cars will only increase greenhouse gas emissions. I know ODOT argues that auxiliary lanes don't actually add



freeway capacity, but the fact is that even auxiliary lanes are additional capacity. And with one of the goals of the project being decreased congestion, that makes driving easier. When driving is easier, more people will drive. That is induced demand 101, and why this freeway expansion will lead to more drivers and more greenhouse gas pollutants.

Additionally, this expansion takes place in the literal backyard of Harriet Tubman Middle School, and in the broader context of a historically diverse neighborhood. We know from environmental justice research that communities of color and low income populations are disproportionately exposed to more particulate emissions. The very initial construction of I5 was run through a marginalized neighborhood with insufficient political clout to prevent the construction. To then expand the freeway under the guise of somehow restoring the community is extremely disingenuous. None of this will improve emissions, just subject a diverse school to more pollution and ensure that the Albina neighborhood will never be reconnected.

Lastly, this project claims to improve bicycle and pedestrian connections, but as a resident and bicycle commuter, I cannot help but see how this will make my experiences worse. The proposed Tillamook bridge will have a 9% grade! That is not ADA compliant, and is almost 2x as steep as any other bicycle route in the city. The proposed addition of switchbacks connecting to the bridge are not a solution - no one likes using switchbacks, and they still are a 5% grade. This prioritizes car access and de-prioritizes bicycles. Then there's the diverging diamond at Williams. That area is already fraught for cyclists. I've nearly been run over by cars ignoring red lights, cutting lanes without looking... and now I'm supposed to ride down the middle with traffic on either side? That sounds awful. How do I merge from the right side to the left side on the north side of Broadway and Williams? What about the wider corners that encourage higher-speed car operations? That will make me feel unsafe. Lastly, there's also a bus lane on the bike lane? This feels like we're the after-thought.

I want ODOT to address safety on its roads. I want ODOT to address congestion on its roads. I want ODOT to improve bicycle and pedestrian connections on its roads. For safety, start with stretches (like 82nd) where there are increased traffic fatalities. For congestion, use congestion pricing! Congestion pricing is the only tool that has ever successfully decreased congestion. Freeway expansion only leads to more congestion. And for bicycle and pedestrian connections - plan with those in mind. As the most vulnerable road users, when bicyclists and pedestrians are safe, drivers are less stressed. I know, because when I drive I'm acutely aware of how easily I could injure someone and that I want them to be protected first.

Thank you for your time. I will be including the No More Freeways testimony below for additional thoughts and comments.

Robert Hemphill

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.

Have you seen our video highlighting how ODOT's proposed freeway widening would expand I-5 into the backyard of Harriet Tubman Middle School?



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' students are Black.

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. As of Friday, March 8, ODOT still hasn't released numerous data sets and appendices that would allow our community groups to independently verify ODOT's assertions that this project would lower carbon emissions, improve air quality or lower traffic congestion. ODOT's strategy is to tell the public "trust us, this is good for the community," and isn't providing any of the materials available for us to double-check their dubious claims. Our coalition wrote a letter on March 4th asking for this information and we still haven't received it. How can ODOT claim to be providing meaningful public engagement with the project when they won't even make the data available for the public to review?

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

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

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



congestion. (There are meaningful, valid concerns about how to implement decongestion pricing fairly - we've explored that in letters to the Oregon Transportation Committee last year)

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Robert Hunter

**Comment:** I am opposed to expanding the I5 freeway basically right through my neighborhood. It increases air pollution and noise pollution. It won't do anything to help congestion. In fact, ODOT didn't even turn over all their research materials like they were supposed to. This hundreds of millions of dollars should be used for expanding our bikeways, fixing all the potholes, and more

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0328 Robin

**Comment:** Hello,

As a 30 year Oregon resident who has never owned a car, I oppose widening the freeway. Instead, adding a toll would generate money and deter the congestion that causes so much road rage! It's working for Seattle, which is where I lived before moving here. More road will cause more cars and more pollution, not ease congestion.

Thank you.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0304 Robin Gray

**Comment:** I am in complete opposition to the proposed expansion of the freeway in Portland. As an environmentally concerned city, it is unfathomable that ODOT would see this as an improvement in any way. I came here from California where freeway expansion does nothing more than make room for more cars causing MORE pollution. It does NOTHING to improve travel time (look at research). Community members will be hurt by this proposal in many ways. We would be much better off spending that money on more public transportation which ELIMINATES the need for cars. Please protect our most vulnerable communities and not risk their health for the benefit of the automobile and fossil fuel industries!!!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Robin Scholetzky

**Comment:** ODOT,



I urge you to consider the following when reviewing the decision to expand a portion of the I-5 corridor:

1. Provide a full Environmental Impact Statement which includes an assessment of the expansion of the freeway into all areas required by an EIS including Air Quality, Socioeconomic, existing bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and a NO BUILD Alternative.
2. Review the literature that documents that expansion of freeways does not REDUCE CONGESTION over time, especially, in this case, in proportion to the overall project cost.
3. Seek alternatives to getting people out of their cars including decongestion pricing
4. Work with the community of Portland to provide alternatives to this expansion which supports work of community advocacy organizations already taking place in the surrounding neighborhoods.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0328 Robyn Klopp

**Comment:** As a resident living close to I5 I urge ODOT to follow the research advice that indicates a freeway expansion would not improve traffic congestion in our community and would impact our environment, local schools, and residents negatively.

Please invest in the congestion management options that research supports, including public transit.

Thank you for your consideration,

Robyn Klopp

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Rod Lundberg

**Comment:** I oppose this freeway expansion. It's old-fashioned thinking given our new sets of problems.

Rod Lundberg

Portland

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Roddy Erickson

**Comment:** I urge that the proposed I-5 expansion be rejected.



\* Traffic in this corridor would be better addressed by congestion pricing and improved public transit (such as extension of Max to Vancouver).

\* At this stage of the climate crisis, freeway expansion isn't where our money belongs.

\* ODOT hasn't even released the primary data which would allow their conclusions to be independently assessed, nor has there been a full EIS.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0322 Rogan Motis

**Comment:** Hello, I attended the open house and would like to point out that although the arguments in favor of this project cited the restoration of black spaces, there was no one-sheet handout demonstrating environmental justice to be a priority. I'm born and raised in this area and don't buy this negatively-impactful gentrification in sheep's clothing. Walk your talk. Let's focus on the pedestrian and bike bridge and highlight that adding lanes to a highway behind Harriet Tubman Middle school (which has already been advised to limit recess activity by Portland State Univ. Professionals) is repeating this violent history the city is claiming to regret. There are not enough black representatives from the community involved, nor are we hearing from the youth who will inherit this project and it's carbon emissions by the time it is finished. I demand more from my city.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0313 Roger Alley

*Blue Line Transportation*

**Comment:** Why is there no 3rd lane, that is the major issue and one that was negotiated with the Oregon Trucking Association. Is there enough evidence/data/testing that the auxiliary lanes will help with the silly congestion on the only two lane portion of I-5 through a major city?

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0402 Ron Alexssen

**Comment:** Please reconsider the Rose Quarter I-5 expansion. Widening the freeway is unlikely to reduce traffic congestion. Instead it likely will increase pollution and certainly won't convince Oregonians to take an alternative method of transit. Please put our money toward public transit.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0315 Ron Arp

*President of Identity Clark County*

**Comment:** We register our support of the Rose Quarter Improvement Project and thank the Oregon Department of Transportation for its rigorous efforts to pursue necessary improvements while balancing many

interests. This support is expressed by the nonprofit business leaders group Identity Clark County, along with the Clark County Transportation Alliance and the SW Washington Freight and Commerce Task Force.

We appreciate your deliberate and thoughtful Rose Quarter plan, in keeping with 20-year-old 1-5 Trade Corridor Studies and related strategic plans which outlined critical deficiencies along the 1-5 corridor. Your nine-year effort has resulted in a reasonable Environmental Impact Statement that pursues necessary improvements while minimizing and mitigating risks.

Your Project addresses one of the two largest transportation bottlenecks in the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area. The Rose Quarter area was again listed among the top 100 traffic-clogging

bottlenecks of the freight industry, currently listed at #28 (the 1-5 bridge was listed as #29). Every community depends upon and must continue to invest in the predictable flow of freight and commerce,

especially key metropolitan areas along the trade-dependent West Coast which help us participate in the global economy.

We appreciate that making improvements within existing highly developed areas requires consideration of many needs, preferences and modalities. A vibrant economic foundation is what provides the tax revenues necessary to maintain our infrastructure, educate our citizens, provide community services, protect nature and support our families. Additionally, a steadier flow of traffic improves safety as our country strives to lower transportation-related deaths and accidents.

We appreciate your work on the Rose Quarter and look forward to future collaboration on replacing the antiquated and accident-prone 1-5 bridge.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 Ron Buel

**Comment:** Hi, my name is Ron Buel, 1810 Northeast 70th. And I've been working on transportation projects for 50 years in Portland. I was involved in stopping the Mt. Hood freeway and transferring the money TriMet to begin its light rail system. We brought out the head of the Federal Highway Administration from Washington D.C. to get that transfer done. I served on the TriMet board when we started the 60 miles of light rail that we have built here in Portland.



We stopped a freeway, yes, the Mt. Hood freeway, but we also stopped ODOT's plans developed by Robert Moses for PBMTS, which would have had dozens of freeways around and across the city. Rose City freeway, the Whittaker freeway, the Johnson Creek freeway, I could go on, 21st Avenue expressway. We also stopped a freeway out Thurman Street which was planned by ODOT, to go out to St. Helens Road. We also stopped the west side bypass. So we have a long history in Portland of saying no to ODOT. No to ODOT on the Columbia River crossing, that \$3.3 billion project that I spent six years fighting against. And we tried to get ODOT to put the freeway on the river underground. Underground on the river, the Moses mistake that was made back in the late '50s and early '60s, when Robert Moses came out here and designed our freeways. And so right there on our beautiful river, the Willamette, we have freeway and all those ramps. And believe me, there's a vision that's out there that Ernie Bonner, and Jim Howell, and George Crandall, and a bunch of other people created which would have put that freeway underground. We should still do it. Thank you.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0312 Ron Swaren

*United Brotherhood of Carpenters (retired)*

**Comment:** Ron Swaren, Portland, retired United Brotherhood of Carpenters. Carpenters build highways, bridges, high rises, seismic upgrades, schools. Just about everything you see in a big city, it has -- carpenters have constructed most of it or a lot of it. The thing I would like to point out this No More Freeways group is just really pushing some disinformation. When we are talking about a \$450 million project, I would estimate probably about a third of that is a highway reconstruction. What this really is is an urban renewal project that's basically designed to stimulate construction development in the north/northeast quadrant area. I had documents for the north/northeast quadrant, and it's also called the Broadway/Weidler project. So if you're going to attack the overall expenses, please go to the City Council with your concerns. Honestly, I'd say probably only about a third of this is in the highway end of it. The rest of it is an urban renewal project. Secondly, as far as history -- I know some of you are pretty young -- in the 1980s, we had a serious recession in Oregon. Our local governments determined that they would invite businesses and gave them various incentives, and that caused a lot of commuting to those jobs. We had a lot of people that were desperate for employment moving in. So we had a lot of commuting. A lot of it came from Clark County. That's just a price you pay for economic recovery. The 1980's recession was very severe. I think the area was glad to get out of it and so we ended up with some traffic problems. This is just one that we have to deal with and I think ODOT is probably doing the best they can. Thank you.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0314 Ron Webster

**Comment:** Please accept this email as my comment regarding the Project. I live in the City of Portland and work near this area. I often commute via I-5 and on surface streets in this area. I



not only find a legitimate need for this project for transportation purposes but believe the project can provide a needed boost to a part of town ready to become a true jewel of the city. Presently the area continues to expand and there have been improvements but a major project is needed to really clean up this part of the city and make it an area where people want to live, visit and work. I'm hopeful that this project will take this part of Portland to the next level and look forward to the completion of the project in the future. I support this project wholeheartedly as an effort to improve Portland's infrastructure.

Ron Webster

Portland, OR

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0328 Ronald C Alexander

**Comment:** I support the Rose Quarter expansion

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0327 Ronelle Coburn

**Comment:** When freeway capacity is increased in urban areas, it typically gets maxxed out \*6 MONTHS BEFORE\* construction is complete. Increasing highway capacity increases traffic...it does not reduce drive time. People are simply encouraged to move further out of the city core because they think they can drive in to work. It's a TOTAL WASTE of taxpayer money. We should not be spending taxpayer dollars to increase traffic congestion and air pollution and encourage fossil fuel consumption. Improving transit is the only way to go...literally...particularly putting in light rail so it's easy to get on/off and NOT have to sit through traffic lights (buses) OR to create bus priority lanes (if improving bus lines). AND creating TRULY bicycle friendly lanes like they have in Copenhagen, Amsterdam and many major German cities. PLEASE DO NOT ADD FREEWAY/AUTOMOTIVE VEHICLE CAPACITY IN THE PORTLAND METRO AREA!!! It is only detrimental, on every level, to our city and environment and also is antithetical to everything this city has prided itself on and worked for over the last 30 years!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0225 Rosanna Henderson

**Comment:** We've known for decades that increased capacity generates more driving via induced demand. Stop trying to greenwash an unnecessary, irresponsible, and flagrantly wasteful highway expansion project for an outdated mode of transportation.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0304 Rose

**Comment:** No more highways!! We don't need more freeways all over this city, it doesn't make sense at all and is no way sustainable!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0000 Rose Swartz

*Carpenters Union Local 146*

**Comment:** I support the project as outlined, mainly bc I'm a carpenter and it will but construction jobs to myself/union brothers and sisters. Also, because it could alleviate congestion, I I often have to commute by car to work because of the early hours and sheer amount of tools I must bring. I live out near 82nd, in the Montavilla Neighborhood and am often stuck in the bottleneck leading to I-84.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0224 Ross Filice

**Comment:** Please reconsider adding additional lanes to I-5 - and the Rose Quarter expansion as designed. Building more capacity for cars is the least effective, least efficient, and most damaging option we could possibly do. Cars kill people in our region, are the biggest contributor to congestion, are the least efficient way of moving people around, and they contribute substantially to climate change. Adding pollution to the environment at Harriet Tubman is a terrible choice. Every time any municipality in the U.S. has built more car lanes it has simply resulted in more cars without alleviating any congestion.

Finally, and probably most importantly, given the existential threat we face in global warming and the damning reports from the IPCC and our own government we must be doing everything we can to reduce emissions and give people environmentally friendly transit options.

Please reconsider this expansion. These dollars could be much more efficiently and effectively spent on transit initiatives which would decrease congestion, improve safety, decrease pollution, and decrease climate change.

thanks much,

Ross Filice

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0218 Ross Winsor

**Comment:** Hello,



Spending hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars on what is essentially a freeway widening project is irresponsible, reckless and the exact opposite of what needs to be done to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. At a time when climate change is increasingly worsening, we should be seeking to limit emissions from transportation as drastically and quickly as possible by investing heavily in walking, biking, and transit, not building more infrastructure that encourages driving and locks us into dangerous emissions for years to come. Instead of wasting public money on highways that pollute the air we all breath and impose many hidden costs on society, implement congestion charges on all freeways through Portland. This will generate more revenue and help to decrease traffic congestion.

Oregon claims to be a leader in protecting the environment but its transportation policies prove otherwise. Please do what is right for Oregonians and future generations and do not "improve" the I-5 Rose Quarter by adding more lanes.

Thank You,

Ross Winsor

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Rowena Paz Norman

**Comment:** I oppose highway expansions. Highway expansions do not reduce congestion and increase pollutions.

Highways can also kill neighborhoods and walkability/accessibility.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0226 Roxane R Auer

**Comment:** The science is right on this. Fake solutions do not make people happy in the long run.

The only way is to increase density around transportation hubs, improve public transportation and bike lanes, improve affordable housing so people can live close to where they work. How about a neighbor benefit funded by the state - you aim to live walking distance from your job, Oregon will help you do that . . . .

We have a limited amount of time, any appointed or elected official in office at this moment has the blood of the planet on their hands. Climate destruction is real people, save us please, those who can . . .

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0330 Roxanne

**Comment:** Widening the freeways will do nothing to help our unique city. And it will in fact be damaging to our beautiful land and nature.

If you look to cities with bigger free way and road infrastructure - China, India, Russia - they have some of the worst traffic congestion and accident rates because they bigger roads do nothing to alleviate the issue.

Wider roads means more lanes to cross when merging which increases chance of accident. It increases the amount of cars on the road, which increases pollution and smog.

Once again, look at China and India. There are so many motor vehicles that the air quality decreases visibility sometimes down to 200ft and the rate of people with life threatening lung conditions is staggering and growing every year. They are killing their population to accommodate more cars.

What we need is better public transit. Lower transit fares. More bike friendly roads and routes.

Please put our residence and families first. Cars are not the solution and a bigger road will be the end of lives.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Roy Huggins

**Comment:** There is no value in the proposed Rose Quarter expansion. All research on the topic indicates that it won't help congestion but it will cost a lot of money, increase carbon output, and further encroach on a school. Pease do NOT move forward with this expansion.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Roy Y

**Comment:** Oregon's freeway system is obsolete and needs to be completely rebuilt. The bicycles have no place on the roads and vision zero is totally stupid. The roads are for cars not pedestrians. Interstate 5 should have been widened thru Portland 30 years ago. Also thru tractor trailers should have to take the I 205 bypass. Only <...> liberals don't want progress.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Roy Zhang

**Comment:** As an environmentalist concerned about climate change, I think the last thing Portland needs is another costly, emission spewing freeway expansion, when that money can be so much better spent on public transportation services as a way of addressing congestion.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0402 Roya Amirsoleymani

*Portland Institute for Contemporary Art*

**Comment:** Hello,

I am writing to voice my concern in the gathering of public opinion on the proposed I-5 expansion project. I and many of my community members who live or work in North and Northeast Portland near the core of the proposed construction site are extremely opposed to the proposal, for several reasons:

- 1) Along the lines of what was shared at the public hearing/testimony session from Harriet Tubman school students and faculty, as well as from other constituents, research tells us air quality will be significantly negatively affected in the immediate area, jeopardizing the health of the predominantly Black and Brown youth who attend school at Harriet Tubman, given its proximity to the project site. As many are aware, environmental health hazards disproportionately affect communities of color and low-income populations. This project is yet another example of this. I would be disappointed in Portland for perpetuating this pattern of environmental and racial injustice and inequity in our city.
- 2) We should not be incentivizing individual car commuting. The Portland area has long been recognized as an environmentally conscious and progressive region, but it is time that we increase investment in public transportation infrastructure and service, more bicycle routes/safety, and other alternative means of transit. As the city and tri-county region grows, let's not follow in the footsteps of Seattle, the Bay Area, or Los Angeles by putting resources toward more freeways. Let's encourage public transit and other modes of commuting. Freeway expansion is not part of Portland's ecologically conscious ethos.
- 3) The I-5 freeway expansion project in the 1970's contributed to destruction and forced displacement in the heart of Portland's Black community. The center of Black communal, civic, cultural, commercial, and church life was irreparably impacted by the I-5, Veterans' Memorial Coliseum, and Legacy Emmanuel Hospital projects. Now the city is finally publicly acknowledging the effects of these shameful acts of past "urban renewal" and gentrification that have pushed and priced out Black folks--for example, through the Right of Return initiative around affordable and subsidized housing for those who lost their homes in these instances to eminent domain and other forced displacement. This project will repeat so much



of the damage and distrust engendered by that earlier round of I-5 freeway growth that was not even very long ago, and is remembered as a trauma of uprooting and dispersing underserved communities. This project, through both the construction and post-completion phases, would perpetuate racist urban planning and privilege and prioritize wealth(ier) White car commuters over Black and Brown communities that still remain in North and Northeast Portland, and/or who continue to work, worship, or attend school there.

4) Disregard for the numerous social service agencies, nonprofits, schools, residences, businesses, and cultural institutions in the vicinity that would bear the brunt of negative impacts and experience extreme inconvenience and detrimental effects on quality of life, including ease of access to home, school, and work; physical hazards and safety concerns from long-term construction and traffic pattern re-routing; construction noise that impacts day to day educational experiences, artistic/cultural events, and home/sleep/domestic life; decrease in foot traffic; discouragement of business/attendance/use by those traveling to the area by car or public transit; reversal of the supposed benefits of the city having invested in and developed the area in the first place, due to people avoiding the area for the length of the construction period.

5) The interference or halting of development of the Albina Vision project that intends to celebrate and honor the African-American history of the area and develop its future based on the needs and desires of Black residents and those most impacted by past instances of displacement and gentrification. The I-5 project would negatively impact the possibility of the Albina Vision project as currently proposed.

I am not alone in staunchly opposing the proposed expansion to the I-5 freeway and related Rose Quarter area changes and firmly believe they are not in the best interest of our most vulnerable communities nor Portland's citizenry as a whole.

Thank you for considering this position in weighing this decision.

Very best,

Roya Amirsoleymani

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0401 Rubilei Diaz

**Comment:** Congestion will not improve. It will get worse during construction, and congestion will not change after it is done. It is a band-aid fix that I've seen done time after time. I used to live and commute in Los Angeles, and freeway expansions NEVER worked. They invited more cars, more congestion, and more air pollution.

I've always loved how Portland has been bike and pedestrian friendly. We should put more money into making car-less transportation a priority. If the car-less options (i.e. bike commutes, public trans, etc.) are more viable, more people will choose that option instead of commuting via car.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0305 Ruby Oland

**Comment:** Highway expansion has never improved traffic conditions! This is a pricey and ultimately unsatisfactory project. Please invest our money in sustainable transportation. ODOT, please focus on logical public transportation and green infrastructure. Help Portland move forward and away from unsustainable ways of living.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Rukaiyah Adams

*Albina Vision Trust (AVT)*

**Comment:** Megan Channell and Emily Cline,

Attached please find the Albina Vision Trust comments on the ODOT Rose Quarter Improvement Project Environmental Assessment.

At a high level, we take the following position:

The Albina Vision Trust (AVT) supports a project in the Rose Quarter/Lower Albina that works best for the people who live in our community, not just the traffic on the highways transecting our home. With this in mind, we have concluded that the current Rose Quarter Improvement Project (RQIP) Environmental Assessment does not adequately address environmental impacts, including community, social and economic outcomes. Due to these deficiencies, the AVT formally requests the Oregon Department of Transportation conduct a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement to provide better design, remediation and mitigation alternatives.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rukaiyah



**Attachments:** [2019 0329 Rukaiyah Adams ATT](#)

## 2019 0318 Russ Grandgeorge

**Comment:** Hello. I would like to comment on the I-5 Rose Quarter Environmental Assessment.

I am opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. The proposed changes to I-5 will do little to reduce vehicle emissions. While initially vehicles may have reduced travel times, over time more people will use this road and we will end up right where we started. This is known as induced demand and is a well studied consequence of road capacity expansions.

2. This project moves us away from our goals of lowering our carbon footprint. As the governor of Oregon states: "Mitigating the impacts of climate change and achieving Oregon's greenhouse gas reduction goals are key priorities for Governor Brown."

([https://www.oregon.gov/gov/policy/Pages/energy\\_climatechange.aspx](https://www.oregon.gov/gov/policy/Pages/energy_climatechange.aspx)). Alone just the act of construction will add to greenhouse gasses (construction equipment, concrete), but induced demand will increase the number of vehicles traveling on the road

3. The money can be spent more wisely. For \$450 million, we can complete 75% of the entire bike plan

for 2030 (<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/44597?a=379136>) or could provide half price Trimet fares for 8 years (<https://trimet.org/budget/pdf/2019-adopted-budget.pdf>)

Before undertaking a costly, unnecessary construction project, we should instead implement congestion

pricing and/or tolling to try and control the traffic patterns in the region. I believe there are already plans underway at ODOT to do this and I fail to see an immediate need for construction when this can be done first.

Thank you for your time,

Russ Grandgeorge

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0328 Russell Senior

**Comment:** I oppose this project. It is likely to induce vehicle traffic, increasing pollution and global warming. Congestion is important feedback to remind drivers to reconsider their choices.

**Attachments:** N/A



## 2019 0326 Ruthie

**Comment:** Don't expand the freeway! It's the wrong move for us. Don't spend our community resources on this expensive project in the service of expedient auto travel when we could be making our streets safer for all.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0000 Ryan

**Comment:** Hi, I'm calling to leave a recorded comment regarding the I-5 Rose Quarter expansion project. My name's Ryan. My phone number is 360-510-1818. I live in NE Portland and I run a business in Old Town. I think that the project is going to expand carbon emissions. It will not help commute times or make a safer environment for travelers and it will not create community connectivity. I think it's a waste of money and would be much better spent elsewhere. Please don't build it. Thank you.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0329 Ryan

**Comment:** My child will be a student at Tubman Middle school and I want projects that will improve quality of life for our most vulnerable citizens, kids. We need solutions to problems, not more spending on freeway expansion projects that have never been shown to improve traffic. Please consider more thoughtful solution to the problems we have that take into account not just traffic, but health, environment and quality of life.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0401 Ryan Linville

**Comment:** This freeway project is a terrible idea. It set the wrong example for our children. We can do better. This type of thinking is regressive. Let's be leaders. We can be better!!

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0326 Ryan Mosier

**Comment:** Dear ODOT,

Please accept this comment of opposition to the proposed Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion. As someone who relies on public transit to get around our fair city, we can do better than a project that increases # of cars on the road at the cost of so much, including increased pollution, delayed bus service, compromised pedestrian and bike infrastructure - the list goes on.

ODOT's reluctance to disclose key documents or perform a full environmental impact statement indicates to me that the findings would be further damaging to their proposal.



Furthermore, alternatives need to be considered, such as congestion pricing.

When considering such a project, it is critical to consider the community that is hostage to such changes, not those passing through on the highway. The community is in strong opposition to this project for the reasons cited, and to plow forward without addressing such concerns would be disastrous.

I would suggest ODOT Rose Quarter project staff refer to the 9th Ave greenway project in NE Portland as an example of how ODOT can refer to and reflect upon the needs of the community rather than paving them over.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0308 Ryan Moskal

**Comment:** I know we need to address the worsening traffic situation in Portland, and we should do it in a way that helps the largest number of citizens and that improves environmental quality. This project will do neither of those things, despite the opaque and laughable environmental report that claims this will reduce emissions while increasing the number of vehicles traveling on the freeway. I want to support transit improvements, but not one that thumbs its nose at real-world evidence and destroys communities while doing it.

**Attachments:** N/A

## 2019 0331 Ryan Schenk

**Comment:** Moving traffic more efficiently and safely through the Rose Quarter while improving bicycle and pedestrian traffic seems like smart city planning. As someone who drives that stretch of highway 1-2 times per week on average, I am really excited to know that there's a plan moving forward to reduce congestion and improve flow.

**Attachments:** N/A