



Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with S

Ordered by first name

Contents

2019 0329 Sabolch Horvat	7
2019 0327 Sabrina Gogol 2	8
2019 0327 Sabrina Gogol	8
2019 0402 Sabrina Louise	11
2019 0215 Sally Ridenour.....	11
2019 0312 Sam Balto	11
2019 0331 Sam Balto	12
2019 0312 Sam Chase	13
2019 0331 Sam Fader	14
2019 0224 Sam Friedenbergl	15
2019 0225 Sam Grover.....	15
2019 0326 Sameer Moudgil.....	16
2019 0326 Sameer Moudgil 2.....	16
2019 0329 Sameer Moudgil.....	17
2019 0401 Sandra Carlson.....	17
2019 0311 Sandra Joos.....	17
2019 0402 Sandy Hickey	18
2019 0326 Sandy McDonald.....	18
2019 0304 Santiago.....	18
2019 0402 Sara Bahmanyar	18
2019 0329 Sara Cochran.....	19
2019 0329 Sara Rudolph	19
2019 0401 Sara Ryan	19
2019 0329 Sara Walker	19
2019 0329 Sarah	20

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with S



2019 0311 Sarah Bachman	20
2019 0329 Sarah Cinnamon	20
2019 0326 Sarah Deumling	20
2019 0326 Sarah Deumling 2	21
2019 0313 Sarah Felix.....	21
2019 0402 Sarah Gregorio	22
2019 0401 Sarah Iannarone	22
2019 0401 Sarah Iannarone	22
2019 0331 Sarah Jesudason	26
2019 0312 Sarah Jurgensen.....	27
2019 0331 Sarah Kincaid.....	27
2019 0401 Sarah Lind.....	27
2019 0228 Sarah McKenzie.....	28
2019 0331 Sarah McLeod-Martinez.....	28
2019 0219 Sara Mirk.....	28
2019 0331 Sarah Pearlman	28
2019 0330 Satya Vayu.....	29
2019 0331 Saul Jones	30
2019 0327 Saumya Kini.....	31
2019 0329 Sandra Schlesinger.....	31
2019 0401 Scott Biersdorff	32
2019 0401 Scott Clyburn	32
2019 0311 Scott Cohen	33
2019 0000 Scott F. Kocher	33
2019 0312 Scott F Kocher	34
2019 0402 Scott Hillson	34
2019 0402 Scott Hillson	35
2019 0219 Scott Kocher	35
2019 0219 Scott Kocher 2	35
2019 0401 Scott Lieuallen	36

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with S



2019 0401 Scot Scott Mizée	36
2019 0401 Scott Murray.....	39
2019 0401 Scott Simpson.....	39
2019 0312 Scott Strickland	39
2019 0401 Scott Simpson.....	40
2019 0226 Sean.....	41
2019 0226 Sean Abplanalp.....	41
2019 0325 Sean Clearley	41
2019 0331 Sean Crowe	42
2019 0401 Sean Hellebusch.....	42
2019 0401 Sean Malone.....	42
2019 0401 Sean Sean McClintock.....	43
2019 0331 Sean McDougal	43
2019 0402 Sean Rea	44
2019 0401 Sean Sendelbach.....	44
2019 0000 SeoVadmNG.....	44
2019 0219 Sergio Acena	45
2019 0312 Seth Alford	45
2019 0226 Seth Blum	46
2019 0326 Seth D Alford.....	46
2019 0324 Seth Pellegrino.....	46
2019 0401 Seth Smigelski	47
2019 0401 shane.a.stricker.....	48
2019 0401 Shannon Robalino	48
2019 0331 Shannon Sullivan	48
2019 0215 Shara Alexander	48
2019 0329 Sharon Birrel	49
2019 0311 Sharon Miller.....	50
2019 0401 Sharon Nasset	50
2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 2	51



2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 3	51
2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 4	51
2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 5	51
2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 6	54
2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 7	54
2019 0327 Shawn Fleek et al	54
2019 0327 Shelby Ness.....	57
2019 0329 Shelby Schroeder	57
2019 0325 Shelby Simmons	58
2019 0401 Shelley Allan-Cole.....	58
2019 0227 Sherry	58
2019 0402 Sherry Bohannan	59
2019 0329 Sherry Salomon	59
2019 0329 Shika Kimura.....	59
2019 0329 Shirley Gibbons.....	59
2019 0401 Simone Crowe	60
2019 0330 Sohpia Cain	60
2019 0307 Soren Impey.....	60
2019 0402 Soren Impey.....	61
2019 0306 Sorin Garber	62
2019 0330 Spencer Alan	62
2019 0326 Spencer Bushnell.....	63
2019 0320 Spencer Kroll	63
2019 0401 Staci Monroe.....	64
2019 0401 Staci Monroe.....	66
2019 0330 Steph Gaines	66
2019 0401 Stephan Leger	66
2019 0325 Stephan Morris.....	67
2019 0326 Stephanie Byrd	67
2019 0401 Stephanie Byrd	67



2019 0523 Stephanie Jarem.....	67
2019 0306 Stephanie Noll.....	68
2019 0303 Stephen Bachhuber	68
2019 0402 Stephen Carson	69
2019 0227 Stephen Galas	69
2019 0305 Stephen Gomez	71
2019 0331 Stephen Hodges	71
2019 0401 Stephen Judkins	72
2019 0401 Stephen Judkins	72
2019 0327 Stephen Tokarski.....	73
2019 0312 Steve Bozzone.....	73
2019 0331 Steve Bozzone.....	74
2019 0312 Steve Brown.....	77
2019 0000 Steve Callaway	77
2019 0328 Steve Cheseborough	78
2019 0225 Steve Daggett	78
2019 0225 Steve Leathers.....	79
2019 0311 Steve Rauworth	79
2019 0218 Steven.....	79
2019 0402 Steven Chambers	80
2019 0218 Steven.....	80
2019 0401 Steven Rosenbaum	80
2019 0326 Stewart Buettner	81
2019 0331 Stone Doggett.....	81
2019 0328 Stuart Emmons	82
2019 0311 Stuart Johnson.....	83
2019 0311 Sue Ellen Liss	83
2019 0329 Sue Ellen Liss	83
2019 0226 Summer Boslaugh	84
2019 0311 Susan Bickerstaff.....	84

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with S



2019 0301 Susan McLawhorn	84
2019 0311 Susan Ferguson.....	85
2019 0326 Susan Ferguson.....	85
2019 0331 Susan Gilsdorf	85
2019 0000 Susan Gisvord	85
2019 0330 Susan Hayden	86
2019 0220 Susan Haywood.....	86
2019 0226 Susan Haywood.....	86
2019 0330 Susan Horky	87
2019 0318 Susan Mates	87
2019 0312 Susan Nolte	87
2019 0321 Susan Rosenthal.....	88
2019 0227 Susan Royce.....	88
2019 0327 Susan Westby.....	88
2019 0330 Susan Westby.....	88
2019 0303 Susie MacPherson.....	89
2019 0318 Sutter Wehmeier	89
2019 0311 Suzan K Ireland	90
2019 0315 Suzanne Clarke	90
2019 0312 Suzanne Moulton	90
2019 0315 Suzanne Steffen	91
2019 0306 Suzy Elbow	91
2019 0228 Sydney Herbst	92
2019 0327 Sylvan Clendenon.....	92



2019 0329 Sabolch Horvat

Comment: Dear I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project Committee, ODOT, and City of Portland,

I oppose the current plan for the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project,

Although I appreciate the effort so far in creating the i5rosequarter.org site, the open houses, and the public dialogue, I do not believe that the public input has been duly considered for the project.

I've read through many PDF attachments from the plan and I went entirely through the more recent online open house, but I do not feel that the materials released online are in a way that is easy to read for the average reader (or even to find which documents are relevant) in the amount of time provided for public comment. A few questions that arose for me which I did not find an answer to are:

(1) I did not find any reference for earthquake resilience requirements for the highway cover. This is worrisome as there may be many community activities planned on the new space. If the likely event of an earthquake does occur in our lifetime, the consequences would be devastating if this is not considered in the design.

(2) The noise mitigations mentioned, including barrier walls, seem insufficient as proposed. The planned noise mitigations for those living near I-5 appear to be suggested at the minimally accepted levels. A proposal that would gain support from the community should require specific higher standards, rather than the simple idea that "barrier walls could be added".

(3) The air pollution already exceeds allowable limits and endangers some of the most vulnerable people- school children whom attend schools near I-5. The projections of how the air pollution would continue over the years are not acceptable. When spending 500 million dollars to increase the comfort and safety of drivers, students should not a tertiary consideration. Let's do right for our future generations.

There are many more reasons why I oppose this project as it is currently planned.

There are better ways to spend \$500,000,000 ODOT funds which still qualify for the intended use of the funds. For example, No More Freeways PDX suggests, "\$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."

I hope that we can all learn from the proposed I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project. Some of the designs can certainly be utilized for future projects, and the learnings from how to engage a community in circa 2019 can be applied so that projects benefit the communities they impact.

I urge you to focus on safety improvements that do not require adding auxiliary lanes in this day and age.

Sincerely,



Sabolch Horvat

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Sabrina Gogol 2

Comment: I have two comments on the EA. 1. I request that ODOT conduct another EA, this time without the expanded version of the CRC in it, to determine what the actual improvements are to safety. I read this article from OPB and I feel like it points out why the current EIS for this project needs to be redone with better condition assumptions.

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

2. I request that ODOT implement decongestion pricing on I-5 before any further study or work to expand the Rose Quarter Freeway is conducted. Thank you for your attention to these requests.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Sabrina Gogol

Portland Bus Lane Project

Comment: I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project

Members of ODOT's I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project team,

We all recognize that our region's population growth has meant more private automobiles on the road and that

this congestion threatens our region's economic competitiveness and quality of life. Adding capacity on the the

Rose Quarter segment of the I-5 freeway is neither a short-term nor a long-term solution. Freeway expansion

has never solved traffic congestion--not in any city in North America over the last sixty years--and has often

made congestion worse at exorbitant and unnecessary cost.

Construction of the proposed auxiliary lanes will subject the region to years of congestion-inducing construction

in the Rose Quarter that will ripple outward--causing delays and detours across the region for bus riders,

pedestrians, and bicyclists. The very groups who are already making the choices needed to reduce congestion

will be severely and extensively impacted by the construction of this auto-centric project.



In response to the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project Environmental Assessment published by ODOT for

public comment on February 15th, 2019 and in recognition that the proposed project significantly affects the

quality of the human environment, the Portland Bus Lane Project requests that ODOT perform a full

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that includes analysis of meaningful alternatives to auto-centric

approaches. Prioritization of single-occupancy vehicles has significant adverse impacts on Oregon's ability to

meet carbon reduction goals enshrined in state law, as well as significant adverse impacts on public health in the

the local community. A full EIS should honestly assess and mitigate the potential negative, disparate impacts this

project may bring to the surrounding Albina neighborhood and the region as a whole. The methodology and

outcomes of these revisions should be made available for public review and comment.

The Portland Bus Lane Project asks ODOT to remove the addition of auxiliary lanes on I-5 from the I-5 Rose

Quarter plan and instead pursue the following two solutions:

1. Work with municipal, regional, business and community partners to implement decongestion pricing

on I-5 before any further study or work to expand the Rose Quarter Freeway is conducted. HB 2017

mandated that the Oregon Department of Transportation move forward with decongestion pricing

initiatives on I-5 and I-205. With overwhelming research indicating that decongestion pricing is the only

successful method of eliminating metropolitan traffic congestion, it is only sensible to move forward with

decongestion pricing first before spending nearly a half billion dollars on the Rose Quarter Freeway

Expansion. Our state's tight budget, our local neighborhood's air quality, our initiatives to combat carbon

emissions are reason enough for ODOT to demonstrate leadership and implement decongestion pricing



before spending at least half a billion dollars on freeway expansion.

2. Work with municipal, regional, and transit agency partners to construct continuous dedicated bus

lanes, protected bike lanes, and high-quality pedestrian environments on all roadways within ODOT

jurisdiction in the Metro region. Many of these ODOT-controlled roads have significant safety problems

and contribute significantly to regional congestion. ODOT has the opportunity to apply \$500 million to

address congestion systemically rather than applying an expensive and ineffective spot solution. Money

contributed by regional taxpayers must be spent on the most cost-effective infrastructure, infrastructure

proven to reduce congestion, air pollution, and carbon emissions. Given that, nationally, gold-standard

BRT lines cost approximately \$50 million a mile, our region would be better served by 10 miles of BRT on

our most congested corridors.

Combining these two recommendations provides significant opportunity to reduce congestion, emissions, and

public health threats, while improving safety on the region's streets and providing more equitable access.

Congestion pricing can create additional revenue that could be used to implement transit-priority improvements

and to construct dedicated lanes for existing and new bus lines and the Portland Streetcar. This project as

currently outlined in the Environmental Assessment document actually slows public transit through the

neighborhood, an unacceptable outcome for a \$500 million investment in transportation infrastructure.

The Environmental Assessment document, as provided, is inadequate. Our organization calls on ODOT to

recognize address this inadequacy with real solutions for the region's challenges. Should you wish to discuss the

destructive impacts of the proposed auxiliary lanes and how to implement the efficient solutions offered in this



letter, please contact our lead authors identified below.

Sincerely,

PORTLAND BUS LANE PROJECT

Sabrina Gogol, Sabrina.j.gogol@gmail.com

Jessie Maran, jessiemaran@mac.com

Attachments: [2019 0327 Sabrina Gogol ATT](#)

2019 0402 Sabrina Louise

Comment: Seriously. Please stop. No more freeways. No more expansion towards things that aren't sustainable. The future already looks grim. Let's promote light rail, mass transit, bike riding, streetcars. Let's recognize that WE MUST CHANGE, and freeway expansion is not the direction for change. Let's approve action and expansion for what's good for our air, our livelihood, our kids. NOT freeways.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0215 Sally Ridenour

ODOT

Comment: Just testing the form

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Sam Balto

Comment: Hi, my name is Sam Balto. I'm a PE teacher in north Portland. I've actually taught lo at King Elementary, so I'm very proud of her. Every day I ride my bike from northeast to north Portland. I go over the I-5 bridge and I ride Rosa Parks, and I'm incredibly grateful for the protected bike lane. I don't know if that was done by ODOT or the City of Portland, but it makes my life and my ride with my son who is one much more appreciative. So at my school we do safe routes to school. And it's an amazing program. And I often wonder why as a phys ed teacher am I so interested in infrastructure. And if you take a moment and think about PE when you were a kid, phys ed is all about getting children of different abilities to move in a space safely. And that is transportation infrastructure. How do we move cars, bikes, buses, light rail, pedestrians moving through the space of our city safely and appropriately? If we have student who is disruptive, off task, bullies and doesn't follow the rules, I equate that to cars. Why would we incentivize the mode of transport that does the most harm and damage to our community, to our children, to our families? So I'm very concerned because lo is my former student and my wife teaches at Tubman. She is a teacher who gets to look at all that exhaust that comes up. And with our new son, I'm incredibly concerned because she comes home telling me how she's lost her sense of smell. How she constantly has a sore nose. And so what are we doing



expanding this even closer to her office? I think money can be better used with safe routes to school funds, making it safer, and thank you for your time.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Sam Balto

Comment: I can't stress enough how much I am against the entire I5 Rose Quarter project. As a Portland resident I am furious with this whole process and the injustice that ODOT has kept information has been kept from its citizens. Oregon DOT does not value the lives and interest of resident of Portland. If they did they would put their funds to improving 82nd and N Lombard St which have caused the injury and deaths of many residents. No motorist has died in over decade from this section of I-5 but somehow we are putting our time and resources into drivers being able to drive fast which will cause more deaths.

On February 24th 2019 a high school student from Madison Park was severely hit on 82nd ODOTs managed street. Her family was able to raise \$3,533 with a gofundme page for her medical expenses. Why do we not value her life and the right to move as much as you value white Clark County, Washington residents right to drive as freely as they want on Oregon roads. We can easily solve this issue of congestion with a Congestion Pricing Toll on the I-5 & 205 bridge. Watch how quickly the Proud Boys stay out of Portland and keep their hatred and violence in Washington. You are supporting white supremacy and white nationalism by valuing white lives over everyone's right to live.

The fact that ODOT is about to spend over a half a billion dollars and have not completed an Environmental Impact Statement is disgusting and insulting. How have you not put time into making sure that the students and staff at the Harriet Tubman Middle School will be safe & healthy by this project. My wife is a teacher there and I can tell you that she has lost her sense of taste since she started working at the Tubman in August 2018. Other staff have also reported negative impacts as well. The burden of air quality should not fall on PPS. This is caused by ODOT, so ODOT should solve and pay for it.

I am also a teacher for Portland Public Schools in North Portland. I am the SRTS champion and I have the privilege to work with the students and families to encourage them to chose active transportation options to school. It is sad to see how poor the conditions are for my students to walk and bike to school while schools all across the state fight over scraps of SRTS funds. How is a student in a wheelchair suppose to get to school when none of the sidewalks are ADA compliant??

There are so many better ways to spend this money. Here is a list: new sidewalk, ADA compliant curbcuts, make transit free, provide a tax deduction for people who buy bikes or E-bikes (like you do for electric cars), create new protected bike lanes, dedicated bus lanes and fund all SRTS improvements across the state.

To conclude, highway widening projects like this have never solved congestion and Black Lives Matter.



Sam Balto

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Sam Chase

Metro

Comment: I'll just -- so people can see a little bit. I want to start with thanking you, for having the opportunity to be able to speak to you today. I want to start -- and so my name is Sam Chase. I'm a metro councilor. I'm the elected representative representing this area as well as the surrounding neighborhoods. And I want to start with acknowledging with the history of institutional racism that is a part of this community. It is something that a lot of us have been a part of.

Metro certainly has been a part of that in building the Convention Center hotel -- or not the hotel, the Convention Center originally. The federal government, the state government, ODOT, City of Portland have all been part of the process of really taking this community and transforming it into something else and displacing the residents that were here, the African-American community especially that was a part of this community. And so now we are faced with a project and moving forward a project in an area that is very -- it's a critical part of our economy in our region. It's a critical part of our livability of our region. The Rose Quarter is a transportation hub, a transit hub for the entire region. It's a place that people go to recreate, but it's also a developing job driver. The Lloyd District has seen incredible growth. It is a model for how you take a commercial district and turn it into a 24-hour residential district and it's growing and developing. And the livability of the community is critical to creating that job infrastructure. And so as we develop this project, as this moves forward, I think it's -- one of the lessons we've learned is we can't just focus on isolated objectives. We can't just focus on moving people through this part of the region quickly in their cars. We can't just even focus on the excellent advancements around a bike infrastructure. You know, we have to ask are we doing everything we can to improve opportunity to create a more livable community. To improve the opportunity for economic development; to improve the affordable housing opportunities that are incredibly abundant in this area and can take advantage of metro and other dollars that are out there to further those incredible needs. Are we addressing the air quality issues as robustly as we can. Are we addressing diesel particulates in the construction and in the long-term traffic impacts. And finally, are we addressing and doing everything we can to mitigate institutional and systematic racism that was a part of the creation of this. And, I guess in closing, I would also say that we really should be evaluating our congestion pricing strategies in the long term. What kind of congestion are we going to see if we do see advancements in tolling and congestion and value pricing. What is that going to do to our infrastructure and how will that change. And I know that Metro, for one, would be happy to stand up as a partner in evaluating those opportunities moving forward. And thank you again for your time.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0331 Sam Fader

Comment: I am writing in opposition to the I-5 widening project - because that's what it is, a widening of an arterial that already cuts down the middle of what vibrant neighborhoods. There are so many things wrong with the project.

I write as a resident of inner NE Portland but also as someone worried about the future of the planet and our future generations' ability to enjoy this beautiful city. I honestly believe we're all on the same page here, but there's some misguided intention leading you to believe that this freeway project is needed right now.

You've heard all these points, but I will make them again:

* Induced demand is a real thing. This expanded freeway will simply be congested again in a few years. That's basically a guarantee and has been proven over and over and over again. It's easy to trick yourself into expanding a freeway for perceived short term gain, but it won't last very long.

* The argument that air pollution will decrease because cars will be driving faster and thus less starting/stopping seems so flawed, but the freeway will be bumper to bumper again soon as you pull individuals from buses, bikes, and carpools since travel time will temporarily decrease. Again, induced demand. The fact is: more cars will be on the road if this happens.

* The misinformation and way you all are hiding data has been really upsetting. See this recent Twitter thread that sums it up way better than I ever could:
<https://twitter.com/maccoinnich/status/1107070933158653952>

You are losing a ton of credibility and withering respect for your organization through this misinformation campaign. It is tough to watch.

* Please listen to the organizations that have spoken out against the expansion, such as PPS and Albina Vision.

* I will never support a project that decreases the quality of bike infrastructure:
<https://t.co/ca49RFHkkl>

* It's so disheartening to see that you haven't done a full Environmental Impact Statement - the one you released just is not the full thing and does not cover all potential impacts.

* Slipping in that you are modeling traffic based on an eventual larger I-5 bridge between Vancouver and Portland in a footnote is slick. It's clear you know this project will not be supported by the community.

Please listen.

Sam Fader

Attachments: N/A



2019 0224 Sam Friedenber

Comment: As a 32 year resident of inner NE Portland, avid bicycle rider and I-5 commuter, I would like to add the following to the public record.

The arguments that the DOT promotes in favor of the Project seem inadequate for the spending of \$500 million, regardless of the federal component.

The speed of the commute will be very, very marginally affected. One or two minutes does not promote or hinder commuting.

The advantage to cyclists will be non-existent. Any cyclist can use alternate routes without physical risk. No new bridge is necessary.

The fact that many small accidents occur at the I-5 and I-84 merge is not a safety issue compared to the many other places where dangerous accidents occur.

I am disturbed about the spending of \$500 million on something that is just not necessary. In the meanwhile, there are many other projects that could use funding such as better bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure (roundabouts, bump outs, bike lanes, etc.), better public transportation options (for me to get to work in John's Landing on bus or street car is a nightmare) and parks, pools, rutted out streets, etc.

Thank you.

Sam

When someone says something, don't ask yourself if its true. Ask yourself what it might be true of. Danny Kahnemann

Attachments: N/A

2019 0225 Sam Grover

Comment: I'm a citizen residing in Portland, Oregon. I love this city and oppose the I-5 expansion.

Expanding the I-5 freeway does not address the issues of congestion. It is also counter productive to the urgent need to develop sustainable solutions for transportation that don't further contribute to climate change. I mean, it is literally going to become a highway to hell.

I urge you to move forward with the plans for improving the Rose Quarter without expanding I-5.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0326 Sameer Moudgil

Comment: I am an Oregonian, a husband, a concerned citizen and a member of the strong working middle class that this country is lucky to have. I am worried about our future, worried about the next generation and our impact on the present day environment. I want to make sure that I leave this planet in a better shape than when I arrived here.

Driving long distances every day in a polluting, sound proofed metal cabin with 4 wheels is not going to address any of my concerns above. This is not a life I lead on a daily basis and I wish more people had opportunities to break this cycle and think outside the box. With this project in discussion, we're being asked not to think forward but to look behind us and continue with business as usual. ODOT is asking us to shut up and let them take care of things while they spend half a billion dollars cementing the foreseeable future with a dying technology. This project will ensure that our next generation will inherit a dying civilization inhabiting a hostile environment made possible by their forefathers.

Have you read the 2018 Biennial report from the Oregon Global Warming Commission to the state legislature? It mentions that drought, flooding, heat, sea level rise and public health effects have arrived in Oregon. Guess which sector is the leading contributor to the state's greenhouse gas emissions - Transportation.

We need to treat transportation related emissions in this state as an emergency and work on resolving the problem until we see improvements. I want my tax dollars to be spent on these efforts rather than the highway boondoggle project that ODOT is hawking.

Please have ODOT submit a detailed Environmental Impact Statement and provide the data for public review. The average Oregonian needs all the data and plenty of time to make an informed decision on this issue.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Sameer Moudgil 2

Comment: This project is a highway boondoggle. There is tremendous amount of greenwashing of the data presented by ODOT here in this online open house. The agency seems to focus only on the multi-modal "improvements" that will result from this project while trying to hide their true intentions and goals. Let's be clear on one thing - this project is only designed to improve access for automobile drivers driving through the heart of the city of Portland. This project is nothing more and nothing less. Please do not paint the newly designed areas over the highway in green color to imply that we're creating a park. Please refrain from putting fake trees in your drawings when you yourself admit that your highway "lids" cannot support any landscape or building structures. This project is a colossal waste of money to improve access to a dying technology that doesn't work in dense urban centers. Imagine how many smaller projects can be financed with the half a billion dollars that we're planning to burn on this mistake of an urban interstate highway. Please consider the input from the residents that



used to live in these neighborhoods that were razed down to create this eyesore through a bustling city. We need to close this highway down and re-connect the city fabric, not widen it and invite more people to drive through. In the short term, please complete a thorough Environmental Impact Statement for this project and provide the data for public review. The current process of a rushed Environmental Assessment with missing details, short comment window and hidden ODOT agenda amounts to lying to the taxpayer and trying to cheat the general public. The only people this is going to benefit is ODOT staffers, private building contractors and people driving automobiles looking to race through downtown at 60mph as if it is a wasteland.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Sameer Moudgil

Comment: Why spend 500 billion dollars on this project when it only provides minimal improvements? What are the other options you've looked at that has us spend lesser money and still achieve bottleneck relief?

What about the construction period disruption? What are your mitigating strategies for the 5-10 years of construction activity?

All things considered, this whole project seems to be a very poor undertaking when you think about the return-on-investment.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Sandra Carlson

Comment: No expansion of the freeways!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Sandra Joos

Comment: I am strongly opposed to the Rose Quarter freeway expansion! According to ODOT's own consultants, it won't improve congestion. But it definitely would increase air pollution right in the backyard of the Harriet Tubbs middle school! This flies in the face of goals to reduce carbon emissions and reverse climate change. Decongestion pricing should be implemented before any further thought is given to freeway expansion. ODOT needs to release all pertinent data for public scrutiny, listen to the community that opposes this project, and abandon this misguided approach.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0402 Sandy Hickey

Comment: I do not believe that expansion is the route to take. We need to decrease traffic by alternative means. IE - max expansion, more bike lanes, maybe elevated bike paths over existing freeways, also the interruption of the east side esplanade is unacceptable as so many people use that as a current safe route to and from work.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Sandy McDonald

Comment: My name is Sandy McDonald, I have only lived here since 1975. I have watched the many changes happen to Portland. Some are positive some not. Certainly traffic has increased exponentially. But I do not support this action is absolutely going in the wrong direction. Given the significant threat of climate change...there are so many better ways to spend \$500 million dollars.

ODOT's own data does not support the safety concerns or the long term environmental decreases in emissions. Please perform an environmental impact study vs just an environmental assessment.

Lastly give the tremendous issues surrounding homelessness and affordable housing it is difficult to support this expenditure.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0304 Santiago

Comment: I do not believe that this stretch of road deserves \$450 million. There are more fatalities on roads such as 82nd (owned by ODOT) and ODOT could not care less about them. The recent deaths on this stretch of road are due to people with mental issues wandering into the freeway; a simple fence could solve this issue. It angers me that ODOT has misrepresented these facts just to bulldoze our city while wasting half a billion dollars while they are at it.

<https://www.wweek.com/news/city/2017/10/11/state-officials-say-i-5-in-the-rose-quarter-poses-a-deadly-danger-police-reports-undercut-that-claim/>

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Sara Bahmanyar

Comment: This project definitely puts the needs of car users over all other members of the community. Increasing freeway traffic near any middle school is irresponsible at best and malicious at worst, especially when that middle school services children from disadvantaged communities. The money that would be spent on this project should be spent on improving public



transit and encouraging walkability not increasing the number of cars. We should be doing everything in our power to decrease driving not increase it.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Sara Cochron

Comment: I am extremely concerned by the impact on the Eastbank Esplanade. The additional details and drawings I have reviewed indicate MAJOR impacts for this important greenspace. In addition to the simple fact that the 'closure' information is very vague, the additional noise and air quality impacts will be huge regardless of if it remains open the full way for all of construction. Lastly, the long-term impact of the I-5 expansion was based on a new CRC which is NOT HAPPENING anytime soon. I do not approve of undergoing a project of this magnitude when the overall positive impact will be minimal and the negative impact appears high.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Sara Rudolph

Comment: Nobody wants this who isn't making money off of it. Stop using the poor of Portland as funders for your pet projects. Full environmental impact statement please and focus on supporting non-petroleum based infrastructure.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Sara Ryan

Comment: Expanding the I-5 so close to Harriet Tubman Middle School would worsen the already-poor air quality students must contend with. This is an environmental justice issue. Freeway expansion is not the solution to Portland's traffic congestion.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Sara Walker

Comment: I want to voice my strong opposition to any project that expands existing freeways in the Portland community. Climate change is having and will continue to have life-limiting and life-altering effects on the health and mental health of our neighbors. We desperately need to limit, not expand, the single occupancy cars driven in our community. The exorbitant funds that would be allocated to this project could be much more productively spent on existing under-maintained roads and public transportation options. Portland and Oregon have an abysmal history of racist policy and practice, including those related to transportation justice and prior I-5 expansions. Marginalized communities are additionally burdened by disproportionate health and other effects of climate change. It is telling that communities of color (e.g., NAACP), as well as other health experts (e.g., Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility) are opposed to this project. We **need** to listen to the communities that will be disproportionately negatively affected by proposals such as this and listen to expert advocates.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Sarah

Comment: I strongly oppose expansion of the I-5 Freeway near the Rose Quarter. The enormous amount of money does little, if anything, to curb congestion and reduce traffic, like all freeway expansions. It's simple illogical math: build more capacity and that capacity gets filled. \$500M could transform Portland's bike and pedestrian network, as well as create viable enhancements to transit to move more people more efficiently throughout the city while making a positive impact on our climate. We don't need to move more single occupancy vehicles a mere mile? Less than a mile? Really? And for \$500M? You really have to ask yourself if this makes any logical sense. Let's move more people in ways that don't negatively impact the environment. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Sarah Bachman

Comment: I don't support the expansion of I-5 through the Rose Quarter.

It won't improve congestion, according to your own analysts. Why not try congestion pricing first?

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Sarah Cinnamon

Comment: I think it's a great idea! Especially if we can make electric cars more accessible and affordable. I'm not a bike person so I'm all for this.

Thanks,

Sarah

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Sarah Deumling

Comment: There are so many reason that the proposed freeway expansion is a bad idea. Instead of listing them all I will say that I am absolutely sure that climate change is the biggest threat we face and fossil fuel guzzling vehicles are a huge part of the problem. I badly want a livable planet for future generations and reducing our dependence on driving is a straight forward way to combat CO2 emissions which cause climate change. Let's do all we can with all



our collective creativity and imagination to encourage each other to get along happily without cars rather than asking for more cars and VMT with a freeway expansion.

Sincerely,

Sarah Deumling

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Sarah Deumling 2

Comment: I think this proposed freeway expansion is very misguided and urge you not to proceed with it. Climate Change is by far our biggest threat to a livable future. The only way we can hope to manage (if not stop) climate change is to stop burning fossil fuels - yesterday! which means getting out of our cars and off our freeways and using alternative modes of transportation, many of which are much more healthy. If there is money to invest in transportation please use it for encouraging various non-fossil fuel modes of transportation.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sarah Deumling

Attachments: N/A

2019 0313 Sarah Felix

Comment: This ill-conceived project should be stopped. There is evidence of possible adverse environmental impacts on vulnerable communities in the neighborhood and surrounding areas through increased auto traffic. This project adversely impacts an area that is historically minority population, and which has already been devastated by "urban renewal" projects and gentrification. There is no evidence that this project will reduce traffic congestion or accidents. The evidence is to the contrary. The project will expend an enormous amount of money that could be better spent elsewhere on greener solutions to Portland's traffic congestion issues. The impacts on Harriet Tubman Middle School alone are enough to stop this project. Other projects in Portland and elsewhere that have used this freeway expansion model have failed to achieve the goals of the project. I urge you to stop this project. Please withhold my address, email, etc. from the public record. You may use my name, and that I am a resident of the nearby Irvington neighborhood. Thank you very much.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0402 Sarah Gregorio

Comment: I am a resident of the Eliot neighborhood and I strongly encourage you to stop the freeway expansion project. We have a responsibility to try all other options first, especially congestion pricing. It is also unfair to the largely minority and disadvantaged youth attending harriett Tubman Elementary school. Finally, we have learned so much about the unsustainability of our current practices and need to think proactively about how to help the earth support us and cut down significantly on car traffic and fossil fuel use.

Please reconsider, stop the freeway expansion and work with the community to find more environmentally responsible ways to manage our transportation needs.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Sarah Iannarone

City of Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee

Comment: Dear Project Leaders and Policymakers,

Attached please find my comments on the Interstate 5 (I-5) Rose Quarter Improvement Project Environmental Assessment. I wholeheartedly request that you support our community by calling for an in-depth EIS process from ODOT and FHA.

Further, knowing what we know about the relationship between transportation and global warming, no 21st C. city leader who claims to value equity or climate action should in good faith support freeway widening in urban areas.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Iannarone

Portland, OR, 97206

Attachments: [Sarah Iannarone ATT](#)

2019 0401 Sarah Iannarone

City of Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee

Comment: Dear Ms. Channell, ODOT Staff, and policymakers on my behalf:



The “Environmental Assessment of the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project” (RQIP) provided to the public for review on February 15, 2019, is an incomplete and inaccurate evaluation of the potential impacts of ODOT’s proposed expansion of a freeway through Portland’s Central City. As such, I must stand with the numerous professionals, engaged community members, neighborhoods, and organizations who have worked diligently and highlighted extensively the flaws in your methodology, findings, and public process in insisting that ODOT proceed to a more rigorous and thorough accounting of RQIP impacts by preparing a full Environmental Impact Statement followed by a valid public review and comment period .

Contrary to your findings in the EA, public review of the RQIP has made abundantly clear that ODOT’s proposed action to widen an urban freeway through a historically disenfranchised community (Lower Albina), adjacent to a middle school (Harriet Tubman), and above a waterfront multiuse path (Willamette River & Vera Katz Esplanade) will not achieve its stated goals but will negatively affect the quality of the human and natural environment in the project area. The people of Portland deserve deeper, more reliable analyses of project impacts based on complete, relevant, and accurate variables and data sets; the opportunity to thoroughly understand and comment on any potential project impacts via a comprehensive, transparent engagement process; and the ability to shape alternative mitigation and remediation strategies currently lacking in your Environmental Assessment including but not limited to:

1. Implementing equitable congestion pricing with transit subsidies before undertaking urban freeway expansion projects, including RQIP. Traffic is worsening as our region grows, affecting our economy, environment, and quality of life. However, the phenomenon known as induced demand means that widening I-5 as proposed will not alleviate congestion near that interchange (or in our region); it will only increase congestion, pollution, and sprawl. Thus, it is imperative that ODOT collaborate with municipal, regional, business, and community partners to thoroughly implement and evaluate congestion pricing on this stretch of I-5 prior to further consideration of the RQIP. The RQIP should be considered only as a last resort once congestion pricing has been demonstrably proven inadequate to solve congestion and improve transit service. The EA dismisses analysis of a congestion pricing alternative on the basis that it will be considered at a future time. Such an excuse is antithetical to NEPA, which requires



reasonable forecasting and consideration of all reasonable alternatives.

2. Closing on-ramps to reduce fender-benders and ease congestion. Both PBOT and ODOT have acknowledged that given the principle of induced demand, the RQIP is not a project that can actually relieve congestion as proposed, so ODOT has shifted its marketing to emphasize safety concerns, noting accurately that there are a lot of fender-benders at the interchanges near Lower Albina and that reduction of these fender-benders would dramatically ease backups in the area. If reducing fender-benders and easing backup for the convenience of through-traffic is truly the problem for which we are trying to solve, a simple (much cheaper) solution is to reduce the number of cars merging onto I-5 in that area by closing adjacent onramps.

Ramp closures have been used to reduce congestion in other cities, yet the agencies overseeing this project have failed to fully evaluate this alternative in the EA.

3. Reallocating resources away from central city freeway expansion to high crash network intersections and orphaned highways across Portland in addition to 100% build-out of the city's bicycle and pedestrian networks. If ODOT truly cares about traffic safety and reducing the loss of life on thoroughfares in the Portland area, they would redirect the half-billion dollars allocated to this project toward safety infrastructure in places where serious injuries and loss of life to traffic violence is highest and work with PBOT on a fully-funded jurisdictional transfer of state "orphaned" highways to local control, where "Vision Zero" is the prevailing policy framework. The City of Portland's Bicycle Advisory Committee has strongly recommended the No-Build Alternative for I-5 RQIP (based on diligent analysis of very limited information provided in the EA), noting 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 in direct conflict with city planning goals.

4. Removal of I-5 freeway ("decommissioning") as the best option for local communities, regional prosperity, and climate action. Although the EA highlights a pattern of environmental injustice, racist policymaking, and displacement in lower Albina, it proposes nothing to adequately remediate the situation as it currently exists. In fact, it is likely to exacerbate dangerously poor air quality conditions adjacent to Harriet Tubman Middle School, a historically Black school that currently has a 40 percent African American student population,



according to Portland Public Schools (PPS) data. As Rukaiyah Adams of the Albina Vision Trust in her comments to you on this EA points out, only “remediation is remediation.” The buildable highway covers (“caps”) as currently proposed are insufficient to achieve the Albina Vision. Adams’ observation is supported by other engineering and design experts in our community who have pointed out that the caps as proposed are wholly inadequate to support housing, quality parks and green spaces, or improved air quality. The people of Lower Albina deserve far better than window dressing; the residents of Lower Albina (past, present, and future) deserve the very best remediation efforts physically possible in support of their vision for a vibrant, prosperous neighborhood between the Willamette River and Lloyd District. Mounting evidence from freeway removal projects around the world suggests that many of the fears involved with removing freeways are unwarranted; when considered alongside the many positive impacts of freeway removal, it’s clear that freeway removal has very little downside for cities. At this critical time in human and climate history, and given the history of inequity in Lower Albina, it is essential that ODOT consider the highest quality freeway removal option possible in an Environmental Impact Statement.

In conclusion:

It’s clear that the public is correct in demanding an EIS process from ODOT and FHA on the proposed RQIP. But we need to think beyond that: freeway widening projects like this one do not actually reduce congestion and/or improve safety. As a state, region, and city our priorities should be providing increased mobility options and improving street safety through investments in transit, walking, and bicycling. With the resources currently allocated to freeway expansion, the City of Portland could make investments that would result in substantial progress toward ensuring our city’s streets are safer, air cleaner, neighborhoods healthier, and giving people more affordable travel alternatives to driving alone.

In the last few months, many decision-makers have reminded our local community that the money earmarked for the I-5 Rose Quarter freeway expansion project is “ODOT’s money,” the result of the HB 2017 transportation package of taxes and fees intended to “Keep Oregon Moving” that was widely hailed as a successful measure to reduce congestion, maintain and improve infrastructure, and increase transit access statewide. Unfortunately for Portlanders, this bill was flawed for more than its regressive bike tax: no city in the 21st Century that



claims to care about the health of its people, place, or prosperity can in good faith sanction freeway building through its urban core, especially in the name of “safety” and “congestion relief.” HB 2017 includes not one, but three, urban highway expansion projects.

Portland’s Transportation Commissioner asserted at a public hearing recently (March 12, 2019, at Oregon Convention Center) in response to overwhelming opposition to the project as proposed and the EA as submitted: “This isn’t a PBOT project, this is an ODOT project. This money is from the Highway Trust Fund. As much as I’d like to spend half a billion dollars elsewhere. It’s not my money, and it can only be spent on highways. We can’t take this money and spend it on Vision Zero city streets.”

With all due respect, I heartily disagree: telling ODOT that we will not permit freeway expansions in our urban areas is precisely what Portland can and should do.

Portlanders like me who care about climate action and environmental justice stand ready to reprise our Freeway Revolts of the 1960s and 70s, insisting that our local policymakers withdraw municipal and regional support of the RQIP and negotiate with state and federal governments for more racially just, operationally effective, and environmentally sound allocation of transportation resources than those currently proposed in the EA. This political about-face is necessary to ensure Portland meets its economic, equity, climate action, and transportation safety goals in the near term and for future generations.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Iannarone

Member, City of Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee

Resident, Mt. Scott-Arleta Neighborhood, Portland, OR 97206

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Sarah Jesudason

Comment: This project cannot be approved until the EIS is made fully public.

No pixels were harmed in the creation of this email.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0312 Sarah Jurgensen

Comment: Oregon needs fewer cars on the road, not more. As a lifelong Oregonian, I do not want any of my tax dollars spent on freeway expansion. We know that higher speeds equal higher fatalities. If a freeway seems more convenient to use, it will increase usage and thus pollution, and will negatively effect the health of those of us living near this freeway. Globally we need fewer emissions and projects that support alternative transportation, such as tolls, mass transit, and safe places to ride bicycles without having to dodge cars. Oregon needs to stop giving incentives for driving, limit speeds of driving, and provide support for people to make different choices. Oregon needs to lead by example and act in a way that reduces climate change and planetary environmental breakdown. Too much driving has an obvious negative impact on Portland and the world. Oregon needs to do things differently.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Sarah Kincaid

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

This is NOT innovative, it's destructive and the opposite of the direction our city needs to move. More green options, more mass transit, more rewards for using it. NOT MORE FREEWAY.

Please, as a lifelong Portlander, as a parent, as someone who wants to live in a city that makes POSITIVE change, I ask that you reconsider this backwards plan that will do nothing to help us going forward.

Sarah Kincaid

Portland, OR

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Sarah Lind

Comment: I am opposing the Rose Quarter freeway expansion for a variety of reasons.

1. It isn't going to help traffic congestion.
2. I live in the neighborhood - I use this part of the freeway on a regular basis - BUT I do not want an increase in air pollution and disruption of regular traffic flows/public transit/bike lanes. We need to be looking at alternatives to just driving where possible to make this a more livable city. A bigger freeway smack dab in the middle of town will make Portland less livable.
3. It doesn't serve the interests of those who live in the area - potentially only the folks who commute through, but even then, it's not really serving their interests because it won't help congestion!

So please, for the sake of the community, neighborhood, commuters, and the environment, do not expand the freeway there.



Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0228 Sarah McKenzie

Comment: Bad idea!

Additional highway lanes does not relieve congestion. Do your homework.

The additional lanes and their construction would be harmful to students at Tubman, who already have more than their fair share of pollution.

NO HIGHWAY EXPANSION AS PLANNED!!!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Sarah McLeod-Martinez

Comment: Please do not widen I-5 in Portland. I rely on public transit and would appreciate \$500,000,000 was not spent on roads that would significantly lower my quality of life.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0219 Sara Mirk

Comment: I live in North Portland and am writing in with a public comment on the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion Project. I'm against the expansion because I think it's a misuse of money that is not the right priority for Portland's future. The biggest reason I'm against the expansion is the growing climate crisis. We need to transform the way we get around and use way less fossil fuels, otherwise the next generation will have to deal with environmental disaster. Instead of spending money to expand freeways, we need to be investing in ways to get around without cars and to make it possible for every Oregonian to feel safe biking, walking, and taking transit instead of driving.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Sarah Pearlman

Comment: I am especially excited about the proposed waterfront park as well as the care taken to acknowledge the historical displacement of past Albina residents. I am curious about the building that would be included on the cap. I would like to see some priority given to low-income or houseless residents as opposed to more multimillion dollar condos. I know Albina Vision's,



Rukaiyah Adams talked about including mix-income housing and it would be great to see that become a reality for this new space. I am also hopeful that this lid could mean greater access to public transit and hope to see an expansion of the MAX, either on this freeway lid or separately. I am curious what this project could mean for future advancements in public transportation. Would it be able to support a highspeed rail? Or does it need to? Finally, if there is priority for low-income housing, will there also be new supermarkets (like a Winco?) built? I'm sure you have all taken these things into account and I'm beyond excited for this project!!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Satya Vayu

Comment: I am writing to urge you to reject the freeway expansion proposal. In this time of climate emergency we must be choosing solutions that reduce car traffic and fossil fuel use as quickly as possible, not encouraging more of it. And there are many other reasons that freeway expansion is a bad idea.

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

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

Most crucially, 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 claims that this project will benefit the community, but continues to hide the data such benefits are supposedly based on, and makes it impossible for community groups to verify.



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).

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.

Finally, ODOT's truncated Environmental Assessment document simply isn't focused enough on the significant impacts to health and public safety this project represents. ODOT must study much more fully the more sensible alternatives (including decongestion pricing!) to this expansion with a full Environmental Impact Statement.

Thank you,

Satya Vayu

Portland, OR

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Saul Jones

Comment: To who it may concern,

Please do not expand 1-5. Every study I've seen indicates this will make traffic worse, not better. Furthermore, the damage it will do to the environment is not something we can accept at a point in history where climate change is the biggest existential threat facing humanity. Portland prides itself on its liberal views, but an expansion of 1-5 would go against the image we try to present of being environmentally conscious and will harm communities of color disproportionately with the extra pollution from traffic.

Saul Jones



Portland, OR

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Saumya Kini

Comment: Freeway expansion has NEVER solved traffic congestion--not in any city in North America over the last sixty years. In fact, it has often made congestion WORSE at exorbitant and unnecessary cost. Construction of the proposed auxiliary lanes will subject the region to years of congestion-inducing construction in the Rose Quarter that will ripple outward--causing delays and detours across the region for bus riders, pedestrians, and bicyclists. The very groups who are already making the choices needed to reduce congestion will be severely and extensively impacted by the construction of this auto-centric project. In response to the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project Environmental Assessment published by ODOT for public comment on February 15th, 2019 and in recognition that the proposed project significantly affects the quality of the human environment, I implore ODOT to perform a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that includes analysis of meaningful alternatives to auto-centric approaches. Prioritization of single-occupancy vehicles has significant adverse impacts on Oregon's ability to meet carbon reduction goals enshrined in state law, as well as significant adverse impacts on public health in the the local community. A full EIS should honestly assess and mitigate the potential negative, disparate impacts this project may bring to the surrounding Albina neighborhood and the region as a whole. The methodology and outcomes of these revisions should be made available for public review and comment. The time has passed for creating more of the same infrastructure that got our cities into this mess in the first place. Do the right thing for future generations--do NOT widen I-5. Instead, put the same money toward fixing and improving unsafe or uncomfortable pedestrian and cyclist routes, or toward better transit service. If you're tempted to write this suggestion off as idealistic, remember--the future is human, not vehicular. Now is the time to be courageous and continue to set an example for the rest of the country. Thank you for reading.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Saundra Schlesinger

Comment: All previous data show that building and expanding highways brings more traffic, not less. If congestion is the problem, then expansion is not the solution. A congestion tax is the only way to reduce congestion. People will not stop using the highway until they have to directly pay to use it. I understand that this puts a burden on those using the highway for transportation, so to ease that burden we must have effective alternatives in place, namely public transportation and safe cycling and pedestrian pathways. People stuck in traffic today will not be any less stuck in traffic after the expansion. If the goal is to cut congestion, then congestion needs to be addressed directly.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0401 Scott Biersdorff

Comment: I'm disappointed after reading the Environmental Assessment for Rose Quarter project. Specifically the EA fails to properly evaluate the project in two ways:

It does not properly analyze the no-build option. By including traffic projects for the project under the assumption that the Columbia River Crossing project has been completed it cannot truly assess the project's effects. It is hard not to conclude that this was done to make the project capacity improvements seem more necessary – just like this project will be used to justify any future CRC proposal. This is a very serious mistake and will lead ODOT on a binge of freeway widening – each project hoping to address a new bottleneck created by the increased traffic funneled into it from the last project.

It does not consider the anticipated congestion pricing of I-5. Unlike a potential CRC project (around which there is no consensus and which lacks funding) congestion pricing is authorized by the State and could be implemented much more quickly. Including a highly speculative project (CRC) but not a resonantly anticipated one (congestion pricing) fatally biases this report. I can only conclude this was done to make this project seem more worthwhile than it would in an unbiased analysis of the alternatives, as the completion of the CRC project would increase congestion in the project area whereas congestion pricing would reduce it.

These two grave omissions from the report negate any conclusion it makes about the impact of this project on either traffic patterns, CO₂, or local pollution levels. Oregonians deserve better from ODOT, and I urge it to reevaluate this project and advance an alternative that reduces CO₂ regionally compared to the status quo (not some hypothetical future where this region has already greatly expanded its freeways), aligns with the city of Portland and Metro's mode share goals and wins the support of Portland's bike and pedestrian committees.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Scott Clyburn

Comment: Dear ODOT,

Portland has the opportunity to grow as a city in climate-conscious ways – unlike Los Angeles or even Seattle. Expanding a major freeway through the heart of our city is antithetical to not only this vision, but to the raw data.



To pursue this project against the sentiment of the community, in lieu of a full Environmental Impact Statement, and in the absence of a close look at alternatives like decongestion pricing, is reckless and corrupt.

I urge you to reconsider.

Yours,

Scott Clyburn

Resident, Taxpayer, and Small Business Owner

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Scott Cohen

Comment: I have serious reservations about the Environmental Assessment, since it does not account for future congestion pricing. Considering that the EA uses all of the projects in the region's transportation plan to project trips in the future, why couldn't the impact of congestion pricing - an ODOT initiative that will significantly impact this stretch of I-5 - be included in the assessment? Without including the single most effective tool at mitigating congestion and thus air quality and vehicle miles traveled, the EA has completely failed to accurately determine the impact and need of this project. Go back and include congestion pricing in the EA and let the public know how that impacts the need for the project.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0000 Scott F. Kocher

Forum Law Group

Comment: Some people have said this is a "bottleneck" where the freeway "slams down to two lanes" each way. In fact, north-south freeway capacity balloons through Portland because 1-5 operates together with 1-205 and 1-405 for a total of seven through lanes each direction for through and commercial traffic plus auxiliary lanes. How many is enough?

This project would tear up 1-5, causing years of delays. By the time that's done, changes in vehicle technology, private vehicle use and ownership, and commuting habits will have changed. Anyone who pretends to know what the "demand" for freeway travel in 10 or 20 years will be is kidding themselves, or us. The people who pretend to know are the ones who make income from expanding freeways.

I run a law firm, which is an employer small business in Portland downtown. We generate revenue and attract lawyers who are specialists who serve the entire state. This national talent doesn't come to Portland because we have big freeways. Portland's competitive advantage is clean air, forests, beaches and snow. ODOT's agenda to keep expanding freeways is a threat to our communities and natural environment that make Portland a valued place.



ODOT calls this an "improvement" project and promotes it with a web site that has a .org designation (i5RoseQuarter.org), suggesting it is somehow a non-profit. The web site features pictures of pedestrians and bicycles. This is greenwashing, and it confirms for many that ODOT is manipulating the process to promote a pre-determined agenda that is rooted in a 20th century freeway-building mindset. We know better than that.

Please hear us loud and clear. No more freeways.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Scott F Kocher

Forum Law Group

Comment: As a second generation Oregonian, Portland business owner, and person who cares about our future, I urge ODOT to proceed promptly with tolling and not to expand 1-5 through the Rose Quarter. Here's why:

There is no safety basis for this project. There is no history of serious crashes on 1-5 in the Rose Quarter. ODOT has not tried basic safety measures to reduce the minor crashes that have occurred, such as advisory speeds or video radar to reduce top end speeding. Our safety dollars are better spent elsewhere on ODOT's network, such as SE 82nd Avenue, SE Powell Boulevard and the other high crash corridors that ODOT operates within Portland.

As for reliability, fender benders will slow the freeway even if ODOT adds more lanes. Unreliability due to minor crashes is inherent to freeways, and a reason we need other ways to bring workers to central Portland, such as light rail and bus transit, and pedestrian and bicycle corridors that are safe and comfortable for everyone. Advisory speeds and automated enforcement are proven to eliminate the top end speeding and the speed differentials that contribute to fender benders. We simply can't jump to spending this kind of money for a marginal improvement in freeway reliability.

Some people who support this project think it is for capacity. ODOT acknowledges that capacity won't significantly add capacity. And if it does, that's not good. We know that adding capacity will induce demand, and nobody will get there faster. Adding capacity for private vehicles to come onto P01iland' s surface streets is not the future we want.

ODOT has a lot of pictures of lids and trees to make this project look nice. Nobody is going to use the small, noisy, smelly lids for anything. They're a waste of space and money.

There is no reason to tie surface street improvements to the freeway expansion. If ODOT says we can't have surface street improvements unless we agree to the freeway expansion that we don't want, that's a false choice and ODOT should be ashamed.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Scott Hillson

Comment: No more freeway expansions! Find other ways to reduce congestion (effective,



comprehensive, and fair tolling)

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Scott Hillson

Comment: No more freeway expansions! Find other ways to reduce congestion (effective, comprehensive, and fair tolling)

Attachments: N/A

2019 0219 Scott Kocher

Comment: This is a freeway expansion. Stop pretending the surface street improvements are wanted. hey are just greenwashing. Toll to generate revenue and provide freight and transit priority. Don't waste our \$0.5 billion on this backward-looking boondoggle. The EA is incorrect in assuming no induced demand. What is the impact when 700 plans for that?

Attachments: N/A

2019 0219 Scott Kocher 2

Comment: Thank you for asking for public comments on the Rose Quarter freeway expansion. I think it is a bad idea and should be scrapped because:

Tolling and better speed enforcement would solve all the problems you claim to be trying to address. Instead of costing \$500 million, tolling would generate revenue that we can use to help the people who are hard hit by current transportation inequities, and invest in our future.

We know that by the time you've finished digging up the freeway (years of disruptions) the transportation landscape will have changed. If you're honest you can't claim to know how it will have changed. What we actually need then may well not be more freeway lanes to bring private automobiles into central Portland.

You need to include I-405 and I-205 when you talk about how many north-south freeway lanes we already have.

Freeway expansion encourages people to drive farther and drive more. The extra lanes you want to use my tax dollars to build are just going to fill up.

We need the money for other things. So many other things.

By tying ped/bike improvements to this project and claiming "environmental benefits" you are not fooling anyone.

ODOT has a terrible reputation in Portland. This is only making it worse.

Scott



Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Scott Lieuallen

Comment: If you expand I-5 through the Rose Quarter, the great likelihood is that within a few years or even sooner, the freeway will be as congested as it is now. Do we really have a half a BILLION dollars to spend on a fantasy? We should at least try to improve our prospects for the future by managing traffic with congestion pricing and investment in public transit before we spend \$500,000,000 on something that hasn't worked anywhere else.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Scot Scott Mizée

Comment: April 1, 2019

Ms. Megan Channell

Major Project Manager Oregon Dept. of Transportation

Ms. Emily Cline, Acting Environmental Manager

Federal Highway Administration

RE: Comments in Opposition to Rose Quarter 'Expansion' Project and Environmental Assessment dated February 15, 2019

Dear Ms. Channell and Ms. Cline,

I stand firm in my belief that the Rose Quarter Improvement I am a North Portland Resident of more than 15 years. I have traveled through and commuted to work through this corridor nearly daily for much of that 15 year period.

I am deeply troubled by the results of the EA and the way ODOT is conducting itself as it marches onward over the people of Portland to push this project forward. The reasons I oppose this project are too numerous to mention here and I know others are already providing specifics that I do not need to repeat here.

This project does not achieve the goals it purports to pursue. It has negative effects on our city, our children, our public transportation system and our walking and biking infrastructure. I support the Albina Vision and this project does not in any way make it easier to move that



vision forward into reality.

This project does not recognize the proven reality of induced demand and is a waste of our taxpayers time and money.

Please bring it to a stop now without going further.

I conclude my comments below with one final quote from a woman who is directly effected negatively by this project with her personal property.

Sincerely,

Scott Mizée

Portland, OR 97203

mizees+NOI5RQ@gmail.com

And Betsy Reese feels like ODOT didn't fulfill their end of the bargain when it came to promises made around the I-5 Rose Quarter project:

"My husband and I own the property known as Paramount Parking that is being taken by ODOT to create the new Hancock/Dixon.

My decades of bicycle and pedestrian safety advocacy, much of it specifically surrounding the notoriously dangerous

Broadway/Flint/Wheeler intersection, apparently made us an easy mark for cooperation in the original design phase of this project. Allowing a bicycle and pedestrian ROW to be acquired through our property was represented as the fix to one of the most dangerous intersections in the city for bikes and peds.

Several aspects of the project that we were led to believe would improve our city are now missing or negatively altered on the current plan.

The new bike infrastructure was to be two-fold, promising:

– 1. The new Hancock-Dixon street that would run through our property would provide a safer, lower-stress route from N. Portland to the Broadway Bridge.

Instead, the new Hancock-Dixon St. will be an auto thoroughfare



with painted bike lanes at a 10% grade that is now acknowledged by ODOT as likely being so unappealing to and unused by cyclists that they are not even indicating it on the maps they use in presenting active transportation infrastructure upgrades.

– 2. Additionally, the original plan showed two new MUPS running on ODOT property connected by the new Hancock/Dixon lid over I-5 that would effectively replace Flint Ave. The new off-street bike/ped paths were to connect the stubbed-off Flint at Tillamook to Broadway west of I-5.

Instead, of the two proper MUPS, one is completely missing, although ODOT said at March 4th meeting that it is still a “possibility”, and the other is not a MUP, but what I call BS. – BS stands for Bikes on Sidewalk – what engineers do when they can’t figure out what to do with bikes. This one is an elaborate and cramped 5%-grade switch-back MUP that will pit pedestrians and bicyclists against each other, and that few cyclists will use more than once.

This plan of passing through our property was represented as the solution to the need for a safer more comfortable bicycle route from North Portland to the Broadway Bridge.

Instead, it’s, ‘No. Sorry. It’s the Vancouver/Broadway/I-5 Freeway intersection for you, bicycle riders.’

– Yes – this is the route 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 from Vancouver to Broadway across the freeway off-ramps. Given the number of daily bike commuters on this route – the highest in the city – I think it highly unlikely that the 90-degree turn into the jughandle and waiting for the light in the staging area will feel like



an improvement over the right turn onto Broadway from Flint that we have now.”

Source: BikePortland.org

Attachments: [2019 0401 Scot Scott Mizée ATT](#)

2019 0401 Scott Murray

Comment: I fully support modernizing and streamlining our existing road infrastructure for efficiency, but please- do not move ahead with any *expansions* of existing roadways. Let's first eliminate existing bottlenecks.

Thank you,

Scott Murray

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Scott Simpson

Comment: Pave the roads we have. 82nd Ave us full of potholes. This city has horrible roads and we want to expand a highway? Vancouver BC has the same population as Portland but has expanded faster and have less cars entering the downtown core than in the late 1960s. I lived there for 4 years and found that it was quite easy to get around despite no highways through town. Highway expansions just add more cars and pollution and does little to abate congestion. Build it cars will fill it. Waste of my money!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Scott Strickland

Operating Engineers Local 701 union; Columbia Pacific Building Trades union

Comment: Hello, my name is Scott

19 Strickland. I was a proud resident of Portland for
20 about six years until I moved to Estacada recently.
21 I am here in behalf if the Operating Engineers Local
22 701, as well as the Columbia Pacific Building Trades
23 unions. The building trades unions are a coalition
24 of building construction trade unions representing
25 workers all over the state of Oregon and some in
southwest Washington, and we have a dedicated



2 interest in this project. Not just because of jobs
3 but the impact that it can have on our communities,
4 both through people having family wage jobs and
5 availability to that, to build careers to bring
6 self-determination back into their communities, but
7 also for the environmental concerns and other
8 concerns.
9 When I see 2.5 million hours a year, I see
10 that as more time spent at home with your kids, more
11 time spent on your life with your projects, and it
12 is improvement to the lives of the working people in
13 the state of Oregon that we are interested in. I
14 think that this process is wonderful and that we're
15 bringing in all manner of people to address the
16 injustices of the past and look at the needs of the
17 community in the future, and that this ticks all of
18 those boxes; environmental concerns, transportation
19 concerns, growth concerns, the housing crisis. It's
20 sort of an important first step in solving the nexus
21 of all of these issues. So out of respect for the
22 community members, I yield the rest of my time.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Scott Simpson

Comment:

Hello, my name is Scott¹⁹ Strickland. I was a proud resident of Portland for²⁰ about six years until I moved to Estacada recently.²¹ I am here in behalf if the Operating Engineers Local²² 701, as well as the Columbia Pacific Building Trades²³ unions. The building trades unions are a coalition²⁴ of building construction trade unions representing²⁵ workers all over the state of Oregon and some in southwest Washington, and we have a dedicated² interest in this project. Not just because of jobs³ but the impact that it can have on our communities,⁴ both through people having family wage jobs and⁵ availability to that, to build careers to bring⁶ self-determination back into their communities, but⁷ also for the environmental concerns and other⁸



concerns.⁹ When I see 2.5 million hours a year, I see¹⁰ that as more time spent at home with your kids, more¹¹ time spent on your life with your projects, and it¹² is improvement to the lives of the working people in¹³ the state of Oregon that we are interested in. I¹⁴ think that this process is wonderful and that we're¹⁵ bringing in all manner of people to address the¹⁶ injustices of the past and look at the needs of the¹⁷ community in the future, and that this ticks all of¹⁸ those boxes; environmental concerns, transportation¹⁹ concerns, growth concerns, the housing crisis. It's²⁰ sort of an important first step in solving the nexus²¹ of all of these issues. So out of respect for the²² community members, I yield the rest of my time.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Sean

Comment: Please do not follow through with this plan. As a community member I see nothing to gain here and so much to lose.

Environmental concerns are on the top of some many citizens priorities and investing in infrastructure for fossil fuels is not something we support.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Sean Abplanalp

Comment: Hi Megan, I just wanted to say thank you for helping to make the Rose Quarter Exit a better place. Traffic's been so bad these last years, it will be nice to see the change. Thank you! Sean Abplanalp

Attachments: [2019 0226 Sean Abplanalp ATT](#)

2019 0325 Sean Clearley

Comment: The freeway expansion is a paltry smokescreen for someone getting paid off. There is no available data to say it will work, there is no community that wants it to happen, and there is no reason that ODOT should HIDE the rest of the data that is not available.

The only reason that all of these would be in place, and the freeway continues, is because of graft. Is this wrong? Is this slanderous? Don't care. Much more is at stake than someone's face-saving CYA shuffle because of some payoff.

The freeway expansion is grim, the freeway expansion is not wanted by ANY citizens of the state, and the freeway expansion will destroy our environment.

Take your bribes, your freeway expansion is killing your children. Quite a trade.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0331 Sean Crowe

Comment: Good morning,

Strong evidence suggests that increasing road capacity causes a commensurate increase in traffic,

negating the effects of the expansion. Do not expand the I-5. Spend the money on biking and public

transit. There is still a lot of work to be done on the city's bike infrastructure.

Thank you,

Sean Crowe

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Sean Hellebusch

Comment: I feel this project is irresponsible and will only further our current issues. We should be putting out money in sustainable urban mobility, not additional lanes. Not to mention that this project has used statistics that involve the Columbia River expansion that was squashed many years ago. That kind of misinformation is irresponsible. Please stop misinforming the public.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Sean Malone

Comment: Please find attached testimony for the I-5 Rose Quarter Draft Environmental Assessment. Please

place the testimony and attachments into the record. Please respond and indicate that testimony

and attachments have been received and placed into the record.

I have also had the vast majority of my attachments submitted physically on a thumb drive by Chris

Smith. The file located on the thumb drive is labeled "SM."

Thank you,

Sean Malone

Attorney at Law

Attachments: [2019 0401 Sean Malone ATT 1](#); [2019 0401 Sean Malone ATT 2](#); [2019 0401 Sean Malone ATT 3](#); [2019 0401 Sean Malone ATT 4](#)



2019 0401 Sean Sean McClintock

Comment: The Environmental Assessment is not sufficient. I call upon ODOT and the City of Portland to undertake a full Environmental Impact Study. We need to fully explore alternatives to freeway expansion -- which this project certainly is despite any protestations to the contrary -- including how the implementation of congestion pricing would impact traffic patterns. Not to mention the fact that the model used in the current assessment is woefully incorrect, using traffic data from a non-existent Columbia Crossing bridge! We need a massive overhaul of the Oregon Transportation Commission and the Oregon Department of Transportation. Highways should be the project of last-choice given our need to shift away from carbon-based transportation solutions. That half a BILLION dollars (and likely more as few projects come in at budget) should be spent on other forms of transit. I-5 through Portland should be shut down, reclaimed, and all traffic routed down the I-205 bypass. And I say that, living right next to I-205. Yes, it will greatly impact my ability to drive my car, but it is a sacrifice we all need to make. Along with shifting land use regulations to add Missing Middle housing and add more affordable housing stock, greatly adding capacity, speed, and efficiency to our mass transit, we need to make it more onerous to live far from your work and driving. We need to be forward-thinking and progressive so we build the city and the region that supports a sustainable world. Please stop this boondoggle of a project that ODOT is trying to force down our throats by withholding data and designs until the majority of the public comment period is over. I don't know if it is incompetence or corruption or a little of both, but there needs to be consequences either way for how this project has been mishandled.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Sean McDougal

Comment: Please, it is vital to the well being of those of us who work and live in Portland and surrounding areas to improve the capacity of our infrastructure, currently strained under rapid increase in population and lack of real expansion in decades. The commutes in and around Portland are awful, and it is driving away employers and workers from the area.

Don't buy in to the pipe dream that bad infrastructure will force people to use public transportation- that shows a complete lack of understanding of human nature and the existing behavioral evidence. Public transportation is a waste of resources that could better be spent on increasing the road capacity for drivers, since drivers are the ones already paying for it and deserve better infrastructure.

-Sean

Attachments: N/A



2019 0402 Sean Rea

Comment: I am a resident of the Boise-Eliot neighborhood and remain steadfastly opposed to this project. This project will only bring more pollution and congestion to the area and I have a hard time finding the benefit in that. Alternatives, such as demand pricing, should be fully researched and tested before committing this project.

It is also clear that ODOT has mismanaged the project and been lazy at best and outright dishonest at worst when it comes to discussing the traffic projections. Based on that alone, I strongly believe that a full environmental impact statement needs to be conducted before this project proceeds any further. We need to know the effect such an undertaking will have on all road users -- such as transit users, pedestrians, and cyclists -- not just motorists.

Sincerely,

Sean Rea

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Sean Sendelbach

Comment: This project will have minimal impact on Portland's congestion woes (which are undeniably bad, and getting worse) or epidemic of traffic fatalities (ditto), despite ODOT's claims. Additionally, spending half a billion dollars on this freeway expansion has a significant opportunity cost on our ability to invest in transportation systems that actually support Portland's stated goals to lead on climate, provide cleaner air, support healthy communities, build infrastructure for affordable housing and invest resources equitably across the city.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0000 SeoVadmNG

Comment: Здравствуйте! Хочу предложить вам продвижение вашего сайта в поисковиках, методом наращивания ссылок. Чем больше ссылок будут ссылаться на ваш сайт, тем выше он будет в выдаче по вашим ключевым запросам. Для работы мне необходимо лишь ссылка на ваш сайт и ключевые слова, по которым вы продвигаетесь в поисковых системах. Если у вас установлена метрика, тем лучше, можно взять (скачать) оттуда ключи за последний месяц или квартал.

Работа занимает примерно 2-3 недели, после которой вы получите рост позиций, доверие поисковиков, увеличение траста вашего сайта, посещаемость, более 1000 ссылок на ваш сайт с различных ресурсов.



Стоимость – 9900 рублей.

Заинтересовались? Пишите на Email: prohrum*[*mail.ru](mailto:prohrum*@mail.ru) (уберите звездочки *).

Подробнее обсудим.

С Уважением к вам, Вадим.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0219 Sergio Acena

Comment: I'm a Portland resident and I oppose freeway expansion. Freeway expansion is a flawed idea, over and over cities find that widening freeways to reduce traffic just leads to more cars on the freeway and whatever gains made are lost. ODOT's own consultants found this. As climate change threatens our nation and community more and more ODOT needs to think about ways to make transportation easier for people in the Portland Metro without leading to an increase in carbon emissions. I don't own a car and so I rely on biking and public transit to get around, if the current plan goes forward and the Flint Avenue crossing goes away it makes the city harder for me to get around.

Thank you for reading my comment.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Seth Alford

Comment: Hi, I'm Seth Alford. I from Raleigh Hills, which is in unincorporated Washington County. I've been living in the Portland area since 1984. I am opposed to the Rose Quarter freeway expansion. The point I want to emphasize is that if this project is approved, don't expect an extra lane in the freeway, and the covers, and the active transportation features to appear the next day. Instead there will be four to five years or longer of construction. Based on my past experience with ODOT bicycle detours and what ODOT does for bicycles, specifically with Scholls Ferry Road and 217 during the construction project, if this project is approved, despite what ODOT's representative said earlier, I expect the bicycle infrastructure will be demolished first and rebuilt last. Effectively during the construction period, bicycle transportation in this area will be cut off. Furthermore, during the construction there's going to be delays and lane closures and additional traffic problems created by the construction itself. That idling motor vehicle traffic during construction will further enhance the greenhouse gases that this project will produce. If the project is being justified as reducing greenhouse gases through better traffic throughput, you have to count that idling traffic during construction against that hypothetical improvement. A better low-cost solution would be decongestion pricing as you have heard. In the meantime, spend the money you were going to spend on this on local projects that fix bike lanes, especially on Barbur. Fix the Beaverton-Hilldale, Oleson-Scholls intersection. Again, again I'm opposed to the Rose Quarter freeway expansion. Thank you.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Seth Blum

Comment: As someone who lives, works, and drives near the Rose Quarter, I am very very strongly opposed to this idea. My family and I all suffer from severe allergies and asthma, which is directly affected by freeway pollution. I drive through the proposed freeway widening area every day, and though the traffic can be frustrating, there is no reason this expansion needs to happen. It wouldn't even solve the congestion problem, as overwhelming evidence demonstrates. It's an exercise in futility. It will have a negative effect on our city and the Earth. Please, please reconsider. Oregonians are ready for sustainable solutions, like congestion pricing. We don't want more car traffic. We want a future for our children, our city, and our planet.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Seth D Alford

Comment: At the hearing about the EA, we heard from an ODOT representative that they would provide bicycle detours around the project.

I testified that based on my past experience with the ODOT project on Scholls Ferry Road at 217, we should expect that bicycle infrastructure during construction will be demolished first and rebuilt last. So, I expect bicycle transportation during most of the 4-5 years of construction of this project will effectively be cut off.

I wasn't able to show this during the hearing, but I did make a video of what the construction at Scholls Ferry looked like. Here's a link:

<https://youtu.be/X5CXjrufAg8>

This is just one reason I am opposed to this project. Other reasons I'm opposed include those pointed out by others, such as promoting climate change, induced demand, and that demand tolling should be tried first.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0324 Seth Pellegrino

Comment: What's the best way to dig yourself out of a hole? Well, step one is to stop making the hole deeper. We know that adding freeway lanes can not reduce congestion. Ultimately, more capacity just allows for more people to be congested at the same time. We must stop thinking of traffic volume as an unstoppable external force: it is a dynamic response to the choices we make. We will solve all traffic, forever, by doing nothing more or less than making different choices. Congestion pricing, vehicle-miles traveled (VMT) fees, eliminating parking and road subsidies, changing our housing options, and providing alternative infrastructure all have a



role to play in unwinding this spring. "Adding capacity" has been tried, and we understand its effects. We know that the money would be better spent elsewhere. By your staffers' own admission, this project is unlikely to improve safety, but widening a freeway to pump more cars into our already-overstressed arterials will harm vulnerable road users. If safety is ODOT's priority, 82nd, Barbur, and Powell are a few of ODOT's high-crash properties in the Portland area that are also deadly to pedestrians. For \$500m we could overhaul significant portions of these dangerous corridors. We know that freeways sicken us: 2.5-micron and 10-micron particulate matter (PM2.5 and PM10) consist of not just combustion products, but tire fragments and brake dust. Electric vehicles (EVs) will produce comparable levels of particulate matter to internal combustion engines, and the emerging link between PM2.5 and even non-respiratory diseases like diabetes suggests to me that we are not paying enough attention to this problem. This project's proximity to the Harriet Tubman school alone should be enough "environmental impact" to stop it! We know that the clock is running out on climate change, and we can no longer afford to deny the reality that highways are fossil-fuel infrastructure. EV sales are nowhere near high enough to replace the 4.1 million registered vehicles in Oregon any time soon, and what's worse is that EVs are mainly powered by fossil fuels. As energy usage outpaces renewable growth, new marginal demand (like when an EV owner plugs in their car for the first time) must be satisfied by burning more coal or natural gas. Your environmental impact statement claims a decrease in emissions from this stretch of highway, but it fails to account for emissions generated elsewhere, included the effect of the projected increase in nearby transit times. With atmospheric carbon dioxide approaching catastrophic levels and transportation accounting for 40% of Oregon's emissions, I have to wonder why we would build a stretch of road that must go unused in order to meet our climate objectives? This ain't it, ODOT. This ain't it.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Seth Smigelski

Comment: Hello,

I live on the edge of Portland & Milwaukie. Even as someone who mostly gets around by car, I oppose expanding the freeway.

Take a trip to sunny southern California if you want to see how well enlarged freeways do at reducing congestion...

ODOT is good at building freeways. It's what you know, but freeway expansion should be a last resort - only used if boosting other forms of environmentally-friendly transportation are somehow unsuccessful.

This is a terrible way to spend money.

If you really want to reduce congestion in PDX... how about untangling the traffic flow the east side of the Ross Island Bridge. Shouldn't there be a ramp onto I-405 instead of the bonkers street route?



Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 shane.a.stricker

Comment: I'm writing to remind you that it's 2019. Not 1960. We have learned that tearing up Portland with our highways was a costly mistake. Please stop putting money into it. Instead focus on the real reason people love living here: walking and biking safety and infrastructure.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Shannon Robalino

Comment: I am strongly opposed to this freeway expansion. Time and time again, research evidence has shown that expanding freeways and building more roads does nothing to alleviate traffic congestion. It does, however, increase the number of cars on the road and pollution. At a time when we should be moving more people towards more sustainable forms of transportation to limit the climate crisis, building a freeway expansion is the wrong thing to do. The city knows this.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Shannon Sullivan

Comment: Do not consider further construction or addition to the I-5 corridor. Consider further environmental impact studies, as well as implementation of congestion pricing. Further more, public transit affordability and wide-spread use (via fareless transit, perhaps?) should be considered and implemented before decimating the community and our shared environment with more roadways only for automobile vehicles.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0215 Shara Alexander

Comment: This project is primarily about adding freeway lanes. When you add freeway lanes you increase the number of

people driving on freeways, and that's a fact. You have only encouraged single vehicle miles. That you would

suggest that this project will reduce carbon emissions just tells me how far from reality you all are willing to stray.

Truly you live in a world of make believe.

Another hilarious spin on safety- adding speed to the freeway will increase safety and reduce deaths? The pedestrian



overpass money could be spent elsewhere. The pedestrians who died crossing the freeway were in a mental

health/drug and alcohol crisis. If you want to try to prevent those kinds of deaths, please invest in treatment

programs, not freeway lanes.

So disappointed in your greenwashing of this nonsense. I'm not buying it, and neither are most Portlanders - hence

we elected Jo Ann Hardesty. This is just about moving freeway drivers through faster so they can get to their

outlying homes / Vancouver tax haven.

These hundreds of millions could be spent elsewhere and actually improve human health.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment,

Shara Alexander

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Sharon Birrel

Comment: I am speaking out as a Portland native against the proposed I 5 freeway expansion in North Portland. Climate change is real and the biggest threat facing us at this time. I have observed the changes over time in this area including the effects of increased wildfires and drought. It is deeply troubling. We should be working towards sustainable non carbon emitting transportation options. Sustainable forms of alternative transportation and walkable, liveable neighborhoods should be the focus, not expanded LA style freeways. To accommodate more carbon emitting traffic is counterproductive in light of the undeniable climate science.

As a native of this area I have always thought of Oregon and Portland in particular as leaders in environmental stewardship. As the city continues to grow we must keep environmental and human impact in the forefront especially when considering large impactful projects such as this. Adding freeway lanes that accommodate more carbon fueled vehicles, especially so close to a middle school, is simply not the answer. A full environmental impact study that addresses environmental and human impact of this project needs to be completed and the results be made available to the public before any action is taken by ODOT on this project.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposed project. I sincerely hope you will take this opinion under consideration.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0311 Sharon Miller

Comment: Please do not implement decongestion pricing, as it disproportionately affects low income families. Working to reduce traffic in other ways seems advisable, by increasing public transportation options.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Sharon Nasset

Economic Transportation Alliance/Third Bridge Now

Comment: I Testified At The Oregon Transportation Commission
March 21, 2019 Concerning How The Rose Quarter
Environmental Assessment Process

It is imperative that a Full Environmental Impact Statement be started immediately.

The Environmental Assessment for the Rose Quarter, I-5 and I-84 area has been all outreach and NO REACH IN for the public. Divide and conquer

The very fact that the hearings and “informing briefings” have been on the news stations as contentious, overly crowded, with picketing, signage, speeches, and marches demanding our BASIC CIVIL RIGHTS for a Full Environmental Impact Statement

I found it easier to drive to Salem and make my comments about the process in front of the Oregon Transportation Commission then to attend the “opportunities” and the way the citizen public comment process was being handled. I would like my video testimony to be added to the formal citizen comment for EA of the Rose Quarter.

I testified at the Oregon Transportation Commission March 21, 2019 concerning how the Rose Quarter Environmental Assessment process and citizen comment on the EA that it has not been good and the project should not continue. The OTC link is below I spoke 22 minutes and 45sec
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I1Ekb6-FQM&t=1665s>

The growing chorus of civic organizations, elected officials, neighborhood associations, business associations, and individual stating numerous significant environmental issues with the “proposal” plans the departments of transportation have cobbled together from several plans, years old, and studies that have never been though a thorough NEPA Process Environmental Impact Statement.

Sharon Nasset Economic Transportation Alliance / Third Bridge Now 503.283.9585

Sharonnasset@aol.com

Attachments: [2019 0401 Sharon Nasset ATT1](#); [2019 0401 Sharon Nasset ATT2](#)



2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 2

Comment: Significant interest in the Environmental Assessment clearly states the imperative need for a full Environmental Impact Statement to take place immediately.

Attachments: [2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 2 ATT](#)

2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 3

Comment: Please add to the formal citizen comment on the I-84 Environmental Impact Statement A~1

Attachments: [2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 3 ATT1](#); [2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 3 ATT2](#); [2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 3 ATT3](#)

2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 4

Comment: Please add to the formal citizen comment on the I-84 Environmental Impact Statement A~2

Attachments: [2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 4 ATT1](#); [2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 4 ATT 2](#)

2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 5

Economic Transportation Alliance/Third Bridge Now

Comment: A Need For Study: Separate attempts to "study" the Environmental Assessment study boundaries over the decades are numerous pointing to the ABSOLUTE need for an Environmental Impact Statement

on any project being considered to go forward.

In the 1980's the Oregon and Washington Legislators came together and stated that the I-5 Freeway through

Portland was over capacity for the volume, speed of a freeway, and was rated F on FHWA traffic flow charts.

The I-5 freeway failed, even after the opening of the I-405 Freeway By-pass. This led to putting in metered

ramps as a "temporary solution" sending additional freeway traffic overflow onto the surface level streets

adjacent to the I-5 and I-84 freeways.

The freeway Ramp Meters as a "temporary" solution started decades ago in the 1980's.

Since then several committees, study groups, and plans have developed because of the numerous traffic volume

problems in the area, stating the need for a comprehensive plan and a full EIS.



After decades of redirecting traffic the majority of the surface level streets in the area have failed. Unable to

handle traffic levels, pushed onto local neighborhood streets that are not equipped to for high capacity vehicle

usage levels.

In 2001 the I-5 Portland / Vancouver Transportation and Trade Partnership (I-5 Partnership) Environmental

Impact Statement boundaries from I-5 and I-84 freeways in Portland to I-5 and I-205 in Vancouver WA was

shorten to the Bridge Influence Area removing the area south of Columbia Blvd. through the Rose Quarter

Area. Stating the complexity of the two areas was to great for one Environmental Impact Statement and

recommendation to start a process for the Rose Quarter Area needed to be addressed separately.

In 2006 the Columbia River Crossing Environmental Impact Statement boundaries from I-5 and I-84 freeways

in Portland to I-5 and I-205 in Vancouver WA was shorten to the Bridge Influence Area removing the area

south of Columbia Blvd. through the Rose Quarter Area. Stating the complexity of the two areas was to great

for one Environmental Impact Statement and recommendation to start an EIS process for the Rose Quarter Area

needed to be addressed separately. *See Clark County Board of Commissioner December 18, 2006

2010-2012

I-5 Broadway/ Weilder Facility Plan

North/ Northeast Quadrant Plan

And other neighborhood plans

At least 70 “alternatives” mostly likely components where recognized by this Environmental Assessment

Separate attempts to “study” the Environmental Assessment study boundaries over the decades are numerous

pointing to the absolute need for an Environmental Impact Statement on any project being considered to go



forward.

The challenges in this one small area demand

A Full Environmental Impact Statement

The NEPA process states the need for an Environmental Impact Statement

When significant Environmental effects MAY OR Will occur

The confluence of commerce, transportation, event centers, shopping center, restaurants galore, and

vibrate residential neighborhoods, schools, parks, old and new homes, justify a full EIS

~~ All of the below complexes, transportation infrastructure, PLUS schools, parks, historical structures,

and residents are inside the Environmental Assessment Area and directly adjacent.

No major plan that encompasses these high traffic needs of these complexes has been done.

This area of North and Northeast Portland has regional, national, international, and local traffic plus

being the area of the I-5 freeway system with the largest amount of accidents, congestion and pollution in

the entire state. The pollution and noise levels in the area exceed national health requirements. The start

of the I-84 Interstate Freeway to the interior of the United State and crossing the country is a tremendous

economic benefit.

This part of our neighborhood has the two Interstate Freeways I-5 and I-84 it also HOST :

The I-405 freeway Fremont Bridge and ramps

The Emanuel Hospital complex covering several blocks, once a residential neighborhood

The Lloyd Center first mall in America, once a residential neighborhood

The Veteran's Memorial Coliseum complex, once a residential neighborhood

The Rose Quarter complex and parking lots, once a residential neighborhood

The Oregon Convention Center complex, once a residential neighborhood

The federal government 911 building complex, once a residential neighborhood

With these large complexes

Approximately 5 large hotels with parking lots and several tall apartment complexes evolved.

Construction of light rail and streetcar systems.



~~ All of the above complexes, transportation infrastructure, PLUS schools, parks, historical structures,

and residents are inside the Environmental Assessment Area.

No major plan that encompasses these high traffic needs of these complexes has been done. A comprehensive

Environmental Impact Statement is necessary.

It is Wrong to make our community BEG for our civil rights to an Environmental Impact Statement. We are the ones to decide what is significant to us and significant enough to have a full Environmental Impact Statement done. To know what will be done to us, our children, schools, parks, and the effects! Basic Human Rights respect us.

Attached Clark County Board of Commissioner letter dated Dec 2006

FHWA Citizen Guide to the NEPA process

NEPA Process Chart showing EIS necessary if there May or Will Occur

Sharon Nasset Economic Transportation Alliance / Third Bridge Now 503.283.9585

Sharonnasset@aol.com

Attachments: [2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 5 ATT1](#); [2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 5 ATT2](#)

2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 6

Comment: Please add to the formal citizen comment on the I-84EA and need for Environmental Impact Statement Historic 4(f) Historic Resources: NOTE NO ATTACHMENT PROVIDED

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 7

Comment: Please add to the formal citizen comment on the I-84 Environmental Impact Statement A~3

Attachments: [2019 0401 Sharon Nasset 7 ATT](#)

2019 0327 Shawn Fleek et al

OPAL - Environmental Justice Oregon; Neighbors for Clean Air; 350PDX



Comment: I-5 Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion Letter - Public Comment. <<Submitted by NMF>>

Please find attached an op-ed published in BikePortland.org co-authored by representatives from OPAL - Environmental Justice Oregon, Neighbors for Clean Air, and 350PDX. We wish to submit this to the record for public comment in opposition to ODOT's proposal to widen the Rose Quarter Freeway.

A Year of Bad Headlines for Freeway Expansion: Public Comment on ODOT's Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion Project

(A slightly modified version of this letter was originally published as an Op-Ed in BikePortland.org on February 18, 2019. <<Footnote 1>> We are eager to submit this for the public record on the ODOT Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project).

In 2017, the nascent No More Freeways coalition published an editorial in The Oregonian asking elected officials for an honest reassessment of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)'s plans to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to expand the Rose Quarter Freeway in North Portland. <<Footnote 2>>

Since then, headlines over the last eighteen months have only confirmed that this is a gravely misguided project.

Last March, the Portland Mercury reported ODOT's own consultants concluded the Rose Quarter freeway expansion wouldn't have any discernible impact on congestion. <<Footnote 3>> This finding may be counterintuitive, but it is a textbook example of the concept of "induced demand," a phrase transportation planners use to describe the phenomenon in which more lanes of freeways only lead to more eager motorists electing to drive. The Mercury also reported that, despite requests from advocates and elected officials, ODOT has refused to study whether decongestion pricing initiatives could solve the corridor's gridlock by itself, without wasting hundreds of millions on a widening project that does nothing to reduce congestion.

Secondly - as a result of induced demand, our community will suffer from worse air quality and pollution. In May, Willamette Week detailed the alarmingly poor air quality at Harriet Tubman Middle School. <<Footnote 4>> Researchers suggested students should avoid outdoor recess, and yet ODOT plans to literally expand I-5 into the backyard of the newly-reopened school. The latest studies on air pollution are grim - poor air quality is linked to lung disease, poor student performance, <<Footnote 5>> heart disease, dementia <<Footnote 6>> and diabetes. <<Footnote 7>> ODOT speaks to the importance of healing the Albina neighborhood's scars from urban renewal, but it is impossible to heal these scars by further polluting air near children's classrooms. Speaking of public health, ODOT has tried to sell the freeway widening as a safety project. But last October, Willamette Week punctured these phony claims, concluding that the stretch of freeway in question hasn't seen a traffic fatality in over a decade. <<Footnote 8>> Meanwhile, ODOT's regional arterials remain shockingly dangerous and deadly.

Finally, squandering half a billion dollars widening a mile of freeway is an egregious form of reckless climate denialism. We've all felt the unease that permeates our communities when our



neighborhoods are cloaked with the wildfire smoke that has draped itself through the Willamette Valley three of the past four summers. October's IPCC report warned that phasing out fossil fuels in eleven years was essential to avoiding the destruction of society as we know it. Last month's reporting by The Oregonian suggests that even with passage of pending carbon legislation, Oregon won't hit carbon reduction targets without fundamentally reducing emissions from private automobiles. <<Footnote 9>> It is frustrating to watch self-proclaimed environmentalists in City Hall and Salem champion freeway expansion when 40% of Oregon's carbon emissions come from transportation. The hurricanes, fires and floods are only growing stronger.

Expansion of this freeway represents a complicit willingness to ignore Oregon's responsibility to future generations and the planet.

Future headlines will only make it more self-evident that spending billions on freeway expansions across the region is a wholly inappropriate use of taxpayer dollars given the daunting challenges Oregon faces. We encourage Oregonians committed to cost-effective governance, our children's lungs and the planet our children will inherit to join us in asking ODOT to conduct a more thorough Environmental Impact Statement that more rigorously studies the significant impacts this project will have on our community.

FOOTNOTES:

1 This op-ed is available online at <https://bikeportland.org/2019/02/18/guest-opinion-a-year-of-bad-headlines-for-freeway-expansion-295697>.

2 "Portland leaders have a choice: increased congestion or courageous leadership (Guest opinion)" The Oregonian: https://www.oregonlive.com/opinion/2017/09/portland_leaders_have_a_choice.htm

3 "A New Report Shows Highway Widening Won't Solve Portland's Congestion Woes" Portland Mercury: <https://www.portlandmercury.com/news/2018/03/07/19724128/a-new-report-shows-highway-widening-wont-solve-portlands-congestion-woes>

4 "A Middle School Prized by Portland's Black Community Would See Its Poor Air Quality Worsen With a Rose Quarter Highway Expansion" Willamette Week: <https://www.wweek.com/news/2018/07/04/a-middle-school-prized-by-portlands-black-community-would-see-its-poor-air-quality-worsen-with-a-rose-quarter-highway-expansion/>

5 "How Car Pollution Hurts Kids' Performance in School" CityLab: <https://www.citylab.com/environment/2019/02/air-pollution-kids-health-data-school-academic-test-scores/581929/>

6 "Researchers warn a common air pollutant is a driver of dementia, even at levels below current EPA standards" Washington Post

https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2018/09/05/researchers-warn-that-common-air-pollutant-is-driver-dementia-even-levels-below-current-epa-standards/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.341e73c33e2e



7 "A Frightening New Reason to Worry About Air Pollution" The Atlantic:

<https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2018/07/a-frightening-new-reason-to-worry-about-air-pollution/564428/>

8 "State Officials Say I-5 in the Rose Quarter Poses a Deadly Danger. Police Reports Undercut That Claim." Willamette Week: <https://www.wweek.com/news/city/2017/10/11/state-officials-say-i-5-in-the-rose-quarter-poses-a-deadly-danger-police-reports-undercut-that-claim/>

9 "With emissions on the rise, Oregon falls well short of greenhouse gas reduction goals" The Oregonian. <https://www.oregonlive.com/politics/2018/12/with-emissions-on-the-rise-ore-htm>

Attachments: [2019 0327 Shawn Fleek et al ATT](#)

2019 0327 Shelby Ness

Comment: Hello,

I am writing to express my opinion regarding the I5 expansion. I think the expansion of the I5 Rose Quarter corridor is exactly opposite of what this city needs and pretends to be about. Portland is supposed to be a green, forward thinking city working towards reducing climate change, yet expanding the highway corridor to give cars the advantage, while leaving buses in the dust and climate change causing pollution is in contrary to this. Portland needs to focus on ways to get more people taking public transportation and out of single occupancy vehicles. As this city grows, the citizens do not want to see it grow into a Seattle or LA. We do not want to see bumper to bumper traffic, or congestion and rush hour traffic. To best avoid this, we need to prioritize buses. When the city prioritizes buses, the citizens prioritize the bus. If a bus is sitting in the same traffic that single occupancy vehicles are sitting in and going no where, people will continue to drive. When a bus is zooming by single occupancy vehicles and those drivers see bus riders arriving to work faster than those sitting in their cars, they will get out of their cars and take the bus. In order for this to happen, Portland needs to spend the money that is allocated for the highway expansion on dedicated bus lanes. It is simple really. Reducing climate change and reducing the dependency on single occupancy vehicles should be the top priority of the city and dedicated bus lanes are a sure fire way to do this.

Put your money where your "green" mouth is Portland. Step up and prioritize the bus and reducing single occupancy vehicle use by prioritizing public transportation.

Thank you,

Shelby Ness

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Shelby Schroeder

Comment: I think that planning for the I-5 expansion at Rose Quarter should be halted based on the lack of transparency ODOT has provided; the known environmental impacts of highway



expansion; the proof that expansions don't curb congestion; and because planned congestion pricing may achieve the intended results. Most importantly, ODOT's secretive inflation of congestion figures by presupposing a 12-lane Columbia River Crossing is a violation of ethics, and calls into question why ODOT is pushing so hard for this project.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Shelby Simmons

Comment: I say no to the freeway expansion. What we should be expanding is public transit options, more bike and pedestrian lanes. Why add more pollution anyway? Portland and Oregon can do better.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Shelley Allan-Cole

Comment: I urge you to put this freeway widening project on hold and examine other solutions to congestion. I believe that this will make congestion worse. We need to be looking at climate sensitive solutions.

I am also concerned that the project will cost a great deal more than what you propose. We will also negatively impact neighborhoods, schools, and traffic during construction.

I don't see this project as a step toward improving transportation in Portland or in Oregon in general.

Please halt this widening project now, give more time for input and take a 21st century point of view to solve traffic congestion.

Thanks for listening,

Shelley Allan-Cole

Attachments: N/A

2019 0227 Sherry

Comment: What happened to Oregon progressive GREEN thinking?? Why do humans have to destroy environment for its own selfish reasons- better driving?? Hello, put a train on the internet; make people pay huge driving fees- THINK of something other than making our carbon footprint bigger- what happened to OREGON, my OREGON- is it only Californians now who control our vision of a NEW GREEN WORLD? STOP now, why is it that we have to accommodate everyone that wants to move here- so you and your friends can line their pockets? That what it seems like as NO thought is being given to the rights of animals, trees and the environs of Portland. SHAME ON YOU.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0402 Sherry Bohannon

Comment: What city do I live in? I thought it was PORTLAND. The Portland I helped build believed in things like GREEN spaces; reduction of toxic substances into the air, water or earth; no I-5 bridge without planning for mass transit; growth boundaries. Where am I now? I can not believe you would consider this expansion. Is all of California now in key positions in the Oregon system that once fiercely cared for our beautiful state? Really, people will come so we must build and expand? Only those who are solely concerned with profits are in power it seems. This is not the city that I helped build, disaster awaits for the generations that follow- I thought we had a plan to keep the greedy and the gas guzzling out of Oregon for generations to come- that spirit has died and California has arrived to destroy our state just like they did their state. You who would make such a decision as expanding the freeway will not have a different legacy- we came, we destroyed, we didn't think, we just reacted.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Sherry Salomon

Comment: We do not need the freeway expanded. We need to find solutions that are environmentally sensitive and do not destroy the air we breathe and destroy our quality of life.

Expansions, at best, are temporary. Soon we will need more and more expansions leading to the destruction of our lives and the environment.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Shika Kimura

Comment: Please invest in public transportation and the MAX. Express service and stops would be an obvious choice. Also instead of freeway expansion, please improve current infrastructure.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Shirley Gibbons

Comment: Build a road and cars will come. I gave up my car and driving several years ago. This is not an option for everyone, but I see nearly every car with only the driver..no passengers. Trimet provides excellent service almost 24 hours a day. Try it! You might like it. Let someone else drive.

I am a very senior citizen. Lifelong Portlander. Most folks my age should have given up the right to drive long before. Remember that owning a car and driving are precious privileges, not rights.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0401 Simone Crowe

Comment: To Whom It May Concern, I am very concerned about the proposal to widen I-5 in Portland, please do NOT spend \$500 million on a project that will contribute to climate change, degrade public transit and hurt our public spaces.

We know that widening this freeway will do nothing for traffic congestion in the long run. It will only induce demand and set our city's traffic problem back. It will only mean more air pollution in the Rose Quarter.

Instead, let's invest this money in bike lanes, public transportation, or even closing roads. At the very least, invest it in updates to east Portland roads.

From equity, climate change and transportation perspectives, this freeway expansion is a bad idea.

I urge ODOT to conduct an EIS.

Simone Crowe Portland, OR

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Sohpia Cain

Comment: Please don't expand the freeway! We already have some of the worst air pollution and this will just make it worse. What we need is better public transit options and safer biking routes to get cars off the road. Please don't disrupt our city traffic with this unneeded expansion. It will be a massive waste of money and it won't fix the problem. Look at the research!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 Soren Impey

Comment: The claims that this project will significantly enhance multimodal service are not credible. The project eliminates a high quality ped/bike-friendly bridge (Flint) and replaces it with a steep and less accessible crossing. The bike improvements on Williams and Vancouver also seem minimal. Why no improvements on Broadway and Wiedler?

The analysis of air toxics and pollutants is also not credible. Why were there no analyses of pollution levels on the caps and on the new crossing infrastructure? The decrease in pollution relies on the premise that vehicle idling would be reduced. This is ridiculous given the likelihood of induced demand. Moreover, many vehicles no longer idle. Given that these new two lanes are likely to fill up this ill conceived project is almost certainly to increase pollution, increase climate-destroying motor vehicle use, and increase the stress and harm to Portlanders living in this area of NE Portland. Please reconsider this terrible project.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0402 Soren Impey

Comment: The City of Portland and the metro region have committed to reducing greenhouse gas (GHG)

emissions by 80% by 2050. Oregon has also committed to a 75% reduction in emissions by 2050. Because transportation represents ~40% of emissions in Oregon and Portland, ODOT's proposal to expand the I5 freeway near the Rose Quarter makes a mockery of these goals. The principle of "induced demand" has been repeatedly replicated and indicates that this highway expansion would stimulate increased driving and increased vehicle emissions (<https://www.citylab.com/transportation/2018/09/citylab-university-induceddemand/569455/>). Thus, ODOT's proposal to build two additional highway lanes is a form of dangerous and quixotic climate change denial. Moreover, the transportation modeling conducted in ODOT's EA is not credible at all.

Instead of using Portland and the metro region's transportation and climate action plans as the basis for modeling, ODOT concocted a model where all infrastructure, including the canceled CRC, would be built and utilized. This is absurd and patently in bad faith! The city of Portland has seen significant reduction in vehicle miles traveled since the 1990s and its stated goal is to reduce VMT by over 60% by 2050 (<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/531984>). It is deeply insulting to Portland residents for ODOT to fabricate a model that ignores past trends and shamelessly dismisses the City's own transportation planning.

The planned improvements in public space and active transportation infrastructure are also "shams". For example, the loss of the flint avenue bridge – a direct and heavily used connection – and its replacement with a kafkaesque facility with an unusable ~10% grade is horrifying. The freeway caps are nothing more than left-over construction equipment that are unusable as buildable space and make virtually no effort to connect with the existing streetscape. And many of the other "alleged" cycling and pedestrian improvements on surface streets completely fail to mitigate the risk of crossing multiple lanes of fast moving traffic.

Adding additional lanes is not compatible with the city's stated goal of encouraging multimodal traffic and discouraging driving.

I urge ODOT to cancel this ill-considered, unneeded, and over expensive freeway expansion. This revenue must be used for transportation projects, such as light rail, that genuinely take



into account the region's transportation needs and a more sustainable future.

Sincerely,

Soren Impey

Attachments: N/A

2019 0306 Sorin Garber

Comment: I'm having difficulty finding the Transit Technical Report which is referenced in the ERA. The New and Library tab has a link to Environmental Technical Reports and below that is a link to Transit - Appendix A. The material in that link are descriptions of figures. I'm looking for the detail that supports the analysis of transit operations described on pages 68 and 69 of the EA.

I left a voice mail this afternoon with the same request.

Thank you.

Sorin Garber

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Spencer Alan

Comment: I am a resident of Portland and I oppose the Rose Quarter expansion project.

It is hard for me to think that my typed words here will have any impact on the outcome of this discussion. There are far more learned folks than me who also oppose this project but who know and have studied induced demand, congestion pricing, environmental impacts, and climate change. I am afraid that the cacophony of voices in opposition, growing louder and more pained, will be ignored. I wish I knew the magic combination of words, the correct things to write, that would change the minds of the people who can pull the plug.

We, collectively, have the power to build the society we want to live in. I may not know the magic words to stop this project but maybe I can paint a picture of what the society I want to live in looks like to me.

I want to walk around my neighborhood unafraid of being stuck and killed by a motor vehicle.

I want to bike to work unafraid of being struck and killed by a motor vehicle.

I want to sit outside and breathe unpolluted air.

I want to walk along the Willamette river to the sounds of birds and water, not cars and trucks.

I want open plazas, cafes with ample room for outdoor seating reclaimed from streets, pavement turned to grass and trees.



I want enforced lower speed limits, fewer streets dedicated to vehicle traffic, dedicated bus lanes, expansive light rail.

I want a government that sees the insanity in expanding a freeway that would never suggest such a thing in the first place.

I am a resident of Portland and I oppose the Rose Quarter expansion project. Please, do not do this.

- Spencer Alan

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Spencer Bushnell

Comment: I am writing to express my dismay at the proposed highway expansion in the Rose Quarter. I am firmly opposed to enabling more induced demand. Expansion will induce demand and further cement (literally) our city, region, and country in an archaic transportation system.

More needs to be done to combat climate change and enabling more vehicles to travel burns more CO2 and creates more climate change. We need to implement congestion pricing now prior to any expansion. In addition, removal of the Flint avenue bridge makes absolutely no sense whatsoever. Countless pours of concrete went into that along with vast amounts of CO2. Why don't we continue to use that as a facility?

Furthermore, any project in this area should enable re-knitting the street grid and allow building high density buildings on top of the Rose Quarter road sections so that we do not waste more valuable urban land space on SOV's.

Any road project must allow rapid mass capacity transit as well. It does no good to have a bus sitting in traffic.

Please perform the Environmental Assessment / EIS as dictated by current law.

This is a boondoggle that will instantly be filled with greater volumes of traffic (just like the LA freeway expansion years back).

Thank you

Spencer Bushnell

Attachments: N/A

2019 0320 Spencer Kroll

Comment: The expansion of the I-5 in the Rose Quarter will not solve the traffic problems that Portland is experiencing. The expansion of freeways only creates a situation where more cars fill up the roads and gridlock will still exist. This will not solve the situation. Where more



investment needs to be spent is at the Columbia River crossing. This is the only spot where I-5 shuts down between Canada and Mexico. This bridge needs to be re-built as soon as possible. Additionally, major investments in the improvement of city infrastructure, such as expanding the max throughout southeast Washington and separate bus only lanes, need to happen. This will more effectively help to mitigate traffic than expanding a freeway and enabling continued gridlock.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Staci Monroe

CoP BDS

Comment: On behalf of the Portland Design Commission, we want to thank you for the excellent briefing on March 7, 2019. We also commend you for your continuing work with community members and other stakeholders through the alternatives analysis to-date. It's important that this project accomplish the community urban design goals as identified in the project vision. Below is a summary of our concerns and recommendations to you as you proceed into the next phase:

1. Overall urban design: From our perspective the potential to re-connect and rebuild the community that was lost is paramount. Therefore, the design of the infrastructure is critical and should support these efforts.

2. Pedestrian/Bicycle Features: We commend the effort to improve pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area, but we do note a few areas of concern:

---Some of the intersection corner radii appear very driven by large vehicle turning criteria and not pedestrian safety. On the preliminary plans, these features seem to coincide with unusually wide pedestrian crossings. Higher potential turning speeds and less pedestrian queueing area could lead to a place that does not encourage walking or a safe walking environment. This project should embody more of PBOT'S urban street standards that have evolved to accommodate multimodal mobility.

--- Street design should employ current best practices used by PBOT in existing street re-design and new street design projects throughout the city. Highway geometric design should not encroach into the surface streets of this project. 3. Highway Covers: The concept of covering over a trenched highway to re-connect urban districts is a strong idea and critical to re-establishing a viable neighborhood structure. However, the cover configuration as currently show is flawed in several ways:

---Fragmented, staggered lid shapes due to structural span or ventilation constraints (or other?) are not valuable or useable as open space and are not sized or shaped to accommodate new air rights buildings. The way to re-establish continuity of street level experience from east of I-5 to west of I-5 is to provide continuous public sidewalks and commercial uses at street level. We are at a point in Central City Portland where new fragments of landscape open space that are not programmed with activities, don't have an adjacent active use that spills out to occupy, don't



have visual cues as to ownership of the space, and don't have a robust management and maintenance program are more liability than asset. Un-housed citizens, substance abuse victims, and a lack of mental health services all produce a population that seeks out unclaimed fragments of public space to set up temporary living. That outcome is not going to advance the re-connecting and re-birth of Lower Albina Neighborhood. Central Open Space: the proposed one-block park space shown in the concept simulations is potentially ill-conceived. Active ground floor uses in future buildings are across very busy traffic streets and essentially cut off from activating the proposed park. Passive activities like strolling, sitting, small gatherings, eating lunch, etc., will all be subject to significant noise impacts of both the surrounding surface streets, highway entrances and exits, and the mainline freeway itself. The covers as illustrated aren't extensive or continuous enough to provide effective noise mitigation. An active building use like offices with ground floor retail or common rooms would seem to have a higher chance of providing continuity at this critical block. The project team should look further into structural capacity for a low-rise commercial building here. 4. Noise Barriers: We have a concern about the possibility of noise barriers against sections along the east edge of the freeway as planned. In the effort to re-connect a fragment of an original neighborhood to a larger, intact adjacent district, physical and visual continuity are important. Buildings with active ground floor space, adequate sidewalks, street trees and amenities all contribute to a continuous experience. However, visual continuity of neighborhood on either side of I-5 is also important. More detail is needed, but it should be noted that noise walls are typically 10-12' tall and made of dense material like concrete to provide noise mitigation. These will isolate the two sides of the neighborhood, to their detriment. Consider transparent noise barriers or other alternative configurations that don't cut off views between areas.

The Commission's feedback is based on the Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines, the approval criteria that applies to most of the project area. Specifically:

- A3: Respect the Portland Block Structures
- A5: Enhance, Embellish & Identify Areas
- A7: Establish and Maintain a Sense of Urban Enclosure
- A8: Contribute to a Vibrant Streetscape
- B1: Reinforce and Enhance the Pedestrian System
- B2: Protect the Pedestrian
- B3: Bridge Pedestrian Obstacles
- B4: Provide Stopping and Viewing Places
- B5: Make Plazas, Parks & Open Space Successful
- C1: Enhance View Opportunities
- C4: Complement the Context of Existing Buildings
- C5: Design for Coherency



C7: Design Corners that Build Active Intersections We encourage to continue the dialogue with all stakeholders as you move into the project's next phase. We look forward to our next briefing with the project team during the public urban design phase planned for Spring of this year. As mentioned in the briefing, a Design Commissioner may be available to be on urban design panel. Please reach out when this panel is being formed.

Attachments: [2019 0401 Staci Monroe ATT](#)

2019 0401 Staci Monroe

City of Portland Bureau of Development Services

Comment: Thank you, Megan.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Steph Gaines

Comment: Freeway expansion will not solve congestion. The facts support this. Portland should be leading environmental initiatives and coming up with smarter ways to solve traffic issues.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Stephan Leger

Comment: I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Rose Quarter I-5 freeway expansion. There are many deeply problematic issues with the project, but some of the most important ones are: racial inequity, environmental pollution, ineffectiveness in terms of reducing congestion, and wasting/misusing our public funds. I will elaborate on each of these reasons below.

- Racial Inequity: I-5 runs alongside the historically black community of Albina, and its emissions disproportionately impact people of color. This particularly impacts the Harriet Tubman Middle School, which sits right next to the freeway. Rukaiyah Adams of the Albina Vision Trust has sent a letter requesting a full Environmental Impact Statement for the project.

- Environmental Impact: Research has shown that freeway expansion projects like this one, increase traffic and, therefore, emissions as well. Transportation accounts for 40% of Oregon's climate emissions. We need to decrease these emissions, not increase them, and this project is a major step in the wrong direction in this regard.

- Ineffectiveness: The project goal is to decrease congestion, but because expansions have been shown to increase the number of cars on the road, they don't actually improve congestion.

- Misuse of Public Funds: The project is projected to cost \$500,000,000 and it would likely go over budget and cost even more. There are so many useful projects that could be done with that money (things like adding sidewalks to historically under-served neighborhoods in East Portland



or expanding our buses and other forms of public transit) rather than on harmful and counterproductive projects like this one.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Stephan Morris

Comment: The last thing we need is more freeways. Put the money into transit and active transportation.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Stephanie Byrd

Comment: Please do not expand any more freeways until we improve our existing infrastructure to make it safer, healthier, and easier for Portlanders to get around our city. What a waste of money when it has been proven over and over that widening freeways only worsens traffic, increases pollution, and encourages the kind of development patterns that weaken our cities. Please implement decongestion pricing to reduce congestion and create revenue for maintaining our current infrastructure. If you aren't willing to at least try this first, I have a hard time believing you have the best interests of regular Portlanders in mind.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Stephanie Byrd

Comment: Please don't go ahead with this project. I drive my car often in Portland and would love to get rid of it, but auto travel is subsidized to such an extent (via zoning regulations, building codes, parking subsidies, tax code, and many other ways) that transit and active transportation can't compete. Please invest in making it safe and easy to walk, bike, and ride transit instead of adding to the mess that cars are making of our city. Why are there still places it is impossible to walk to but possible to drive a car to? Let's take care of that problem first.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0523 Stephanie Jarem

Comment: The I5RQ project's main goal is "safety" which seems reasonable as it relates to the fact that it is the highest crash corridor; however, the focus should really be on improving areas where there are the highest fatal and severe injuries, as THAT would be the greatest improvement in safety and health. There are other ODOT roads that are incredibly dangerous and could save lives with improvement. This project does not do enough for safety, congestion, air quality, or even reliability to warrant the cost to the state, especially when other projects in areas that are less well-served or are historically underserved (e.g., east Portland's 82nd Ave) could benefit.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0306 Stephanie Noll

Comment: I'm writing to express my concern about the environmental impacts of a Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion.

I am a resident of North Portland, living just a few blocks from I5. I cross over the highway daily to bike my children to our neighborhood school, Beach Elementary, and I too have spent my share of time in stopped or slow-moving traffic on I5 on my frequent commutes to Salem. My family breathes the polluted air of traffic idling on I5 on a daily basis.

Investing in expanding the interstate bottleneck at the Rose Quarter is not a reasonable solution to congestion, especially when regarding the cost of the project. Expanding freeway capacity will only expand drive alone trips and associated emissions.

If we are serious as a region about reducing congestion and carbon emissions, we should instead invest on the same scale in increasing transit capacity and bike and pedestrian infrastructure. I live only 5 miles from downtown Vancouver, yet have no reasonably direct option for getting across the river except by personal vehicle. (I find the current bike facilities on the Interstate bridge terrifying.) I have great transit options for getting to downtown Portland and use them frequently, but our transit system is inadequate for traveling efficiently on the regional scale. My family bikes daily for neighborhood trips, and would bike much farther, but there are huge gaps in our regional trail and bike/ped network.

Investing \$500 million instead in light rail, enhanced transit lanes, and off-street or protected bike and pedestrian infrastructure would be far more transformative for our region and our daily commutes. We will not meet our climate smart or freight mobility goals by investing this sum in a 1.5 mile freeway project.

There are much better solutions to the problem we're trying to solve than freeway expansion.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Noll

5801 N. Albina Ave.

Portland, OR 97217

Attachments: N/A

2019 0303 Stephen Bachhuber

Comment: I strongly, vehemently oppose the freeway expansion proposed for the Rose Quarter area of Portland. It is an ineffective way to spend taxpayer money when ODOT's own calculations report that congestion will return again by 2027. It is a waste when \$500 million could be spent to improve transportation in so many other ways. It ignores the urgency of



climate change and the need to act swiftly and decisively to terminate all new fossil-fuel infrastructure, which includes freeway expansion. Finally, it is poisoning us. Diesel and gasoline exhaust contain extremely hazardous substances directly linked to deteriorating health and higher death rates. I live in an area of high fine-particulate contamination- the Brooklyn neighborhood sandwiched between Highway 26 and Highway 99. I personally suffer from the effects of bad air, and I worry about the effects on my children and grandchildren. I don't wish this problem on anyone, especially the children of Tubman Middle School and the people of North Portland. All of us can't just sell out and move to the suburbs- isn't that part of the problem anyway? Stop expanding freeways and stop fossil fuel infrastructure. This idea is a boondoggle.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Stephen Carson

Comment: Widening roads doesn't fix traffic. At best, it pushes congestion to the next bottleneck. In the face of a climate catastrophe, spending half a billion dollars to widen a stretch of road is gross malpractice. You could be taking vehicles off the road. You could be expanding buses, light rail, bike lanes, and sidewalks. You could be relieving people of the necessity and economic burden of car ownership, and lessening the hardship of those who cannot drive, be it due to disability, poverty, or legal status.

Fewer cars, not wider roads! Public transportation now!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0227 Stephen Galas

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.

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'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.

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 0305 Stephen Gomez

Comment: I write to oppose the investment of +/- \$500M in the I-5 Rose Quarter area as proposed by ODOT.

It is a well known fact that expanding freeways does nothing to reduce congestion--we only have to look to Los Angeles and the failure of the expansion of I-405 as one recent example: <https://www.laweekly.com/news/11-billion-and-five-years-later-the-405-congestion-relief-project-is-a-fail-5415772>

The expansion of I-5 will directly impact Harriet Tubman middle school which sits above the freeway with increased pollution. This is a school historically and currently serving young students of color. The impacts of gentrification and displacement to this neighborhood, including the original construction of I-5 are well known--expanding the freeway will only continue this legacy.

We have arrived at point where all science says that climate change is definitively man-made and in Oregon our leading cause of greenhouse gases is transportation. A half-billion dollar investment in enabling more single-occupancy vehicle transportation is willfully ignoring climate change science.

Investments to enable transportation around our region are needed but should be directed into public transportation including bus rapid transit and safety and flow improvements to state highways that run through urban areas including protected bike lanes and sidewalks.

Lastly the only proven tool to manage decongestion is road use pricing including variable pricing schemes to reduce or redirect trips at peak hours. This tool reduces single-occupancy vehicle trips and enables the flow of truck freight. Road pricing can employ modern technologies to provide solutions that do not burden low income community members.

Thank you for your consideration.

Stephen Gomez

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Stephen Hodges

Comment: Please widen the freeway! The congestion is so bad now. Any amount of money to alleviate congestion is worth it.

Stephen Hodges

Portland Oregon

Attachments: N/A



2019 0401 Stephen Judkins

Comment: I am deeply concerned about the assessment, which is not consistent with any recent, real environmental impact of freeway expansion. It will almost certainly increase miles driven and emissions.

Further, I am concerned that the engineering drawings are inconsistent with the promotional graphics used to promote the project in previous meetings. Multiple switchbacks have appeared and we have no guarantees it will not change further.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Stephen Judkins

Comment: Hello,

I live in North Portland near the Rose Quarter and expect my children to attend Tubman middle school. Further I am a regular commuter through the area. I've been following this project closely and have concluded it would be an enormous mistake to continue with the current plans, for the following reasons:

The project represents a real increase in capacity that will increase the amount of traffic and pollution according to the well-understood, empirically verified concept of induced demand. Traffic projections include a non-existent new Columbia River bridge expansion, as well.

Air quality will absolutely decline at a historically disadvantaged middle school.

Children will not be able to play outside much of the year if they follow medical recommendations.

Initial promises included improvements in pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure in the area. As plans are solidifying, it's clear that this will represent a far worse pedestrian experience and a more dangerous situation for vulnerable road users. Some of the infrastructure--on one of Portland's busier cycling and walking routes--won't even be ADA-compliant because it's so steep.

Studies show an improved level of service for drivers, but speed and convenience for transit users, pedestrians, and cyclists were not even included. Further, it's implied that the streetcar and esplanade may be closed during construction but there is zero indication for how long or what the alternatives will be. One the busiest and most popular cycling routes--the esplanade--may be closed for several years without an



alternative.

I will do whatever I can to halt this project, since it's clear it offers few benefits with enormous costs.

Thank you,

Stephen Judkins

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Stephen Tokarski

Comment: Even if this freeway expansion would reduce traffic (it won't), it would be so far down on the priority list that it shouldn't be part of the discussion. There are so many other things that you could do with this \$500 million, it boggles the mind that this is what we would choose to spend it on.

So it's no wonder that ODOT has launched a deliberately deceptive campaign in order to support it, and ignored public comments thus far, which have been almost universally opposed to it.

Don't do it, don't do it, don't do it.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Steve Bozzone

Comment: Hi, I'm Steve Bozzone. I used to live in the neighborhood before I was no-cause evicted, but that's a whole other story. I was on the committee, I was joined by my neighborhood in voting no on the project. I just want to say that this has never been about the surface streets. The first meeting started with this big flying diamond diagram and that's where we started. And so we're supposed to be happy that we didn't bulldoze the entire Rose Quarter and we just bulldozed most of it. So I just wanted to dispel that myth. That this is completely a highway widening project and it has been from the start. And as someone who has been a part of the process this entire time, I've been very disappointed. In fact, ODOT staff -- I tried to build relationships with them at these meetings, and they laughed at me. They laughed at me for asking for information, and we're seeing that again with the failure to release all the data that we've been asking for and the failure to extend the comment period or to take a full environmental assessment. To address the point about funding, Commissioner, I think we can do it. I think we can do it together. This is Oregon money and we're Oregonians and we can do this. Yes, it takes some work and we would have to be strategic, but we can redirect that money. And that money doesn't start flowing until 2022. We have plenty of time to direct this money to where it matters most and where it will save the most lives on ODOT's high-crash corridors. Thank you.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Steve Bozzone

North/Northeast I/5 Rose Quarter Stakeholders Advisory Committee Member

Comment: To Whom it May Concern:

The proposed I-5 Rose Quarter Freeway Widening Project is a scientific, environmental and moral failure.

I say this project is a failure confidently as a community member who sat on the N/NE I-5 Rose Quarter Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC). What I found to be concerning during that dubious and highly inequitable public process remains today, only now that we have more information on the details of ODOT's plans, my concerns have grown into show stoppers that must be addressed before the project can move forward.

The project must undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement process. Anything less sets a troubling precedent for future freeway expansion projects through Oregon's most populated county.

The project will have serious impacts on Portland's local air quality and public health and must undergo further study. This project will bring more cars and their pollution. The widening of the freeway by over 20 feet will lead to an increase in the heat-island effect of the current highway. Brake dust, diesel, oil, gasoline and other pollutants will be emitted on the ground and dispersed into the air. The project will permanently disturb the riverbeds of the Willamette River.

ODOT failed to provide necessary information to the public in a timely manner, releasing data late into the current public comment period. ODOT has refused to extend the public comment period. ODOT conducted design meetings for the public during afternoon work hours. ODOT has acted in bad faith, obscuring public records and data until the last minute.

ODOT has not conducted adequate public outreach and meaningful engagement of the local community in addition to local agencies. This includes Portland Public Schools, Harriet Tubman School, Eliot Neighborhood, Boise Neighborhood, King Neighborhood, Portland Parks, and Albina Vision. I can also speak to this first hand having been a long term participant of ODOT's disappointing public process.



ODOT has not calculated the amount of delay created for people walking, biking or riding transit. Due to the location of ODOT's desired highway widening, there are serious deleterious impacts to the local urban walking, biking and transit networks. While ODOT has not adequately studied admits transit will be delayed by this project. We need more information about the impacts of the highway widening, replete with new ramp designs, new auxiliary lanes and new surface street lanes.

This project fails to address the harmful, racist impacts of the current I-5 freeway on Portland's historically Black Albina and Jumptown neighborhoods. There are no components of this project that address the impacts of I-5 to Portland's Black community, including historic redlining, systemic divestment and institutional racism.

The I-5/RQ Freeway project fails to support the community-led Albina Vision coalition, which proposes a true reconnecting of the neighborhood grid over I-5, buildable freeway caps, new mixed-use development and affordable housing. ODOT already admits the proposed freeway "lids" will not support these development goals in any shape and form.

In violation of Oregon's Climate this project fails to address climate change and Oregon's carbon reduction goals in any meaningful way, and will likely lead an increase in carbon emissions. According to the Oregonian and the Oregon Global Warming Commission 2018 Report, " 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. " See attached chart illustrating the path necessary for meeting Oregon's carbon reduction goals. All of our transportation projects must be considered in the context of Oregon's frontline battle with climate change.

The project will encroach into an existing Public park, the Vera Katz Eastbank Esplanade. The new support structures and bridge decking that must be built to accommodate the addition of new lanes to the I-5 highway will take away important public access from the riverfront. It will bring short and long term detours to existing bike and pedestrian pathways. The project as currently designed is not compatible with public use of Portland's Eastbank Waterfront park.

The project uses inaccurate traffic projections and fails to consider planned Congestion



Pricing tools in ODOT's near-future plans. Congestion pricing is a proven method for successfully reducing traffic congestion. ODOT has failed to incorporate this available tool in their planning. ODOT has put their thumb on the scale and factored in predicted vehicle trips based on unbuilt, long dead projects along the corridor. ODOT has not provided any Average Daily Traffic data (ADT). ODOT must use accurate data for traffic projections as they impact this project. Ideally those will be made available and analyzed in a full EIS process. ODOT failed to consider HOT lanes, HOV lanes, tolling, or pro rated/pro tem highway ramps as design options for this project. During the public design process many proposals were submitted by participants that included these concepts. ODOT dismissed all alternative design concepts without any explanation for why they were unacceptable by ODOT's standards. Those alternative concepts all lead to less surface, soil and environmental impacts. The alternative proposals all cost less funding and disruption to local air quality and pollution. They also mitigate the surface level neighborhood congestion created by the highway's location in the heart of central Portland. Those concepts deserve to be adequately considered and not thrown out at ODOT's whim.

Attached to my comment I am submit into the record the attached previously submitted letter containing earlier expressed concerns from 2012, which ODOT has never addressed or responded to.

I look forward to ODOT conducting a full EIS, this time using more accurate traffic projections and factoring in all available tools at ODOT's disposal so that we can successfully manage congestion in the Rose Quarter.

Sincerely,

Steve Bozzone

North/Northeast I/5 Rose Quarter Stakeholders Advisory Committee Member

ATTACHED: Steve Bozzone I5 RQ Public Comment 3-31-19 - Attachments 1 and 2 - PDF format. To be included in full public comment report.

CC: Portland City Council, Senator Lew Frederick, Representative Tina Kotek, Oregon Department of Transportation, Portland Bureau of Transportation

Attachments: [2019 0331 Steve Bozzone ATT 1](#); [2019 0331 Steve Bozzone ATT 2](#)



2019 0312 Steve Brown

Comment: Yes, my name is Steve Brown. I'm a long-term resident of Portland. I speak to you today not only as a resident of Portland but as a citizen of the area. I am absolutely opposed to the Rose Quarter freeway expansion. And there's lots of good reasons, perhaps technical ones, but I want to address really the effect on climate change. When I was 10 years old, 53 years ago something, I had the fortune of going to Mt. Rainier. I got to go through this ice cave. Incredibly beautiful blue sculpted. The sun was coming down. A couple years ago I went back. I looked for that ice cave. The park ranger said that doesn't exist. It hasn't existed for some time. Then he looked at me and he goes, you know, it's only you guys with silver hair that even ask me about that. That is really frightening. But you don't have to listen to the rantings of me. We just have to look at the last several years when this beloved state of Oregon was on fire, on fire. Just go to California. We are blessed that the effects of climate change are less in Oregon. We have nice water supplies. My point being is we cannot wait. We have to make good, sound decisions. And I understand there's lots of different interests. Everybody makes decisions on a lot of things, how it affects them. If you're a project manager at ODOT and this was your project, you're fully supportive. But it's time to come back and say we need to make decisions, not only for Portland, but for the U.S. and for the world. I give up the rest of my time. Thank you for listening.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0000 Steve Callaway

City of Hillsboro

Comment: RE: 1-5 Rose Quarter Auxiliary Lane Improvements

Dear Commissioner Eudaly and Mr. Windsheimer,

On behalf of the City of Hillsboro, I appreciate the opportunity to share our thoughts on the value of the proposed improvements to 1-5 generally between the N. Greeley Avenue and 1-84 interchanges. The region's interstate freeway system, together with the State's freeway system including US-26, are essential to the ability for our region to compete economically in a highly competitive world market. Hillsboro's high tech and manufacturing industry is a critical economic driver of the region and the State of Oregon, but its products, as well as, Washington County's agricultural products must get out timely and reliably to the world market daily through the Interstate system connecting north, south, and east of Portland. The 1-5 Rose Quarter is uniquely situated in the center of this critical distribution hub.

Auxiliary lanes have proven to be highly beneficial in facilitating safer and more efficient flow of vehicles through complex corridors challenged by multiple entrance and exit ramps. Eliminating merging and weaving movements between interchanges will optimize the capacity of the freeway system, improve its safety, and enhance the reliability of the 1-5 corridor. Enhancing this bottleneck will in turn improve traffic flow and reliability on the 1-405 loop, benefitting the US26 corridor by minimizing the negative impacts of 1-405 on US26 eastbound travel during the



critical afternoon freight mobility window. These improvements also deliver the benefit of reduced emissions as tens of thousands of vehicles travelling through the corridor daily are able to do so more efficiently and with less pollution emitting delays.

Hillsboro applauds the leadership in making strategic bottleneck relief investments supporting both the environment and our economic competitiveness. We look forward to our ongoing partnership in supporting the state's economy and quality of life.

Sincerely,

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Steve Cheseborough

Comment: Please drop the proposal. No freeway expansion. It would hurt many people through air pollution and traffic. And it would damage Portland's progressive image.

The earth is in crisis. It's time to remove urban freeways and discourage driving. Please use this money for good, not for the evil of freeway expansion.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Steve Cheseborough

Attachments: N/A

2019 0225 Steve Daggett

Comment: ODOT

Re: Public comments on Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion

I am strongly opposed to this expansion. It will not improve transportation.

I live within walking distance of the NE Broadway overpass above I-5. On a daily basis I walk, ride my bike, or drive thru one or more of the streets, bridges, or freeway under discussion. The proposed plan and years of negative construction impacts will result in no improvements and during construction will very negatively impact use of all the existing infrastructure.

I strongly encourage ODOT to invest in initiatives that positively address climate change, air quality, walking, biking, and mass transit.

I look forward to the abandonment of this proposal.

Thank you.

Steve Daggett

Resident 97212



Attachments: N/A

2019 0225 Steve Leathers

Comment: 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. The idea that we will be spending a half billion dollars on something that doesn't work makes me incredibly sad.

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.

If Vision Zero is really a priority, I urge you to consider spending more resources on traffic calming measures east of 82nd avenue, where many people have been struck, injured and killed by vehicles that are moving too quickly.

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 your time and consideration.

Best of luck,

Steve Leathers

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Steve Rauworth

Comment: Two things are certain: the volume of traffic will expand to fill any new lanes as soon as they are built, and the earth becomes a less inhabitable place with every gallon of gasoline burned. Wasting time and money on a technology and infrastructure whose time has past is irresponsible, an admission of failure.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0218 Steven

Comment: Please don't continue plans to expand I-5. Public discussion and consideration of all options is important. People may complain about slow transit times during peak hours, if they feel it is too slow, they should be introduced to and consider public transportation. I drive this corridor because it is easy/convenient adding to congestion and pollution. A bit of promotion



and improvement of our public transportation system is money better spent and much more insightful of our long term needs. Trucks should be limited to one lane unless exiting left.

Thank you,

Steve Vorenkamp M.D.

16562 NW Canton Street

Portland,OR

97229

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Steven Chambers

Comment: In light of projected traffic statistics including a new Columbia crossing and the limited amount of knowledge based on other more likely scenarios, it is my opinion that the best course of action would be to delay the rose quarter project until the other likely scenarios can be studied. Tolling and congestion pricing should also be studied.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0218 Steven

Comment: Hi,

This is probably the wrong email address to write to but I've been on your website i5rosequarter.org and on

Linkedin, and was unable to find the person to get in touch with.

I was wondering if you could help me find the coworker who is currently making product descriptions and content -

Maybe that this is the one in charge of SEO / Marketing? It would be awesome if you could point me to the right

one.

The reason I am asking is that my company is developing a Software that automates content production with the use

of AI and I am trying to understand better how it is done without such a tool.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Steven Rosenbaum

Comment: I am opposed to expanding the freeway along I-5 at the Rose Quarter.



My family lives nearby and I believe it will make our community's livability worse, both short-term and long-term.

I believe the project is based upon flawed assumptions about the future of transportation.

A new wave of smaller, safer autonomous vehicles will rapidly replace current transport.

The future is about more walking and fewer roads. The costs of this project far outweigh the benefits.

Steven Rosenbaum

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Stewart Buettner

Comment: Please, please, please listen to those in the public (students, their teachers, bicyclists, pedestrians, public transit riders) who are opposed to widening I-5 in the vicinity of the Rose Quarter, Portland. Such widening will likely not improve (but, in the long run, add to) traffic congestion. We have known for almost fifty years now that more freeways breed more, not fewer, cars, more air pollution and (more recently) global warming. Let's take the \$500 million and spend it on projects that will IMPROVE, not undermine public health. Thanks

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Stone Doggett

Comment: As a Portland resident whose family's health will be directly impacted by the Rose Quarter I-5 project, as a physician who is well versed in the evidence linking highways that dissect residential areas to diseases like asthma and obesity, and as a citizen who is concerned about the negative impact on climate change that will result from building more infrastructure that encourages single occupancy vehicle trips rather than expanding transit and smart safe travel infrastructure, I am strongly opposed to this project. Extensive research and experience has shown the negative impacts of these projects, so I will be succinct in listing the reasons why this project must not go forward.

1. The environmental assessment has been wholly inadequate and was not presented in good faith by the Oregon Department of Transportation. The supporting data was not initially provided, projections are not based on current conditions or conditions that will reliably exist in the future, details that will directly affect people who live and travel in areas near the project are lacking and some details were released toward the end of the comment period, such as the expansion over the east esplanade, that have a tremendous negative environmental impact. This area is one of the most popular public outdoor spaces in the metro area.

2. This is a 500 million dollar solution in search of a problem. Safety, congestion and rebuilding the damage done to the Albina neighborhood by I-5 could all be accomplished in a much better way by investing in transit and in congestion pricing. These solutions are currently under



consideration by ODOT and should be at the forefront rather than secondary to auxiliary I-5 lanes.

3. The delays and congestion caused by construction over 4-5 years will likely not be recaptured by the addition of the auxiliary lanes. They will disproportionately burden the surrounding neighborhoods including Tubman school with delays and traffic.

4. The proposed caps and "green spaces" are poorly designed and lack capacity for buildings, place making structures or trees. The road designs on the caps prioritize through traffic at the expense of pedestrians. Although the expense of the caps are being attributed to pedestrian facilities, they are a byproduct of construction the extent to which they must be improved to meet their stated purpose is outside of the budget and scope of the project.

5. Transit is predicted to be slower as a result of the project, which is in conflict with other regional priorities.

6. The documents submitted by ODOT for the EA reveal a lack of competence and expertise within ODOT to integrate a highway into an urban center in a manner that is safe for pedestrians and people riding bikes. This is evident in the high crash corridors that ODOT has neglected in the Portland area that have contributed to serious injuries and fatalities.

7. The EA does not account for climate impact from greenhouse gases in a meaningful way. Assumptions regarding decreased car emissions due not account for increased car size that offsets gains in fuel efficiency.

8. A crucial bike bridge, the Flint bridge, is being removed and is being replaced by a bridge with an unacceptable grade that will not be possible for very young and old riders and intimidating for inexperienced riders. The other bridge has a circuitous route that will be impractical to most bike riders.

In summary, this project will have significant negative impacts on the environment with regards to greenhouse gas production, air pollution, noise pollution, visual disruption, transit disruption and bicycle travel. It prioritizes single occupancy vehicle miles traveled over transit and will encourage more sprawl at a time when the great majority of intelligent people understand that this is harmful to future generations. The benefits that are promised are minimal at best, even if the EA is accurate, and are not worth the negative impact during construction and once it is built.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Stuart Emmons

Comment: The expansion of I-5 at the Rose Quarter in Portland is the most obscene colossal waste of money in decades. The enlargement is at odds with everything we Oregonians stand for and I am amazed that our progressive state is still pursuing this boondoggle.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0311 Stuart Johnson

Comment: Hello,

I completely oppose the Portland Rose Quarter freeway expansion. Making bigger freeways only increases congestion and encourages more people to drive motor vehicles. Look at California to see how bigger freeways have only increased congestion by expanding the sprawl further and further outwards.

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.

\$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.

Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Sue Ellen Liss

Comment: Please! Please e more forward thinking than to think that a bigger freeway will solve anything! If we don't solve climate change this planet will not be livable. Air polution from fossel fueled cars is causing illness and climate change. It's science! The answer is more electric mass transit and fewer cars. That freeway you want to build will be a polluting traffic jam immediately. Come up with smarter, more innovative, effective solutions to move people around this city. All of our lives depend on it. Think of your children and grandchildren. No more freeways as a short-sighted, pretend solution. Please!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Sue Ellen Liss

Comment: It is insane to build such a freeway, when we MUST encourage people to use clean energy mass transit instead of fossel fuel cars or we won't have a livable planet and in the meantime the polluted air will be making us sick. You are not going to improve anything with this project. Put more mass transit in that area and across the Columbia River Bridge. Let it be



difficult to drive in this area and easy to park their cars and hop on mass transit. Wake up, wake up, wake up to the imminent danger of climate change...We have 12 years to turn things around before it is TOO late. Quit being in denial. My grandchildren deserve better. Shame on us...shame on you!!!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Summer Boslaugh

Comment: I Have lived in Portland for 13 years and at various times in the late 90s. I have seen how much Portland has changed and the impact on traffic. I am fortunate to be able to bike and bus to work. Many others are not able to do this. Spending \$500 million on freeway expansion won't help them do so. And it won't help the traffic congestion ODOT says it is focused on. That money would be much better spent building bus rapid transit lines across town, or beginning the proposed underground light rail tunnel. These initiatives will help people move around the Portland metro area ways that are better for air quality, carbon emissions, public health, and congestion relief. As a taxpayer I want my money invested in ways that make economic sense and deliver an ROI that is measurable and meaningful. Spending millions on a proposal that doesn't solve the problem and creates new problems is a waste of funds and squandering taxpayer dollars.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Susan Bickerstaff

Comment: I am opposed to freeway expansion. Instead I encourage ODOT to prioritize other approaches to easing congestion including increased bus service and congesting pricing. My children will attend Harriet Tubman Middle School and I am very concerned about the impact of I-5 pollution on their well-being. Please implement other strategies that can reduce traffic congestion and air pollution. Freeway expansion will do neither. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0301 Susan McLawhorn

Comment: Do not spend my tax dollars on freeway expansion! Better use of funds would be to expand public transportation options and to make the existing ones faster and more reliable (they're pretty good already!) We need more bike lanes and more dedicated lanes for buses. We need more pedestrian crosswalks and more pedestrian-friendly streets, NOT more cars on the freeway!

Attachments: N/A



2019 0311 Susan Ferguson

Comment: Please don't waste our tax dollars on the Rose Quarter I-5 road widening. It will not relieve congestion, nor will it encourage people to use public transit. And we need to mitigate the air pollution around Harriet Tubman School.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Susan Ferguson

Comment: Stop the Expansion of the I-5 at the Rose Quarter. It is a band-aid boondoggle. We need to invest in better, faster, more frequent mass transit to get people out of their automotive cocoons and onto trains and busses. Our air quality is already bad - imagine Harriet Tubman kids playing outside - would you want your kids breathing that filthy air? By the way, while you're at it, do something truly valuable and get the filthy diesel castoffs from CA and WA off our roads. Put the "Oregon" back in ODOT.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Susan Gilsdorf

Comment: I lived in Portland from 1998-2009, and moved back here in 2018. I can attest to the fact that freeway traffic has worsened as a result of a population increase and more drivers on the road. An expansion of freeways is not the answer! Portland enjoys a reputation as a city that thinks outside the box, "the city that works," and we should try to live up to that high standard by increasing the amount of public transportation, and incentivizing its use, instead of putting major resources behind a project that will undoubtedly go over budget, cause more traffic problems in the short term while the freeways are under construction, and result only in an ugly, pollution-aggravating, short-term fix. We need a full environmental impact statement before moving forward with a freeway expansion. Let's rethink the existing bus routes, and add some additional routes. How about using \$500,000,000 to create more MAX lines? Portland needs to consider the long-term future health of the city and its citizens. Freeway expansion should be the very last option on the table.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0000 Susan Gisvord

Comment: I am not interested in having you get back to me. I just want to convey my concern about this project. In my view, you can't build way out of congestion. Frankly, as a Portlander I'm tired of letting people dictate what I need to do for them. I think it would be very destructive to businesses and so-called affordable housing to have that project in the works. I hope the project will never come to fruition and I want to tell you my concern. I live in NE Portland and my name is Susan Gisvord and that's my message. Thank you.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0330 Susan Hayden

Comment: More freeways do not reduce cars. They just make more room for them. Having lived in N. Portland since 1979, we have watched this area mowed down, suffered additional pollution in residential and school areas, and also watched the traffic grow and grow.

NO NO NO to this proposed expansion.

Susan Hayden

Attachments: N/A

2019 0220 Susan Haywood

Comment: Please don't expand freeways! This does nothing to relieve traffic congestion and will increase air pollution. We need to increase public transportation, including trains to outlying areas, and be mindful of the climate crisis that we are facing.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Susan Haywood

Comment: The problem we have now is congested traffic, and an increase in pollution from the congestion. We cannot widen a lane of traffic for a short stretch and expect it to solve this problem. The problem is that the downtown area is a throughfare for long distance trucks. We need to reroute the big trucks, which will solve both the congestion and the pollution.

Portland cannot afford to throw \$500,000,000. at this problem in any case. A lot of our streets are unsafe due to deep potholes, and we have many unpaved, almost impassable roads. We are not managing our money well, and this project is an example of how not to spend it. I vote for my considerable tax dollars to not be spent in this way.

In addition, we have less than a dozen years now to completely change our priorities and our transportation models. There is no point to add more concrete and infrastructure to accommodate fossil fuel vehicles. There is no point in taking any modicum of nature still remaining in the city.

We need to reroute trucks away from the civic center, and we need to fix roads that Portlanders use for safety's sake. Those roads accommodate not only vehicles, but bikers and pedestrians.

Let's have a Green New Deal here in Portland.

Thank you,

Susan Haywood

2146 NW Everett St.

Portland, OR 97210



Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Susan Horky

Comment: Use mass TRANSIT! BICYCLE! CARPOOL! WORK FROM HOME!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0318 Susan Mates

Comment: I have some serious concerns about the I-5 Rose Quarter Project. This does not seem to be the moment to be expanding freeways in order to reduce congestion.

About 90% of Oregonians today live where diesel exhaust exceeds health benchmarks, putting us at the sixth highest health risk in the nation due to diesel pollution and causing more than 450 premature deaths per year in our state according to the United States Environmental Protection Agency. Besides degrading air quality from particulate matter and ozone, diesel exhaust is responsible for over 70% of the cancer risk from all air toxics. Pollution levels near freeways - and in the low income, minority communities and industrial areas that are often near them - are often two or three times as high and put some of our most vulnerable citizens at risk.

Please consider investing in public transportation instead. Freeway expansion has never solved traffic congestion.

This freeway expansion seems to fly in the face of the slow and painful moves we are trying to make to alleviate climate change and environmental injustice in our Metro area. More than 40% of Oregon's carbon emissions come from transportation. This is the time to be improving and prioritizing public transportation projects such as providing bus rapid transit lines across town and helping fund the proposed underground light rail tunnel.

My understanding is that the state is mandated with moving forward with decongestion pricing. While that has its own problems, including how to fairly implement it, surely we need to determine what inroads that might make into reducing traffic congestion.

Please reconsider the focus of this project.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important issue.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Susan Nolte

Comment: I am opposed to freeway expansion as presented in this project. It does not solve traffic congestion, and impacts local populations heavily with increased noise and vehicle emissions. Please share the data that you have on the number of trips that are crosstown commuters, commercial freight, local traffic, airport bound, etc so we can craft creative solutions



that put livability FIRST and support more public transit. The East side esplanade is a delightful space but needs less noise, and school children should be able to hear their own playful shouts over the traffic noise. Spending on highway expansion is an outmoded approach to an age old problem. Figure out how we can get people out of cars onto shared transit whether it is more convenience, more pleasant and safer bus stops, certifying pets for travel on transit that have earned the right with excellent training or requiring basket muzzles. Take that huge some of money and build light rail and install toll booths on roads to retrain people!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0321 Susan Rosenthal

Comment: I oppose the expansion of the I 5 freeway through the Rose Quarter. This project will not improve traffic congestion. Building extra highways does not improve congestion. When highways are built people drive more than they did in the past. The amount of congestion increases.

ODOT should be spending money improving local infrastructure such as Barbur Blvd. I have ridden my bike on Barbur many times. It can be very dangerous, especially on the two bridges between Capitol Highway and downtown. The Rose Quarter project will cost 500 million dollars. This money could be better spent on improving. Conditions on our local roads.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0227 Susan Royce

Comment: I am on board with the campaign to stop the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion for all of the reasons that they propose - it will increase air pollution and traffic congestion and the funds dedicated to that should be aimed at reducing congestion and improving alternatives to driving. Money should be spent on improving and prioritizing public transportation including train, bus, bike, and scooter, ride share programs, and building walkable communities.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Susan Westby

Comment: I live a few blocks from and commute by bike daily through the proposed freeway expansion area. I am dismayed at ODOT's backward-looking freeway expansion plan. Please rethink this terrible boondoggle! Save Flint overpass!!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Susan Westby

Comment: I live in NE Portland in the Eliot neighborhood. The prudent choice is to try congestion pricing before launching a costly lane-adding project to I-5. I commute by bike to



and from work most days. Other days, I take mass transit. Of course I sometimes use the freeway to get to and from someplace. This project would only invite more car trips, so the net the benefit seems to be negligible (or non-existent). It WOULD increase air pollution. It WOULD harm the students at Tubman school and anyone in the vicinity breathing the air. It would cut off Flint Street, a valuable route through the neighborhood. PLEASE CONSIDER LESS COSTLY, LESS POLLUTING OPTIONS to improve our transportation infrastructure first.

Over the years, my neighborhood has suffered incalculable harm from the freeway on many levels. More is not better.

Respectfully,

Susan Westby

Attachments: N/A

2019 0303 Susie MacPherson

Comment: Hello!

I'm a concerned Portlander. Our air quality is threatened and our children's health is at risk. We have too many cars, pollution and accidents already. I urge you to NOT move forward with further expansions of our freeways. The current proposal is wasteful, unwanted and unnecessary, if we address the larger issue of too many cars on our roads.

Thank you for reading this public input. Thank you for all of your hard work every day.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0318 Sutter Wehmeier

Comment: I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project. No matter how the project is framed, expanding the freeway simply adds up to more cars on the road, and I am shocked that ODOT has not published their methodology to demonstrate the claim that induced demand will not increase.

I am a bike commuter and small business owner in NE Portland, and I am dismayed that the funds proposal could be funneled to a freeway expansion instead of more pressing issues of equitable access to transit, pedestrian safety, and bike infrastructure. As a parent of two young sons, I am also infuriated that the children of Harriet Tubman Middle School will be subjected to worsened air quality and that the pattern of environmental injustice to the African American community in Portland may be perpetuated.

On the issues of environmental justice, climate change, walkability, and transparency of planning, this project deserves a failing grade. We can do better.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0311 Suzan K Ireland

Comment: I am very concerned about the plan for expansion of I-5 in Portland. This project will not decrease congestion, will increase carbon pollution and will not encourage other forms of transportation in our city.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0315 Suzanne Clarke

Comment: No road expansion until diesel trucks are banned in Oregon! The air quality in Portland is abysmal. Expanding the freeway is an unhealthy solution and it doesn't work; it did not solve Seattle's traffic woes. I would put in an express lane that people can pay to travel in during rush hour like Washington DC implemented. Improving public transit is the way to go! If folks want to work in Portland, they can live in Portland. leave the highways open for ambulances, firetrucks and hybrid commercial trucks delivering goods to our communities!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Suzanne Moulton

Comment: Dear Committee,

Portland doesn't need to spend billions on one lane expansion to connect two highways.

What Portland needs is a real rapid transit system like Chicago's or San Francisco's. Portland's MAX system is the most slow moving and least expansive of any city I've lived in that has "rapid" transit. The MAX needs more elevated rails or tunnels to allow faster transit with fewer stops between outlying suburb city centers and Portland city center. The MAX should not be a bus on rails on regular city streets.

If you analysis San Francisco's three transit systems; the Bart, the Metro (trolleys and street cars) and bus system, the Bart is the rapid transit on which the most people rely for transit to and from work and traveling long distances. The Metro is the slowest system mainly for sight-seeing and mostly used by tourists, while the Bus system is used to connect to shorter destinations after using the Bart.

Respectively here in Portland, we do NOT have a BART type system- only the slower sight-seeing Metro style Max and Bus. Portland seems to expect the MAX to serve as the BART, but the MAX is NOT designed to be rapid transit along nearly all of the lines, only by the airport.

If we want to reduce road traffic, pollution and better connect our communities, we need to invest in a rapid transit system that can get people to work in a reasonable amount of time and ultimately is the better way to get around the city. Put your billion dollar budget toward a rapid transit solution and congestion will be more manageable as the population grows in the Portland region.



Thanks for your time.

All the best,

Suzanne Moulton

Attachments: N/A

2019 0315 Suzanne Steffen

Comment: Portland should prioritize pedestrians, cyclists, & public transport - not cars! Adding freeway lanes to the tune of hundreds of billions of dollars would make Portland pro global warming, anti human health, pro increasing car traffic, anti environment, & pro government waste.

I'd been commuting by bike in Portland since the mid 90s. Part of the reason I moved away from Portland last year was because the huge increase in auto traffic in the last few years made cycling stressful. I used to consider Portland a progressive city. If this freeway expansion is approved Portland will be officially just another carcentric US city.

Thank you for your time,

Suzanne

Attachments: N/A

2019 0306 Suzy Elbow

Comment: To Whom It May Concern,

I'm a longtime Portland and a current resident of North Portland (97203). I continue to be deeply troubled by this project. It feels profoundly shortsighted to invest this heavily in such a short term fix--we know that expansions like this induce demand over time, and with our future depending on radical climate action over the next decade, we need to be making more thoughtful investments in transportation. We could be funding a huge number of improvements to our various transit options instead of dumping \$500 million into this misguided, polluting project. \$500 million is way too much for a band-aid solution to our traffic woes. I'd like to see action taken to implement decongestion pricing before any freeway expansion efforts.

Sincerely,

Suzy Elbow



Attachments: N/A

2019 0228 Sydney Herbst

Comment: More freeways will not fix our congestion problem. We need to implement smart TDM programs in order to encourage people to get around in other ways than driving alone. Portland is supposed to be a progressive City, but this would be taking several steps backward.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Sylvan Clendenon

Comment: This plan is immoral and unethical at best. Even if the entire project was entirely harmless, inexpensive, and beneficial, the fact that you hid a ~\$3B bridge proposal? really, folks? That's just not okay. It's shady, manipulative, and I seriously expected better from you.

Don't run away from this guilt, either; embrace it. Use it to weed out such similar terrible behavior, make yourselves stronger and more benevolent. We're counting on you.

Attachments: N/A