



Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with T

Ordered by first name

Contents

2019 0326 Talia Searle.....	4
2019 0401 Tanner Baldus.....	4
2019 0330 Tara Hershberger.....	4
2019 0304 Taran Nadler.....	5
2019 0401 Ted Buehler.....	5
2019 0226 Ted Dreier.....	6
2019 0311 Ted Savarta.....	7
2019 0327 Ted Savarta.....	7
2019 0215 Ted Stonecliffe.....	7
2019 0329 Ted Timmons.....	8
2019 0401 Tenille Woodward.....	8
2019 0312 Teresa J Frakes.....	8
2019 0226 Teresa McFarland.....	9
2019 0301 Teresa McGrath.....	9
2019 0328 Terese Kelly.....	9
2019 0327 Teressa Barsotti.....	9
2019 0326 Teri Seaton.....	10
2019 0401 Terra Weikel.....	10
2019 0402 Terrence M. Joy.....	11
2019 0402 T. Dublinski-Milton.....	11
2019 0000 Terry Parker.....	12
2019 0307 Terry Parker.....	13
2019 0319 Terry Parker.....	14
2019 0330 T. Morrison.....	15
2019 0306 Thea Kindschuh.....	16

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with T



2019 0331 Thomas Brown.....	16
2019 0402 Thomas Doherty	16
2019 0331 T. DuBuisison.....	16
2019 0401 Thomas Jeanne	17
2019 0401 Tim Davis	17
2019 0313 Tim Holdaway	19
2019 0330 Tim McCann.....	20
2019 0226 Timothy Stinson 1	21
2019 0226 Timothy Stinson 2	21
2019 0402 Timothy Stinson	22
2019 0312 Timur Ender	22
2019 0325 Tod Pitstick	24
2019 0402 Todd Brown.....	24
2019 0328 Todd Peres	25
2019 0322 Todd Williams 1	25
2019 0401 Tom Baldwin	25
2019 0226 Tom Bender	26
2019 0402 Tom Brenneman	26
2019 0331 Tom Foeller.....	27
2019 0329 Tom Howe.....	28
2019 0331 Tom Rodrigues	28
2019 0328 Tony	29
2019 0327 Tony Green	29
2019 0331 Tony Jordan	29
2019 0328 Tony Tapay	30
2019 0402 Tonya Roe	30
2019 0325 Topher Henness	31
2019 0401 Topher Rhodes	31
2019 0402 Toranse Lowell.....	32
2019 0224 Tracey Egan.....	32

Environmental Assessment Comments

First Name Begins with T



2019 0225 Trask Owen Colby	32
2019 0219 Trevor Farrell	33
2019 0326 Trevor Williams	33
2019 0401 Trish Claffey	33
2019 0301 Troy Unverdruss	33
2019 0401 Tyler Bullen	34
2019 0402 Tyler Deffenbaugh	35
2019 0401 Tyler Karr	35
2019 0401 Tyler Lyon	35



2019 0326 Talia Searle

Comment: NO! On the freeway expansion. How about ODOT give money back to the state and fund communities for the homeless. ODOT wastes money and ignores residents. Nazis!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Tanner Baldus

Comment: I am writing to urge against the expansion of I5 in the Rose Quarter. According to ODOT's own report it would not do anything to relive congestion. By this metric expanding I5 would be as worthwhile use of \$500,000,000 as as constructing a 100 foot statue of SpongeBob Squarepants exclusively from used chewing gum. As both would have an equal effect on traffic.

However a blue whale sized nickelodeon character sculpture would actually be a be a better use of a half billion dollars than expanding I5. Since said sculpture might bring fun and whimsy to a child's life instead making them choose between recess or a premature smog related death. Which according to PSU expanding I5 would do to the students of Harriet Tubman Middle School.

Another advantage a juicy fruit simulacrum of bikini bottom's beloved fry cook has over the expansion of a freeway that it would not be take us one step closer to climate collapse by encouraging more single car use. Instead it would remind us that the "F" in fun is for "F is for "friends who do stuff together".

I would rather have \$500,000,000 on something more practical like the Albina Vision project or a MAX line. But if we can't do that, let's at least do something that won't actively poison children or contribute to rising sea levels. Like a eco friendly statue of SpongeBob. (Or really any other amusing cartoon character.)

Best,

Tanner Baldus

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Tara Hershberger

Comment: I oppose freeway expansion in Portland. It will increase air pollution and add to our collective carbon footprint. We need climate solutions, not denial. I call for a full EIS to study alternatives.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0304 Taran Nadler

Comment: The minimal information provided in the Environmental Assessment is refuted by decades of transportation practice and research. The Fundamental Law of Road Congestion clearly demonstrates that more road capacity creates greater road congestion. There is nothing in the Environmental Assessment that provides any explanation as to why this clearly established principal would not apply to the Rose Quarter expansion.

The Environmental Assessment Environmental Justice Findings provides no mention of potential impact on Harriet Tubman Middle School, a historically black middle school already facing environmental concerns.

More broadly, Oregon should be focusing its transportation resources on increasing accessibility and functionality of non motor vehicle modes of transportation given the carbon cost and high mortality rates associated with cars.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Ted Buehler

Comment: I am writing with several concerns to the Rose Quarter I-5 EA. I have 2 concerns:

1) Metro Portland, up until recently, had been known for decades for its ability to grow its population, its economy and its job base without adding freeway miles. We have many decades of experience with this route, called "Transportation Demand Management" and other names. The Rose Quarter freeway widening project is a dramatic departure from this trajectory. Since the addition of 2 freeway lanes in the Rose Quarter, by your own calculations, will only reduce Greenhouse Gas emissions by 0.2%, I would request that you consider a different "build" alternative that focuses on demand management and spot safety improvements. Such a project would cost much less than the freeway rebuild, and would provide region-wide improvements to congestion.

I request that the EA be expanded to a full Environmental Impact Assessment, and as part of it formulate a "Build" option based on TDM and other best practices, specifically following the historic success that are identified in the City of Portland/Portland State University's "The Portland Story" curriculum.

<https://www.pdx.edu/fsp/first-stop-portland>

<https://www.pdx.edu/fsp/schedule-visit-fsp>

2) Develop a much better metric for bikeway evaluation.

I have personally conducted the bicycle count at N Williams and Russell 2 times in the last 5 years, and can vouch for the accuracy of the peak hour volumes reported.

There are a lot of bicycles using the facility already, and the City of Portland would like to see this number triple over the next 11 years, as stipulated in the Portland Bicycle Master Plan for



2030.

This will put 2250 bicycles per hour on the Williams Ave corridor by 2030, and this requires much more expansive roadway space than is currently allocated for. And require larger queueing boxes, longer signal phase times, and better passing zones for faster groups to pass slower groups.

This will also require routing the major bikeways around the "box" of freeway ramp termini at Broadway and Weidler, and a new north-south system along Wheeler/Flint Aves to allow northbound bicycle traffic to achieve this.

Please revise the EA with better performance measures for bikeway systems, plan for 2250 bicycles per hour on most segments at peak hour, and provide direct routing options that avoid the freeway termini.

Also, you included "distance" as an objective. You need to upgrade this to a "performance measure" and ensure that distances are not made longer by this project.

Similarly, you need to add the sister performance measures of "travel time" and "travel energy" to the evaluation. How long will it take to ride the system from point A to point B? How much work will it be? This will put into focus the out-of-direction travel proposed for the Flint Ave MUP from Dixon to Broadway, and the west terminus of the Clackamas Bridge. Switchbacks slow bicycle traffic, make overtaking more difficult, and add hassle to the ride. All of these are disincentives to use a bicycle for transportation.

By dictating a performance measure for "travel time" and "travel energy," your engineering staff can redesign the bikeway system so it is something that will be an attractant to people to choose to commute by bike, rather than a discouraging agent.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Ted Dreier

Comment: 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.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0311 Ted Savarta

Comment: Freeway widening does not reduce congestion, as I'm sure you already know. \$500,000,000 will go a long way if spent on public transit or pedestrian and biking infrastructure. Transportation is a huge part of the climate problem and incentivizing driving will just make that worse.

What might help? Tolls, especially when tied to time of day or congestion levels. Do that first and put the money raised into transit and see how much better life can be in our city.

Thank you.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Ted Savarta

Comment: Dear Sirs and Madams,

Expanding freeways doesn't lessen congestion, as you know. It incentivizes driving until the new capacity is filled to the previous congestion level. Do not expand I-5!

Also, the data used to justify this expansion assumes the I-5 bridge to Washington will be replaced, which it won't. Put this half billion into public transit instead. We will all be better off.

Ted Savarta

Portland, OR

Attachments: N/A

2019 0215 Ted Stonecliffe

Comment: I would like to comment on the redesign of N. Williams Avenue and the disparate impacts this would have for the TriMet lines 4 and 44. Currently, these buses have a direct path from the Rose Quarter Transit Center to N. Williams via NE Wheeler on the east side of the Moda Center. This plan looks like the path would need to be significantly modified because of the new design that converts the existing bike lanes to a cycle track and converts N. Williams to a one-way (southbound) street. The #4 and #44 bus lines carry significant numbers of people from the Rose Quarter to points north including Emanuel Hospital. Any re-routing of the buses will cause these bus riders additional delays and TriMet will have to eat the operational costs for deviating their buses just for the bike riders in the area. I believe this is a poor decision and the street should remain with the same traffic configuration as it does today to allow the buses and bicycles to get through together.



I also think that the landscaped cover for the N. Vancouver Ave. bridge over I-5 should either be a complete cover or no cover at all. If noise control is the object, I think the hole in the cover between Vancouver and Williams will still let quite a bit of noise through. It seems like a waste of money if just a part of it were built.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Ted Timmons

Comment: The EA does not put weight on (a) performance on every other highway widening ever, which show the reality of induced demand; nor on (b) alternatives that would actually help with congestion and predictability, especially tolling and congestion pricing.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Tenille Woodward

Comment: I am writing to let you know that I strongly support the expansion of I-5 in the Rose Quarter area and in fact believe it is long overdue. This area is congested at all times and something needs to be done. Adding one lane in each direction is not going to fix it, but there will be a significant improvement and I appreciate ODOT taking these steps.

thank you, Tenille Woodward

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Teresa J Frakes

Comment: How astonishing that this letter is necessary! In Budapest, Hungary when I was there in 2001 it was impossible to wait even 5 minutes for my underground train around the city. When I moved here in 2002 and found above-ground trains and that 15-minute or longer waits were commonplace for either bus or MAX, it was kind of amusing. It is no longer amusing. We have a climate crisis in addition to commuter congestion. Tri-Met should be generously subsidized to allow for needed modernization as well as lower fares. Half a billion dollars would go a long way toward that end.

It has been proven repeatedly that freeway expansion is counter-productive as an attempt to relieve congestion. It is an exercise in futility it is a tragic waste of public resources. You have a responsibility here, please do your job.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0226 Teresa McFarland

Comment: Please do NOT expand the I-5 freeway. It will not reduce congestion and will lead to even more air pollution. Expanded freeways keep us on track for continued use of fossil fuels, which are destroying the planet. We don't have much time left, please act wisely now.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0301 Teresa McGrath

Comment: haven't you learned from los angeles, widening only brings congestion...please make more bike only roads, and encourage cars to steer clear, as they tend to race down ne going for example...this is the worst idea...removing n flint bridge too is just as bad....also, the madrona/hooper place needs trash pick up next to the frwy.....if oregon thinks they are green, this isn't the way to go, as this will worsen the traffic....free transit is the only way to get folks out of their cars, and adding bike lanes and bike blvds help a ton..i lived in l.a. from '53- '74, and saw the traffic increase with widening....this is a lack of vision....rip it up and begin again....a new bridge west of the i-5 bridge could be beneficial for cars/freight, since port of portland is not as busy/and all motorized...transform the existing i-5 bridge to light rail, bikes, scooters, skateboards, pedestrians, all non motorized transit.....deter washington residents from coming to portland....that needs to end, and the freight problem, open port of portland up with real living wage jobs for those workers...thx

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Terese Kelly

Comment: It is unfathomable to me that ODOT would take on this project in light of the serious climate change CRISIS that is having REAL consequences. I'm a transportation activist and I'm well aware that freeway expansion has NEVER led to a reduction in traffic in this country. How is this an "improvement" project? After reading the Oregonian's investigative report on corporate money in our legislature I'm not surprised that this is happening. But it's downright reckless and immoral to consider a project of this type and magnitude at this point in time. We need to further invest in public transportation and its accompanying infrastructure. And we need to get money out of politics.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Teressa Barsotti

Comment: Add me to the chorus of citizens pleading with you to drop the proposed freeway expansion. I dont have kids at Tubman, but I am a mom concerned about air quality and we need to get pollution out of the air, not add more. Freeway expansion is the wrong kind of solution for our bad traffic congestion. Its not going to work, its a waste of money, and its not consistent with the transportation choices we need to be making. Lets just let this idea go and move on to the next one.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Teri Seaton

Comment: As a North Portland resident I oppose the I-5 freeway improvement. More freeways will not solve the transportation issues of Portland. We need a proposal that addresses the vital needs of our community, especially the communities of color who have a long and storied history in North Portland. At a minimum we need an Environmental Impact Statement so the true impact of this project is identified. Portland has many transportation need: notably 82nd, Powell Blvd and Columbia Blvd.

Stop the I-5 improvement and seek a more comprehensive solution to our transportation needs.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Terra Weikel

Comment: I am a parent of an Irvington student - who will be a Harriet Tubman student when this project is slated to kick off. I sometimes drive through the Broadway-Weidler area; I also take public transportation and (try to) bike and walk through the area. There are clearly improvements that could make all of these methods of travel better - but your current plan does not seem to offer any of them - even the highway "improvements" are under serious question by external groups who are reviewing the plans. I am personally dismayed at a number of things about this project:

- I am shocked at how little the project team engaged with the Tubman school community AND the other feeder schools who will have children at Tubman by the time this project is supposed to happen. Where were the school-focused community discussions and educational materials specifically to engage parents, teachers and students? Given both the historic damage done to the surrounding community (greater Albina) and the current issues with air quality at Tubman, this seems like a major oversight. Yes parents and teachers are busy. There are also ways to get to them and engage them - a lengthy technical report dropped on a website - and one public open house at dinner time - are not those ways.

- I've been a public transportation rider all my adult life, and I decided to raise my son here because I saw it as a city that focused its transportation investments on sustainability and equity - committed to building systems for convenient and affordable transportation - to help all people get where they need to be, across the Metro area. Given what I believed about Portland, its disconcerting to see such a large investment that is based on automobile transportation. I didn't imagine this city would be investing so much in a freeway project: I think our priorities should lead us to invest in street-level improvements to make this area safer and more vibrant for the folks who live, work and travel through here - to invest in projects focused on economic justice for the families who used to live here. To fully fund child-focused safety programmes like Safe Routes to School - and build out a better, more equitable bus system. This is the more just and less auto-focused future I want for all children.



- I support the Albina Vision Trust's vision of what this area could look like, and I believe you need to engage with that vision in designing what happens next with I-5. Again, this doesn't seem to have happened, as I see they are also pushing for a full Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the current wave of young people around the world taking climate change action in their own hands has you re-thinking the steps in this process that you skipped - such as fully investigating the impact that congestion pricing could have (and if done equitably).... as well as running the full EIS. Surely you owe the community of young Portlanders who will suffer the consequences of our bad past and current decisions, and the largely African-American community that was so harmed by the original construction of I-5, the very best of what we currently know and can do to mitigate the harmful impact of car use.

I urge you to be part of building a modern Portland that can continue to serve as an example for other cities and not be stuck in a polluting unequal past.

Thank you

Terra Weikel

Portland, OR

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Terrence M. Joy

Comment: Please do not go forward with this proposal. It really does not solve the problem, as the freeway will be just as jammed as soon as the proposed expansion is complete.

We need less cars, more and better public transit, safe and convenient bike ways and pedestrian paths.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 T. Dublinski-Milton

Comment: As an initial supporter if done correctly, my support has eroded due to ODOT mismanagement of the outreach process. ODOT did not release all of the foundational information including base traffic projections until well into the open comment period, as well as certain engineering drawings regarding East bank esplanade impacts. This shows either gross incompetence, or direct obfuscation of the environmental impacts, particularly regarding carbon output and transportation mode splits after completion. The need for a Portland Eastside Esplanade conditional use permit, which will require a separate public process, required requesting documents. This shows ODOT knew this would be controversial, thereby did not tell the public.



ODOT needs to do a full environmental impact statement including induced demand projections, and the viability of moving I 5 to an expanded and buried 405 removing I 5 between Mccadam/405 and I 84 in the process. Start with THREE scenarios.

- 1) No Build with Congestion Pricing of 5, 205 and 84
- 2) A Build out of the current plan with added active transportation improvements outlined below
- 3) a comprehensive downtown highway modernization moving I 5 to 405 including seismic upgrades, the vacation of ODOT land from McCadam to 84 and buildable caps.

Active Transportation elements needed in the CURRENT design:

- 1) The Streetcar line from NE 7th to the Broadway Bridge to be dedicated bus/train only
- 2) the Clackamas overpass should be continued to directly connect to the Broadway Bridge including direct access to the parking garage. This offers another choice other than the switch-back to commuters, encourage bike use to Rose Garden events and would be an amazing addition to the Green loop.
- 3) I 5 should be capped south of Russell consistent with the Albina re-envisioning project and include a Flint Bikeway replacement.
- 4) the Dixon-Hancock overpass must be built with cemented, separated, bike facilities. Painted buffers are not acceptable for new construction

Thank you and I will look forward to the full environmental impact statement

Thank you

Terry Dublinski-Milton, Former Chair, SE Uplift

Attachments: [2019 0402 Terry Dublinski-Milton ATT](#)

2019 0000 Terry Parker

Comment: Comments on the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project, March 12, 2012

Motor vehicle capacity in Portland has not kept up with population growth. There is a vital need to make more room for cars.

Think of a three inch pipeline where the middle section is reduced with a two inch pipe. When fluid is pumped through the line with increased demand, the fluid backs up from the point where the diameter of the pipe is reduced.

The fluidity of traffic on 1-5 backs up in the same manner, specifically at the Rose Quarter where the travel lanes are reduced from three to two. The improvement being proposed is to add a minimal amount of capacity at the bottleneck to even out the flow of traffic. Opposing the improvement by calling it a widening project is being rhetorical and divisive.



This long over due improvement of the 1-5 choke point will reduce congestion in addition to reducing the number of tire squealing crashes that create even more congestion. With the improvements, engine running and idle times will be reduced by 2.5 million hours a year. This means less fuel will be consumed, and as noted in the environmental assessment, less emissions for years to come.

All the local area road diets, lane reductions and narrowing of motor vehicle travel lanes championed by the car haters have brought about present day transportation emissions in Portland to increase for the first time in a decade. With a taxpayer subsidy of nearly 65 cents per passenger mile, and a two-axle transit bus doing as much damage to streets and roads as 1200 cars, replacing motor vehicle travel with transit is simply not cost effective.

Not making roadways flow better and utilizing the resulting congestion as an attempt to dictate travel choice is both prejudicial to the general population and detrimental to the environment. While biting the hands that feed them, the foes who vocally oppose improving 1-5 at the Rose Quarter continually want other people to pay for their choice of transportation mode. Equity is absent. Transit needs to become more financially self sustainable and bicyclists as opposed to motorists need to pay for any and all bicycle infrastructure.

Improving 1-5 at the Rose Quarter dovetails with a recent Metro commissioned poll where the public has said they want wider roads and increased motor vehicle capacity to reduce congestion and therefore emissions.

Building more motor vehicle capacity and making roadways flow better doesn't bring more cars. Building of more housing and adding density to accommodate unrestrained population growth is what brings more cars.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Parker

Northeast Portland

Attachments: N/A

2019 0307 Terry Parker

Comment: 1) The I-5 portion of the project is absolutely needed to reduce congestion, crashes, fuel consumption and therefore emissions

2) With all the bicycle infrastructure included in the project, bicyclists need to directly help pay for it with a user or license fee.

3) Around the freeway cover 3 consider a smaller footprint to allow short-term only parking on the street. The same for the block with the annex building. This will assist neighborhood businesses not related to events when events take place at the Moda Center.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0319 Terry Parker

Comment: Improvements on I-5 at the Rose Quarter are needed to accommodate growth.

When looking at the I-5 improvements proposed for the Rose Quarter, think of a three inch pipeline where the middle section is reduced with a two inch pipe. When fluid is pumped through filling the three inch diameter part of the line, the fluid backs up from the point where the diameter of the pipe is reduced.

On I-5 at the Rose Quarter where the motor vehicle travel lanes are reduced from three to two, the fluidity of traffic backs up in the same manner. With connections to both I-84 and I-405, and on/off ramps connecting with surface streets, I-5 at the Rose Quarter is a like a big intersection that is not working efficiently. Improving the traffic flow at this bottleneck is long over due.

No freeway travel lanes are being proposed leading into this big intersection. Therefore the improvements can hardly be described as a freeway widening project as the suggested by critics with their divisive rhetorical oratory. The proposed auxiliary lanes are no different than adding turn lanes at intersections on surface streets.

Unlike all the local surface street area road diets, lane reductions and narrowing of motor vehicle travel lanes championed by the car haters that in reality increase engine idle times, fuel consumption and emissions; this long over due improvement of the I-5 choke point will reduce congestion. It will also lessen the number of tire squealing crashes that create even more congestion. Engine running and idle times will be reduced by 2.5 million hours a year. Less fuel will be consumed, and therefore less emissions will be produced. Additionally, with the improvements, more drivers are likely to stay on I-5 as opposed to finding alternative routes on the surface streets.

Only about one-half of the \$500 million will be spent on the freeway itself. About \$30 million will be spent on the proposed bicycle infrastructure. For the bicyclists biting the hands that feed them by spewing much of the hot air criticism, the bicycle infrastructure will be constructed with nothing financially coming from the bicyclist's own pockets. Bicyclists and not motorists should be footing the bill for all the bicycle infrastructure in this project.

The majority of the funding balance will be utilized for the freeway covers and replacing the overpasses, all of which must be built to withstand a major earthquake. The existing overpasses are likely to fail in a major earthquake severing emergency routes.



With a taxpayer subsidy of nearly 65 cents per passenger mile, and a two-axle transit bus doing as much damage to streets and roads as 1200 cars, replacing motor vehicle travel with transit is not all that cost effective. Fares cover only about 25% of the operating costs. Additionally, transit doesn't go everywhere the public wants to go, and there is no direct North-South transit connection parallel to I-5, or one planned, that efficiently bypasses downtown. In addition to increasing overall operating expenses, expanding transit alternatives with bond measures paid back through property taxes escalates the costs of housing.

Improving I-5 at the Rose Quarter dovetails with a recent Metro commissioned poll where the public has said they want wider roads and increased motor vehicle capacity to reduce congestion and therefore emissions.

Building more motor vehicle capacity and making roadways flow better doesn't bring more cars. Building of more housing and adding density to accommodate unrestrained population growth is what brings more cars. If growth is to occur and be sustainable, more room is needed for cars.
Terry Parker

Northeast Portland

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 T. Morrison

Comment: I live in NW Portland and go to medical school at OHSU. My partner is an urban planner who keeps me up to date on urban development plans in Portland. I am deeply concerned about the Rose Quarter lane expansion. There is certainly an increase in traffic as the population of Portland increases; however, lane expansions have never reduced traffic overall. This should be the most concerning considering the \$500M allocated to this project, but we can add on a reduced effectiveness of public transit and increased pollution, especially to the neighboring Harriet Tubman school. We need to think creatively about how to move our Portlanders. People are more willing than ever to consider alternatives to cars, increasing transit and bike use. This infrastructure could be greatly improved and expanded with all this money. We do not want to be a city surrounded by smog, drowned by a thick rope of highways. We want to innovate, reduce our damage to the environment, and feel more connected to our community. This means transit. I've had and have seen many projects with good intentions that fail to deliver. Please consider that your project will not improve the traffic situation and is not a good solution for Portland.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0306 Thea Kindschuh

Comment: Expanding I5 through the Rose Quarter is a terrible and unwanted idea. This expansion would take transportation planning in Portland in an embarrassingly backward direction. Induced demand will increase auto usage of this stretch, and more cars on the road will just lead to increased congestion here and elsewhere in the city. We need to be investing in expanding transit infrastructure, enough space and money is given to autos already and it is not the way our city needs to be going. Sincerely, a lifelong Portland resident and urban planner that commutes from NE to downtown daily (not by car).

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Thomas Brown

Comment: We must break the fossil fuel cycle of addiction. When you expand the capacity to add more individual cars & trucks, that capacity will get used. It would be much more efficient and even wiser to add that capacity to the rapid / mass transit side of the ledger. Please consider doing the right thing!

Thomas Brown

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Thomas Doherty

Comment: Please institute decongestion pricing before any I5 expansion. Use a fair and fact based approach. Road pricing is the only policy actually proven to reduce traffic congestion; its also proven to improve air quality and reduce carbon emissions as well. The majority of the commuters through the Rose Quarter corridor are not living in that area. Local residents should not have to bear the impacts of increased traffic and congestion. I am a parent of a student at Harriet Tubman School. My daughter deserves a better solution than expensive and costly disruptions that will not solve traffic problems and are likely to harm local communities.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 T. DuBuisson

Comment: As someone who jogs and bikes over I-5 at Vancouver/Williams on a daily basis, I don't see this expansion as a wise use of public transportation dollars.

The increased traffic welcomed by the larger freeway will further endanger city residence who are walking and biking. If we're determined to spend resources supporting those who've opted to live too far from work then let's be more forward looking and take this funding as a 1/4 or 1/3 down payment for a Max line between Portland and Vancouver.



Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Thomas Jeanne

Comment: The Environmental Assessment is inadequate and fails to incorporate ODOT's own findings that congestion pricing would likely be more effective than freeway expansion at reducing traffic congestion and emissions. This proposal to spend half a billion dollars to widen a short section of I-5 is short-sighted, irresponsible, and fails in several ways: (1) not meeting the objective of reducing traffic congestion: the EA ignores evidence from around the world that adding lanes to freeways is a long-term solution that will reduce congestion and transit time; instead it will encourage more driving; (2) cost effectiveness: extremely expensive to construct and will take away funds that could be used to promote less carbon-intensive transportation solutions; (3) people-centric transportation approach: this is a cars-first approach, which is the last thing we need in 2019, with climate change accelerating and population growing in the Portland metro area; we need to spend transportation dollars on ways to make the city easier to traverse by people, not cars; (4) equity: the case that widening a freeway will decrease emissions due to higher average speeds through the area is highly suspect in light of the increase in vehicle-miles that is very likely to result; the Rose Quarter and nearby residential neighborhoods have suffered from inequitable city planning and transportation approaches in the past and this will ultimately worsen those by increasing traffic emissions and noise (if speeds and traffic do increase); these will adversely impact health of local residents, including African Americans and disadvantaged populations, and children attending Tubman School. I urge ODOT to perform a full EIS and to rethink how to use public funds to improve transportation and quality life for all who live and travel through Portland.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Tim Davis

Comment: Dear ODOT, Metro, PBOT and City of Portland,

Its incredibly depressing that in 2019, in Portland no less, we are STILL talking about expanding freeways! And this *particular* project is absolutely riddled with problems.

First of all, everything Ive read in the EA is either misleading, incorrect or an outright lie. I could go on for dozens of pages about this fact alone. And the more we hear about ODOTs *real* plans, the worse it gets. And ODOTs *real* plans are for a massive 8-lane freeway, along with reviving the insane Columbia River Crossing proposal from the dead. Unbelievable and unconscionable.

This project is not at ALL about safety. 3 of the 4 deaths in the past decade in this corridor have been pedestrians! And widening the freeway corridor would only make this number likely to increase! This project will make people drive more quickly and make us all LESS safe.

Our politicians are sold on bogus claims of reduced emissions. Even if emissions remain the same, literally EVERYTHING else has a negative impact in every conceivable way. Just ONE of hundreds of negative impacts would be much worse air quality near I-5.



If you build a city for cars and traffic, all you get is cars and traffic! We must STOP *encouraging* people to DRIVE as much as possible *through* Portland. Yes, I fully realize that freight needs to get delivered through the city, but the vast majority of the I-5 trips are NOT necessary. We need to severely curtail *unnecessary* trips, so that those who MUST travel through the city on our interstate system are able to do so more effectively.

We need to create better PLACES, so that people will no longer feel the NEED to drive anywhere near as much. Why on Earth do we keep prioritizing CARS over PEOPLE?!? We must never again prioritize *passage* over *place*. Doing so is wrong in EVERY way: environmentally, economically (which is never, ever understood by ANY traffic engineers), socially, health-wise, stress-wise, etc.

Its incredibly depressing that we have to CONTINUE educating our traffic engineers, planners, politicians and transportation professionals about the basics of induced demand, externalities of fossil fuels and car dependence, decongestion pricing, traffic demand management, parking reform, and dozens of other incredibly obvious and PROVEN next-generation transportation concepts.

ODOT uses 100% discredited auto-based LOS and models that favor speed and throughput, at the expense of livability including literal human lives! Models are only as good as their inputs, and ODOT still lives in the car-dominated 1950s with all their models and traffic engineers who are still incredibly old-school.

I just cant believe that ODOT wants to spend \$500 million to make everything worse for EVERYONE, *including* those who solely drive!!

Plus, air quality would get much *worse*, not better.

ODOT claims to throw some crumbs at non-auto traffic to make the project appear more palatable, but theyre all completely disingenuous. For example, I do NOT trust for *one second* any claims at all about these lids. A lid over a freeway needs to support at LEAST a 6-story building. But these wont even support a ONE-story building. Theyre just staging areas, and they will create ZERO sense of place, ZERO housing, ZERO stitching together of Lower Albina, etc.

Its yet another empty promise. And any cycling crumbs (including a*ridiculous* 9% grade) are laughable. Meanwhile, cyclists would lose the very convenient Flint Avenue bridge.

This MUST be the last year that massive FREEWAY projects are EVER taken seriously within Portland city limits. Highways are great at enabling fast, efficient travel BETWEEN cities and metro areas, but once youre IN a dense urban area, the streets need to be dominated by PEOPLE.

It would be MUCH less expensive and destructive to society if the state were to LITERALLY FLUSH \$1 billion into the Willamette!! Think about that!!

Instead, here are some REAL solutions:

1. Completely kick ODOT out of Portland and create a city that values PEOPLE, community and human life over cars. Multi-lane, fast-flowing highways are great once you are OUTSIDE of



dense urban areas. But within Portland, they are ridiculous, and they only *encourage* people to DRIVE everywhere for everything.

2. Fix the REAL safety problems: 82nd, Powell, 122nd, outer Division, outer Stark/Washington, etc. These corridors *desperately* need transit-only lanes, MUCH more intense development, and MUCH more housing. THAT would be an investment in PEOPLE! And it would create many, many times the economic opportunities for the people living on and near these corridors.

3. TOLL the freeway FIRST! The truckers would support this, because it would get unnecessary car trips off the road!

4. Again, create better, more vibrant and densely populated PLACES in Portland. This will enable people to live much, much closer to where they work, shop and play. Widening freeways *always* makes things MUCH worse in the long run.

5. GET RID of I-5 between the Marquam and Fremont bridges. This would have a HUGE positive economic and health impact in Portland! That is what I want to see most of all. Change I-405 to I-5. Done. Then Truckers could still use I-5, Hwy 99 and I-205 to go north-south through Portland. And with all the unnecessary trips *removed* from the interstate system, there would be plenty of capacity for freight traffic.

Thank you so much for your consideration,

Tim Davis

Portland, OR 97201

Attachments: N/A

2019 0313 Tim Holdaway

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

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

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

Sincerely,



Tim Holdaway

Attachments: N/A

2019 0330 Tim McCann

Comment: I would like to register my *strong* opposition to the proposed Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project. This project is misguided on so many levels, and represents a willing disregard for climate realities, for public transparency and a fair assessment of all of the options on the table, for underrepresented communities, and much, much more.

In no particular order:

Theres the fact that the climate change is already having significant impacts on our world, our country, our state, and our communities. Transportation emissions are now the largest source of global warming greenhouse gases. In what world does it make sense to spend half a billion dollars to make it *easier* for us to keep using a polluting system of transportation? We should instead be spending that money to give people other options to get around -- whether its expanding service on Tri-Met, or creating more high-quality, safe infrastructure for people on bikes or people walking/rolling -- options that arent actively driving our climate crisis.

Theres the fact that this freeway expansion would encroach even further upon Harriet Tubman Middle School, increasing air and particulate pollution at a school where its *already* so bad that researchers warned the school not to let their students play outside. At a school where 40% of students are Black, and 73% are identified by PPS as vulnerable populations, in a community that was literally demolished and split apart decades ago when this freeway was built in the first place, for a state with such a ignominious history of racism, it is appalling to think that we would move forward with this project given the harms it would inflict upon those communities.

Theres the fact that cities have tried to build their way out of congestion before and it hasnt fixed the problem. Induced demand is a real phenomenon, and if this project is built, youll see the Rose Quarter fill right back up with traffic volume, just like has happened in so many other places that have undergone massive freeway expansions. When I think of induced demand, I think of Field of Dreams: If you build it, they will come. Others liken it to a gas filling up the space it inhabits. I just cant believe were here needing to explain induced demand to transportation professionals.

Theres the fact that congestion pricing would address a significant amount of the traffic issues without Oregon having to spend anywhere close to half a billion dollars on infrastructure that wed be dealing with for a generation (or more).

Theres the fact that this project would impact the Eastside Esplanade, further squeezing the already small strip of land wedged between the river and the interstate. If anything, we should be tearing these interstates down and opening up that area to the people of Portland, not making it into a place where we need to deal with even more noise and pollutants from the cars and trucks passing overhead.



Theres the fact that ODOT has tried to justify this project for safety reasons, when in reality I-5 in the Rose Quarter doesnt come anywhere close to being the most dangerous for people. As it turns out, ODOT controls some of the corridors that rank high on that list. Could you imagine what we could do with \$500 million to make 82nd or Powell in East Portland safer?

Theres the fact that ODOT has incorporated a fully-built Columbia River Crossing into the no-build scenario, hiding fundamental facts and assumptions and in the process likely violating the National Environmental Policy Act.

Theres the fact that ODOT has been remarkably intransigent throughout this entire process, withholding plans and designs from public scrutiny. If you have to disguise so many assumptions and create so many hurdles for people to make an honest assessment of the project -- maybe the project doesnt hold up on the merits.

Theres the fact that community groups in the areas that will be most impacted by this project are outspoken in their opposition. Its long past time for ODOT to do more than just hear those groups -- its time for ODOT to *listen* to what they are saying.

I could go on.

As a colleague of mine liked to say, respect is earned in drops and lost in buckets. At this point I dont know if I have any left for ODOT, since iits been raining buckets since this project began to move forward in earnest. But I want ODOT to start earning it back, because there is so much that we need to do to create the transportation systems its going to take to address the critical problems were facing as a society today. We need to be able to trust ODOT and other public agencies as a partner in that work, but earning that trust back needs to start now, with putting a hold on this project until *at the very least* a full Environmental Impact Statement is completed and congestion pricing is implemented. Study ALL of the alternatives, and show Portlanders and Oregonians what our options are, and we can make a real assessment *together*, as partners and stakeholders in this process.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Timothy Stinson 1

Comment: Nothing short of direct action against additional automobilization & petro-based civilization will even begin to effectively mitigate U\$A's transportation-gobal warming interface. Pollution & congestion, their so-far externalized social-ecological costs to private industry's benefit must stop, then be reversed/internalized, to force the necessary shift toward expanded rail & other forms of mass transit.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Timothy Stinson 2

Comment: If this expansion goes through, the next effective mass action must be a call to



investigate ODOT management's interface with the lobbying forces at play in the policy formation & implementation processes, From AAA to the roadbuilding, auto-truck manufacturing, insurance & all related industries--all those whose financial & political interests benefit from status quo projects like the I-5 lane expansion--must be exposed & made to pay some painful costs, including jail time as well as monetary.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Timothy Stinson

Comment: *no comment included

Attachments: N/A

2019 0312 Timur Ender

Comment: To whom it may concern:

We are writing to provide comments as it relates to the Environmental Assessment for the I-5 highway expansion project.

Air Quality

I am deeply concerned about air quality. Until recently, our infant child was enrolled at a daycare facility on N. Flint immediately adjacent to this project area for 6 months. The air quality issues surrounding the existing poor air quality in this area was the single most important driving factor in

taking her out of daycare and moving our child to another location. We were able to switch daycares because we had the means; many of our child's classmates do not have the luxury to make

that choice. During our morning walks to daycare on the Flint street bridge, I could hear my 6 month

old infant child cough due to the poor air quality. When I saw 2 year old kids playing outside, I couldn't help but notice the exposure to poor air quality that they were surrounded by.

It is my opinion that this highway expansion project will only make this worse by attracting more cars

and therefore more congestion and idling vehicles.

Surface streets

One of the best things cities can do to encourage sustainability is to provide opportunities for safe,



convenient options for biking and walking. The Flint street bridge is one of the most used bicycle corridors anywhere in a major US city. It is unacceptable that this project does not replace this bridge or restore the grid network to provide this direct access. The extra effort required by people

who bike under the proposed plan should be considered in the EA as a negative environmental impact. If biking is less convenient, people will likely shift to other modes which impacts the environmental health of this district and the city.

Funding

Highway expansion mega projects are notorious for cost overruns. Further, this funding can be allocated elsewhere where the safety need is greater given that it is a discretionary decision by state

lawmakers and not federally obligated funds. Arterials in East Portland are statistically much more

deadly than this stretch of I-5. No one denies that a highway should have a shoulder but a lot of people feel that highway widening with added lanes and providing a shoulder is not worth the \$500

million cost when there are other more pressing community priorities as expressed by neighborhood

and advocacy groups.

Tolling

Tolling is the single policy that actually solves congestion. This should be implemented first, ensuring

that it is equitable for all involved. We need to make our transportation system work for freight and

people who need to drive. Tolling the corridor would remove discretionary trips off of the system and could also improve transit, biking, and walking. This should proceed any effort to widen the highway.

Data

The claims surrounding greenhouse gas emissions being reduced under the plan to build more highway lanes ignores the concept of induced demand and is not a believable assertion. I am curious as to what this claim is based off of.

“The Build Alternative would not create new capacity or add substantial capacity to the existing



highway.” This is from the EA and I find it to be both untrue and misleading. The proposed project

does add highway lanes and therefore capacity. The simple truth is that the build proposal has more

lanes that what is there today even if they connect ramps throughout the corridor. More lanes induce the demand for more driving which means air quality, congestion, and climate change are all

pushed in the wrong direction. The inability to acknowledge the principle of induced demand is a failure of the environmental assessment.

Conclusion

I feel the items mentioned above are not adequately addressed in the EA and I think it is critical that

this project have a full Environmental Impact Statement if it is to move forward. The best alternative

would be to reallocate the funding to arterials where people are actually dying, toll the I-5 corridor,

and to improve surface streets above the highway without expanding the I-5 corridor.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

Althea & Timur Ender

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Tod Pitstick

Comment: I like the idea of capping the freeway but NOT adding travel lanes! How about turning some of that money over to TRIMET and see what they can do to move people through Portland. Adding lanes will encourage people

to get in there cars, congestion pricing will make the users pay.

Thanks for your consideration.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Todd Brown

Comment: With an ever-worsening climate outlook and reams of data that show capacity improvements are a short-term stopgap at best, new freeways seem like a really poor investment of tax dollars. Let's consider more public transportation funding and tolls instead!



Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Todd Peres

Comment: Writing in support of this project. As a native Portlander, I can tell you this bottleneck has been a problem for DECADES, a fix is 20 years overdue.

Better for cars to be moving though this area vs. sitting and idling with engines on but going nowhere!

We shouldnt build any additional freeways, but maximize the ones we have. This is common sense.

Thank you,

Todd Peres

North Portland

Attachments: N/A

2019 0322 Todd Williams 1

Comment: We dont need to expand our freeways with expensive measure that in the end help residents of Clark County the most. Our property values will stagnate and southwest Washingtons will increase disproportionately due to making the urban center of the region more accessible to them.

We we need instead is increased local infrastructure to support intercity traffic on surface streets to include greater safety for pedestrians, cyclists and busses that do not impede traffic.

As far as interstate highways are concerned - were good.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Tom Baldwin

Comment: While it may seem intuitive that adding lanes to the freeway will reduce congestion, all it does in practice is create more space for the problem to grow. Even if, after months/years of construction delays, the proposed auxiliary lanes achieve the modest improvement in travel times promised by ODOT, that fact will induce demand for highway travel. This leads to more unnecessary trips, more cars on the road, and another bottleneck forming somewhere else. This project doesn't solve a problem, it just spreads it around.

The evidence-based solution to traffic gridlock is to implement decongestion pricing and use the revenue to fund alternative modes that are more space-efficient and more broadly accessible. In urban environments, it's foolish to assume that everyone can drive a car to where they're going -



better to price the highway to reflect its enormous cost and cultivate alternatives that give people a choice.

But ODOT's existing study on this project fails to adequately study decongestion pricing as an alternative. The proposed bicycle and pedestrian improvements are at best a window dressing and at worst a regression (see the massive corner radii in plan drawings). The proposed freeway caps are useless as buildable urban space. Even the no-build alternative contains assumptions about the CRC that don't match anyone's understanding of what it means to not build.

This project, at minimum, should not proceed without a full EIS to address compelling alternative solutions that the current report ignores. But there is good evidence already that it should not be built. We've added enough lanes to freeways in this country to know that this isn't a solution - it's just another click on the policy ratchet that is constantly creating more space for the least efficient, most inequitable mode of urban transportation.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0226 Tom Bender

Comment: *no comment included

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Tom Brenneman

Comment: I live in the Piedmont neighborhood of North Portland and work in Beaverton. I commute every day by bicycle. I ride from my house down to Pioneer Square and get on the MAX train. Part of the reason I commute this way is because to drive from Beaverton to North Portland at 5pm takes a very long time due to traffic.

The freeway expansion around the Rose Quarter would have a direct impact on reducing that time. But I strongly disagree with spending this kind of money to encourage more people to drive. Sure it would help me drive my car to and from work, but it would do the same for many people.

We need more creative ways to improve transportation. I for one would benefit from better bike lanes. Unless you would rather I drive.

Thanks,

Tom

Attachments: N/A



2019 0331 Tom Foeller

Comment: Comment: Dear ODOT Officials, March 31, 2019

My wife and I strongly support the effort for current plans to improve this section of I-5 and the supporting environmental assessment (EA). We live on Hayden island and consider ourselves strong environmental activists, but we are frequently LOCKED between TWO major pinch points along I-5, the Interstate Bridge and Rose Quarter. We live in an 84 unit Condo complex and along with our neighbors desperately need relief from the congestion, unsafe air and traffic conditions, delays, waste, and insufficient vehicular capacity in the rose quarter corridor. We've been involved in MANY near vehicle misses caused by the crowded conditions; crossovers, stop & go, and merging traffic; poor sight lines and other unsafe conditions there.

It's EXTREMELY frustrating and the I-5 delays are enormous economic burdens to commercial and residential travelers. It also make travel through this section of Freeway UNBEARABLE for visitors and workers in adjacent areas of OR and WA. We've sat in traffic for hours with others, engines running, frustrated and extremely angry. Now we frequently try to by-pass most of I-5 by rushing through competing traffic on MLK, Interstate Ave, Denver Ave, Vancouver Ave and both directions on Marine drive while trying to get on and off Hayden island to family, friends, activities and appointments! This also involves frequently trying to find short cuts through residential neighborhoods; by schools, parks, anything..... to avoid STAGNATING in traffic. This tactic has negative impacts on the safety and livability of all of us because the Freeway IS NOT MOVING ENOUGH TRAFFIC.

We find the efforts of "No Freeways" groups well intended but WAY SHORT of practical, effective, life cycle cost effective problem solving strategies. We strongly believe in multimodal forms of transportation; preserving and enhancing neighborhoods; being able to live and work in safe walkable neighborhoods, and designing and enjoying the amenities the Portland area has to offer. BUT unless you can be completely self reliant in your neighborhood you have to be able to reach other critical services and destinations, and without some capable and decent freeways our standard of living and livability will continue to suffer irreversibly. Public transportation alternatives are poor on Hayden Island. Convenience and timeliness of transportation are the most important elements for us at our condo complex,



consisting mostly of Seniors, so we drive.

My wife and I would like to see a realistic regional multi-modal comprehensive transportation plan developed AND IMPLEMENTED for the Portland METRO area, rather than addressing and funding improvements piecemeal, but we know obtaining financing, and public and legislative approvals for plans are very problematic. HOWEVER, this one pretty well thought out plan and EA for the Rose Quarter improvements, and in the belief its cost effective, environmentally sound, and financeable, we SUPPORT it and recommend you support the findings of the EA and proceed rapidly to implement the project

Sincerely,

Tom and Meri Foeller

P.S. After discussions with many of our 84 unit condo complex residents, I'm sure most of the residents support most of the comments above!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0329 Tom Howe

Comment: I'm writing to request that a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) be completed on this project. Many concerns have recently come to light such as increased construction pollution during the long construction period the project requires. And it appears the widening of I5 will extend over the top of a large portion of the Vera Katz Eastbank Esplanade. These impacts need to be assessed in greater detail.

Thanks,

Tom Howe

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Tom Rodrigues

Comment: I'm a longtime Portland resident who strongly opposes any additional freeway construction or freeway expansion. They do not reduce congestion in the long term and the costs are too great to our wallets, environment, and neighborhoods. I want to see more resources spent on more economically, socially, and environmentally sustainable forms of transportation like bus lines, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian infrastructure.

Attachments: N/A



2019 0328 Tony

Comment: One of the main reason there is constant congestion on the i5 freeway is because there is way too many exits and entrances to it. A freeway is supposed to be a way to get across town quickly, not to get a mile or 2 down the road. That's what surface streets are for. With so many people trying to get on and off at so many points it is messing everything up.

It would cost less to get rid of some of these entry points.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0327 Tony Green

Comment: The article by Joe Cortright at cityobservatory.org deligitimizes the entire need for the project and lays the groundwork for a successful lawsuit. Please stop wasting money on a project that will save not a single life.

<http://cityobservatory.org>

Attachments: N/A

2019 0331 Tony Jordan

Comment: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my concerns about the I5 Rose Quarter project. I do not agree with the findings of the Environmental Assessment (EA) and I believe ODOT should conduct a full Environmental Impact Study.

I am opposed to this project because I do not think ODOT has been honest or forthcoming about the need for widening the freeway, the long term intent of the agency regarding the I5 through the Portland Metro Area, or the design and impact of the project. It is particularly disturbing that concerned citizens had to force ODOT to release documents (which initially ODOT denied existed) containing several concerning revelations about the project. This seeming deceit and dishonesty, alone, should be enough to require a step back and RESET on the project.

To frustrated drivers, ODOT has presented the project as either a solution to a congestion-inducing bottleneck, but the models don't suggest that the widening will alleviate commute times by an appreciable amount. To others, ODOT presents the widening as a safety improvement, using a statistical sleight of hand to conflate fender bender collisions with deadly car crashes. To the community displaced generations ago, ODOT presents the project as a remediation, as if a few stinky and noisy freeway lids (likely to be the first items cut in value engineering) will heal the community.



To describe the project honestly would have required ODOT to reveal that traffic projections ignore the principle of induced demand (and make some specious assumptions about the Columbia River Crossing). To be honest, ODOT would have to admit that, if anything, the widening could lead to more deadly crashes in the Rose Quarter as off-peak speeds would increase in the area. To be honest, ODOT would have to advertise that they have not modeled delays to pedestrians and bicyclists due to construction, that the project contains an overpass expansion that would shade the Eastbank Esplanade, and that the car-centric street-level designs they propose don't meet basic modern requirements.

ODOT has the audacity to claim that building the project will reduce emissions relative to a scenario where we don't build it. But ODOT doesn't make it clear that their no-build scenario assumes a 3BILLION dollar mega-highway CRC is built.

The project cost, at least \$500,000,000, could be much better spent on projects that actually help move more people quicker through the city (transit-only lanes, for example). ODOT could save hundreds of lives by spending our money on SE Powell Blvd and 82nd Avenue, both shameful killer state highways. ODOT could alleviate congestion on the highways by implementing decongestion pricing.

This is the wrong project for our time. I have two school-aged children and I worry about the health of the planet and how difficult their lives will be because of the mistakes we've made in the last 100 years. Car culture and car-centric development helped to create a society that appears wealthy and full of individual mobility and freedom, at least for well-off white people. But all that has been purchased on credit and the bill is coming due. We need to move in a new direction, preferably by bus.

Thank you for considering my comments,

Tony Jordan

Attachments: N/A

2019 0328 Tony Tapay

Comment: I cannot support this project for a number reasons, but most glaring is the lack of transparency and outright dishonesty from ODOT. How in the world can anyone, including proponents, rightfully support this project when the information that we're being given is being actively manipulated in this project's favor. ODOT needs to stop being a construction advocacy group and start being an honest and forthright transportation (all types!) department.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Tonya Roe

Comment: As a homeowner in the Piedmont neighborhood, I want to express my strong opposition to expanding I-5 in North Portland. Spending \$500M on a project that will not have a long term positive impact on our city does not make any sense. It may allow more cars to get to the central city, but then where do they park? Doesn't that just cause new problems? If they are



just passing through, isn't that was 205 is for? Why would we encourage them to drive through neighborhoods where our children go to school?

The financial and environmental costs are too high. This is not a good project and should not move forward.

Thank you

Tonya Roe

Attachments: N/A

2019 0325 Topher Henness

Comment: Seeing as freeway widening has never helped congestion, and that we're in the middle of a climate catastrophe, I think spending half a billion dollars on encouraging drivers is nearly criminal. Spend that money on transit and active commuting, if you want to decrease congestion and improve our city. Don't fall down the same trap as Los Angeles and Seattle, try the Amsterdam route instead.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Topher Rhodes

Comment: My name is Christopher Rhodes. Im not a transportation engineer or a city planner, but my dad was Vic Rhodes, Director of Transportation of the City of Portland from 1997 - 2002, so I grew up listening to my parents and their friends and colleagues discuss the problems, challenges, solutions and visions for transportation in our city. I love Portland and I truly want it to thrive - thats why Im strongly opposed to the Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion project and urge you to instead invest in projects that will improve the lives of the people of this city, state and world.

When considering investments in transportation infrastructure that will last for generations, we must be absolutely sure weve considered the impact that the project will have on the regions people and communities. I dont think that enough consideration has been given to the civil, social and environmental impact of this project, and we need a sober assessment that acknowledges that, for the communities through which they pass, freeways are a failure, and we do not need more of them. In a reality where we have less than 12 years to take critical action to avoid catastrophic climate change, the LAST thing we need to do is invest our precious infrastructure dollars in projects that will only serve to increase reliance on cars and further degrade our environment.

Projects like MAX, the Eastbank Esplanade, the Streetcar, etc like my dad championed are what make Portland livable and iconic. We need more of that kind of vision - not more freeways. East Portland still lacks sidewalks, many roads are unpaved or full of potholes, we should address that - to make our city more walkable/bikeable before expanding a freeway that will not



decrease congestion. We could build underground light rail, we could add more buses that are desperately needed; we could do any number of things that would go towards keeping Portland the place that is known for innovative, progressive transportation policy - the place that my father envisioned and fought for, the place that I love.

Thank you,

Christopher Rhodes

Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Toranse Lowell

Comment: Widening the freeway makes for an uglier, more polluted city. A sustainable future is a future that we can breathe in, quite literally. We need more sidewalks, more bike lanes, and better public transportation systems so that people feel less constricted in utilizing more environmentally smart forms of public transportation.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0224 Tracey Egan

Comment: This is way past due. Build the lanes. That pocket is pure gridlock and cant handle the current usage much less projected growth for Portland.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0225 Trask Owen Colby

Comment: I do not support the expansion of I-5 through the Rose Quarter. We can not build lanes out of any "traffic problems." The only effective means of eliminating car traffic is by investment in other forms of transportation. All over the world cities are making it impossible for cars to drive in the center of them. These are cities that are being transformed into places for people to live, walk and bike. What ODOT proposes is the exact opposite.

We have already lost the riverfront to freeways on both sides of the Willamette. Thankfully we regained the west bank, but the east bank I fear is forever lost. Let's not make it worse by continuing to expand it. We will not solve congestion in Portland by making more freeways. In texas an increase from 8 lane to 23 lanes completed nothing except making traffic worse. <https://usa.streetsblog.org/2015/05/28/the-23-lane-katy-freeway-a-monument-to-texas-transportation-futility/>

I see in no way that ODOT can ignore cases like this and others that did nothing to relieve congestion.

Moreover, if your intent is to make it easier for cars to drive, you are fundamentally failing in your duties to be good stewards to the earth. We need less concrete, fewer cars and more



green to make Oregon a better place to live. Take \$500+ million dollars, and invest in buses, parks, bikes, e-bikes!, bus lanes, Sullivan's Gulch bike trail, tree planting, or nature escaping. Literally anything other than more freeways. The world doesn't need more roads and cars, Portland doesn't either. Make the right choice.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0219 Trevor Farrell

Comment: After reviewing the Environmental Assessment, I find ODOT's claims that the proposed Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion will reduce congestion and air pollution to be unconvincing and a massive waste of resources. As a resident of northeast Portland, I urge this project to be halted and for the money to be redirected into local public transportation.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0326 Trevor Williams

Comment: Do not use our tax dollars for the I5 expansion through the Albina neighborhoods. Wrong project at the worst time. This will benefit no one and will negatively impact everyone. Spend money on reducing car travel by investing in equitable access to the MAX, street car, electric bus, bike and sidewalk infrastructure! Please!

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Trish Claffey

Comment: Please don't spend billions to add to climate change! Please spend billions on bike lanes, education, walk-able neighborhoods.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0301 Troy Unverdruss

Comment: As Oregonians, we have always been forward thinking regarding the environment, it's time to put that legacy to work for us.

This project is a costly one, and it will only cement the freeway in the heart of our city. This freeway induces car traffic and will, over time, only become more congested until we're back to where we started - gridlock in the urban center.

This benefits an elite few in the short term (those lucky enough to be able to afford a car and have the physical abilities to drive it). In the long term, however, a larger freeway will allow more cars to idle in the same place, burning fossil fuels, reducing longterm health outcomes for residents, and decreasing the quality of the minimal pedestrian-focused infrastructure in the



plan. (Nobody wants to stand around smelling exhaust in the few little pedestrian areas in the plan, for example, our eastbank could be SO much more amazing if the serenity of our waterfront wasn't adjacent to I5 with all the attendant noise and pollution).

We should take our 500 million dollars and use it to rethink our non-car infrastructure. We could move a lot more people through our city if we increased public transportation options, spent it on biking infrastructure, spent it on pedestrian infrastructure. All of those things would reduce our long term environmental impact instead of eventually worsening it.

Study after study shows that increased freeway size results in induced traffic. Let's follow the accepted research on this and make some sane decisions about our future.

For everyone's benefit.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Tyler Bullen

Comment: Lets not go forth with this I-5 widening project. There are just too many good reasons not to:

- It requires land seizure to expand highway infrastructure. This is backwards - we need valuable land in the center city for people, not cars.
- It further endangers air quality for students at Harriet Tubman High School. Isn't middle school tough enough without being exposed to even more harmful highway toxins?
- Its improvements to the Albina neighborhood are totally inadequate. The caps do virtually nothing to actually reconnect the neighborhood, and the bike lanes as designed aren't even at city-mandated width, given their anticipated volume.
- It won't materially increase the highway safety, as fatal crashes are rare on this section of highway. People are killed more frequently on other ODOT facilities. If this is about safety, let's fix those roads first.
- Most egregiously, it expands our region's fossil fuel infrastructure, helping pump more carbon into the atmosphere and warming our planet. I don't buy that this project will slightly decrease carbon emissions. More highway = more cars = more carbon, period.

Looking to alleviate congestion and improve travel times? Great, that's a laudable goal. Let's actually tackle the problem with decongestion pricing. It works in Europe, it'll work here too. Widening highways is an ineffective 20th century solution that has consistently failed to deliver on its promise.

Let's start thinking about our future in ways that could improve livability for future generations. As one of America's most environmentally-conscious states, Oregon should be a leader on tackling climate change. The world is warming, quickly. Isn't it time we stopped expanding highways?

Tyler Bullen



Attachments: N/A

2019 0402 Tyler Deffenbaugh

Comment: Please dont build this! Its not going to relieve congestion, and even if it did, it would encourage more people driving cars, which irresponsibly increases greenhouse gases.

If we devote millions of dollars to expand highways instead of other green measures for transportation, it means that our leaders dont comprehend the magnitude of the climate change crisis.

Please do the right thing and cancel this project, and instead work to aggressively increase public transit, while discouraging private automobile transportation.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Tyler Karr

Comment: Expanding the freeway is going to do nothing but increase environmental dangers, when we're already experiencing a global threat of irreversible climate change. Portland is considered to be a progressive city, and expanding the freeway instead of utilizing funding to seek and implement clean alternatives to get more folks to stop driving is 100 steps backwards. There are far too many negatives which outweigh any possibility of a positive outcome no city has solved congestion by expanding freeways. It will not change here.

Attachments: N/A

2019 0401 Tyler Lyon

Comment: I'm strongly against expanding the highway and very much in favor for decongestion pricing!

Attachments: N/A