



**Date:** Wednesday, November 29, 2017

**To:** Portland Mayor Ted Wheeler  
Portland City Commissioner Amanda Fritz  
Portland City Commissioner Dan Saltzman  
Portland City Commissioner Nick Fish  
Portland City Commissioner Chloe Eudaly

**CC:** Megan Channell, Project Manager, Oregon Department of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Transportation Portland Area Value Pricing Advisory  
Committee  
Oregon Transportation Commission

**From:** No More Freeway Expansions Coalition

The No More Freeway Expansions Coalition is writing to express our concerns about the Resolution before Portland City Council introduced by Commissioner Dan Saltzman on November 30, 2017, Agenda Item 1276.

### **Congestion Pricing is a Cost-Effective, Healthy, Green, and (if Implemented Successfully) Equitable Answer to Portland's Traffic Woes**

We first wish to thank Portland's City Council for their ongoing support of congestion pricing as a useful, cost-effective, sustainable, and (if implemented correctly) equitable policy initiative to address the myriad of concerns associated with increasing regional gridlock on our region's freeways, from the formation of HB 2017 through Thursday's Resolution. Pricing our roads during peak travel times to encourage usage of mass transit, carpooling, and alternative travel times is an effective public policy tool that accomplishes a litany of preferred policy outcomes. Congestion pricing is the only policy initiative empirically proven to reduce traffic gridlock, for commuters and freight and buses alike, and we welcome Portland City Council's continued willingness to support this new policy tool.

### **Congestion Pricing Resolution Doesn't Go Far Enough**

Our coalition is concerned Thursday's resolution doesn't go far enough in ensuring that the Portland Region fully gains the litany of positive benefits from congestion pricing implementation. We are most concerned that the resolution says nothing about the significant impacts that massive freeway expansion, such as the proposed \$450 million freeway expansion through the Rose Quarter, will have on the potential positive benefits of congestion pricing.



On September 1st, Commissioner Dan Saltzman provided draft language of today's amendment to bikeportland.org<sup>1</sup>. As Jonathan Maus reported, Saltzman's amendment included language that specifically directed the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) to implement congestion pricing before freeway expansion continued:

*"Include congestion/value pricing before the project breaks ground to ensure maximum congestion relief and overall environmental benefits"*

Thursday's resolution in support of congestion pricing contains no language about prioritizing congestion pricing over freeway expansion. It is our Coalition's position that congestion pricing should be implemented on any stretch of freeway within Portland's Urban Growth Boundary before any lane mile expansion is considered. Our reasoning for this is predicated on the following:

### **1 - Congestion Pricing Implementation Will Significantly Alter Freeway Traffic Patterns - It's Foolish to Move Forward with Freeway Expansion Plans without Knowing Traffic Impact**

Pricing streets to discourage peak commute congestion is a policy that has successfully countered traffic congestion in cities and on freeways across the planet. It's evident that implementation of congestion pricing on I-5 will significantly impact existing traffic patterns through the Rose Quarter. It's so evident, in fact, it calls into question why Portland's leaders insist that we move forward with a \$450 million freeway expansion without studying the impacts of congestion pricing first.

If a tolling mechanism instituted on I-5 is effective enough to alleviate traffic congestion for an estimated cost of \$5-10 million, why should we continue with pursuit of this half-billion freeway expansion based on soon-to-be-outdated existing condition traffic studies? It's fiscally prudent to hold off on continued planning of the freeway expansion until we're certain that congestion pricing alone isn't capable of solving the gridlock through the corridor, at an exorbitantly lower price tag (with numerous secondary positive externalities to society writ large).<sup>2</sup>

### **2- Freeway Expansion Dramatically Impacts Potential Equity Benefits of Congestion Pricing Policy**

---

<sup>1</sup> "Saltzman wants congestion pricing of I-5 before widening project starts" *BikePortland.org*; 9/1/17  
bikeportland.org/2017/09/01/commissioner-saltzman-will-demand-congestion-pricing-of-i-5-before-widening-project-st  
arts-241190

<sup>2</sup> Congestion pricing has been implemented in significantly different ways, with different technologies and different prioritized policy outcomes (ie, congestion mitigation vs revenue vs air quality) across the country. Trey Baker, an ODOT-hired transportation consultant, gave a presentation to the Value Pricing Advisory Committee on Nov 20 highlighting the potential new technologies available for the region. The wide variation of the physical infrastructure and economic tolling schemes proposed will also have significant impact on how any freeway expansion would need to be designed for efficient flow of traffic - all the more reason to finalize congestion pricing before moving forward with any planning for freeway expansion. Presentation available here: <https://youtu.be/SeYFFO5u5II?t=1h26m38s>



Congestion Pricing imposes a fee on commuters who choose (or are left without choice but) to drive an automobile during peak travel hours. Many economic justice advocates have rightly noted the necessity of designing congestion pricing policies so that communities of concern do not bear an oversized burden of the costs of implementation.<sup>3</sup>

Our coalition believes the best way to mitigate the potential equity concerns of congestion pricing is to prioritize robust investment in transportation alternatives so that more commuters have options besides waiting for an infrequent bus or paying a toll they can't afford. The \$450 million freeway expansion represents a significant opportunity cost, in that the half-billion dollars required to construct this poorly-conceived boondoggle would see significantly higher return-on-investment to the public if instead spent on increasing transit headways, improving intersections and surface streets for transit prioritization, investment in Portland's Vision Zero initiatives, and/or biking/walking improvements.

Spending \$450 million on a freeway expansion also is of little benefit to the growing number of Oregonians with mobility needs but unable to drive due to age, ability, citizenship status, and/or ability to afford an automobile. Given that automobiles are the second largest expenditure to the typical Oregon family, depreciate substantially immediately upon purchase, and require heavy recurring investment in insurance, maintenance and gasoline, any government investment in infrastructure that makes it more necessary (as opposed to less necessary) to own an automobile to access jobs, education, and shopping has significant consequences for mobility options and for asset accumulation for low income communities. This freeway expansion robs us of the opportunity to begin investing in reliable, healthy transportation options that serve people rather than vehicles, and locks in decades of future generations to pay high tolls to drive on I-5 without providing viable meaningful alternatives.

We believe that to avoid the regressive consequences of congestion pricing, it's imperative to invest scarce infrastructure dollars in the necessary light-rail, bus, biking and walking facilities

---

<sup>3</sup> Adult residents in the Portland, OR, area who travel during peak hours in single-occupant vehicles, approximately 3 percent are low-income commuters. Of all Portland-area commuters, 38 percent travel during peak hours in single-occupant vehicles and have relatively high incomes." Svadlenak, J., & Jones, B. (1998). Congestion pricing and ability to pay: Income levels and poverty rates of peak-hour, single-occupant vehicle commuters in Portland, Oregon. *Northwest Journal of Business and Economics*.

More recent research conducted by *City Observatory* suggests that the commuters most likely to travel by automobile on the I-5 corridors and incur any potential tolls are wealthier than the regional median, and that nationally, peak hour car commuters have incomes almost double those who travel by transit, bike and foot. More research is needed to appropriately understand the socioeconomic and geographic distribution of costs and benefits of any congestion pricing scheme. "Transportation equity: Why peak period road pricing is fair" Joe Cortright, *City Observatory*, September 27, 2017 <http://cityobservatory.org/transportation-equity/>

Nonetheless, more robust research is needed to study how the burdens and benefits of congestion pricing will be implemented implement equitable congestion pricing. We encourage the City to listen to and support equity partners including representatives from Verde, OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon, and Community Alliance of Tenants in their recommendations to the Value Pricing Advisory Committee to ensure congestion pricing is instituted equitably.



that allow commuters more viable alternative of avoiding the newly imposed pricing on the roads or the extensive costs of automobile ownership. By avoiding a “wait and see” approach to freeway expansion proposals, Portland loses the opportunity to instead invest these funds in infrastructure that will provide the options necessary to make alternatives to peak-hour usage of the freeway more alluring for all road users.

Our coalition is eager to support efforts to ensure congestion pricing policy empowers low-income communities by providing a wider range of reliable mobility options so that every Oregonian and Southwest Washingtonian can choose between reliable transportation options including transit, carpool, or driving, with pricing schemes that adequately fund expansion and maintenance of an equitable, climate-smart, efficient regional transportation regional system. Freeway expansion makes these goals of congestion pricing initiatives notably more difficult and expensive to achieve.

### **Holding ODOT accountable to Congestion Pricing Mandate from Legislature**

The Oregon Department of Transportation has been asked by different government agencies numerous times in the past two decades to study options for implementation of congestion pricing in the Portland Region, including most recently in 2009 by the Oregon Legislature<sup>4</sup>. Whether through lack of political will or institutional resistance, ODOT has failed to implement congestion pricing despite its numerous obvious benefits to public health, transportation efficiency, and carbon emission mitigation.

Additionally, it's hardly certain that ODOT's Portland Region Value Pricing Advisory Committee will ultimately adopt a unified stance in support of aggressive congestion pricing that adequately captures our concerns for equity, sustainability and public health, or that the Committee will recommend pricing this stretch (or, ultimately, any stretch) of I-5. Portland has an opportunity to be a regional leader in climate-smart, cost-effective and healthy transportation policy and set the standard that freeway expansion should only be considered after congestion pricing has been implemented first. Asking ODOT to ensure congestion pricing is implemented before entering into discussions about any potential freeway expansion is an appropriate move for a city often embattled in a cold war with the state's transportation department to articulate the seriousness with which it intends to combat climate change and congestion through cost-effective, empirically-proven methods of transportation planning. Language that doesn't explicitly demand congestion pricing implementation before freeway expansion risks letting ODOT once again shrug off their responsibility to enact the legislature's request to implement cost-effective, sustainable, healthy, equitable approaches to congestion mitigation.

### **Suggested Amendment Language**

---

<sup>4</sup> A full list of these efforts, and their outcomes, is available here, in a document submitted to the Legislature during debate for HB 2017: <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2017R1/Downloads/CommitteeMeetingDocument/100577>



The No More Freeway Expansions Coalition proposes the following language as a potential amendment to the Congestion Pricing Resolution to be introduced on November 30, Agenda Item 1276:

*“The City of Portland does not support moving forward with planning, design or construction of the I-5 Rose Quarter project or any freeway expansion within city limits until after congestion pricing has been implemented and its effects evaluated.”*

Our coalition is convinced in the profound shortcomings of this proposed freeway expansion mega-project to bring congestion relief, traffic safety or any other benefits to aggravated regional commuters. With that said, we believe even a sympathetic supporter of the Rose Quarter Expansion proposal would have to see the benefit in the City of Portland adopting a “pricing before expansion” policy as a fiscally-responsible, equitable, and climate-smart approach to addressing congestion on this corridor and throughout the region. There’s no reason to let ODOT continue to advance a solution that requires \$450 million of Oregonians’ tax dollars and compromise on our climate, air quality, public health, affordable housing and equity goals when there’s an alternative that is orders-of-magnitude cheaper and demonstrably proven to actually have success addressing congestion. Political leadership can provide the one thing that freeway expansion cannot: a greener, cost-effective transportation system with less gridlock.

We ask that you please consider our amendment to Agenda Item 1276.

No More Freeway Expansions Portland  
 nomorefreewayspx@gmail.com  
[www.nomorefreewayspx.com](http://www.nomorefreewayspx.com)

The following 165 community members signed our petition in the past two weeks asking Portland City Council to consider congestion pricing before freeway expansion; their comments are included. These signatures join the additional 460 community members and 33 organizations and small businesses that signed our letter to City Council on September 7th, and 160 comments in opposition to this project sent to ODOT’s Public Comment Period on October 6th.

Sergio	Acena	97217	
Roger	Airo	97211	
Spencer	Alan	97201	



Seth	Alford	97225	And it's not like you would approve the expansion and the next day there is another lane. No, instead it'll be 2 years of construction, and lane closures of the existing lanes.
Maureen	Andersen	97213	
Isabel Rosa	Araujo	97221	
Jim	Ashley-Walker	97206	
Christine	Ayer	97203	
Brad	Baker	97212	
Jeff	Barna	97214	
Stephanie	Bateman	97006	No new freeways! I-5 Tolling, please! Safer bike infrastructure!
John	Beaston	97217	
Brian	Belica	97209	
Laura	Berg	97222	
Jeff	Beyer	97239	Let's lead the way on this! Let's set an example of why Portland is the center for Urban Planning in the US. We can't fall prey to antiquated transportation policy.
Jody	Bleyle	97215	
Ovid	Boyd	97201	
Steve	Bozzone	97211	
Noah	Brimhall	97217	
Nitya	Brorson	97206	Please don't expand our freeways! It's not aligned with Portland's green values, we need to reduce carbon emissions, not encourage more of them. Instate congestion pricing, and invest in public transportation instead.
Aaron	Brown	97227	
Reed	Buterbaugh	97217	Los Angeles just sunk 100s of millions to expand their highways and it did nothing but make the problem worse. Please have the political courage to do the right thing not just for our people now but for future generations. Toll the interstates, work with the legislature so you can use some of that money for increased freight mobility and discounted fares on public transit for low-income Oregonians.
Stephanie	Byrd	97239	
Nathaniel	Canfield	97206	
John	Carter	97206	
Aaron	Choate	97202	



Ana	Cloud	97213	A developed city is not a city where both the rich and the poor drive cars but where everyone uses public transport.
Scott	Cohen	97217	Congestion pricing is the smart way to begin managing congestion and meeting our climate and livability goals.
Mark	Colman	97203	
Brendon	Constans	97217	
Melinda	Conti	97212	
Philip	Cooper	97212	
Nancy	Coscione	97203	
Jay	Cosnett	97202	The last thing our region or our planet needs is a massive, expensive construction project that will encourage more driving. But that's exactly what the proposed Rose Quarter freeway expansion will do. Congestion pricing is proven to reduce driving AND congestion. Expanding freeways is proven to do the opposite. Visionary cities around the world are making plans to phase out cars—Portland should join them. This is the best next step in that effort.
Bill	Crawford	97202	
David	Cushman	97219	
Brock	Dittus	97211296 9	
Stone	Doggett	97212	We need your leadership now. Please don't leave this for others to take care of in the future. Thank you.
Daniel	Drebing	97212-51 52	
Tom	Durkin	97232	
Peter	Dydo	97214	
Nick	Egan	97202	
Clayton L	Elzinga	97222	
Jessica	Engelman	97214	If you're still unconvinced of the efficacy of congestion pricing, why not try it on city-jurisdiction roads (perhaps in the Central City) for a trial period and see what the response is like? Other cities have found that--much like with open streets designs like Ankeny Plaza--voices of dissent quickly turn to approval once the change is implemented and the benefits realized.



Alex	Fallenstedt	97201	The future of our city depends on you. I ask you to first reduce the number of automobiles on our road and encourage people to use alternative methods of transportation. By first expanding a free way, the city of portland is going against their climate action goals. Please consider congestion pricing first and encourage people to stop relying on vehicles for small trips.
Naomi	Fast	97006	
lise	ferguson	97214	
Ellen	Finneran	97213	
E.J.	Finneran	97213	
Andrew Hewus	Fresh	97217	
Darrell	Fuhriman	97203	
Kate	Fulford	97211	Please don't add toxic fumes to an already hazardously placed school. Keep the kids at Tubman safe!
Bill	Gallagher	97219	
Nona	Gamel	97209	
Nona	Gamel	97209	
Monique	Gaskins	97212	
Caton	Gates	97211	Portland
Barbara	Gicking	97229	
matthew	glidden	97217	
David	Goodyke	97227	
David	Goodyke	97227	
Jonathan	Gordon	97206	
Blake	Goud	97217	Even those who support freeway widening have an interest in seeing if congestion pricing can provide a more cost-effective and climate change friendly solution to congestion before spending millions on a massive project which will introduce delays during its construction that may not even be necessary if road use is appropriately priced. By using congestion pricing first, it will also be possible to generate revenues needed to more fairly distribute the public resources that are used for transportation.
Jon	Gove	97202	I drive for TriMet and more lanes is not the answer. Congestion pricing has been proven to work all over the world and should be implemented with full force in Portland Metro area asap.





Christian	Grand	97214	Please, please do not add another freeway.
Kristin	Gross	97218	
Jed	Hafner	97206	Congestion pricing on highways in other U.S. cities has increased speeds AND daily throughputs by cutting down on discretionary trips (made mostly by those who can more easily afford discretionary trips). This improves travel times for everyone, rich or poor, while, hopefully, creating a pool of funds that can be used to make our transportation systems even better! Please try congestion pricing!
Marsha	Hanchrow	97214	We can prove ODOT's assumptions wrong by doing congestion pricing right. In addition, were there a life safety problem, it would not be solved by removing a shoulder/breakdown lane.
Michael	Hanna	97232	
Kelly	hansen	97220	Please be sensible!
ethan	harrison	97212	Comissioners and Mayor, expanding highways is a solution of the past. We need robust expansion of public transit and alternatives to vehicle transit. This is not the time for "both and" as we face the terror of climste collapse due to the very fossil fuels that will be increased by this project. Please listen to civic advocates and support congestion pricing and not this bridge to nowhere.
Tony	Hawke	97214	
Jen	Hayes	97212	
Christopher	Heness	97222	Continuing to prioritize and incentivize motor transport will end up with Portland becoming the newest victim of the trap that caught Seattle and Los Angeles. Look to Europe and their vibrant, beautiful cities. The common theme? A lack of cars, accomplished through congestion pricing.
Josh	Hetrick	97202	Congestion pricing is the only known solution to urban freeway congestion! It's critical that we focus on congestion pricing first and evaluate its effects before looking at other changes to the roadway.
Jonathan	Hinkle	97201	
Wendy	Hoffman	97218	
Ned	Holbrook	97202	
sabolch	horvat	97218	
Eric	Iverson	97206	Freeway expansions have never solved traffic. Portland needs to spend the money instead on bus rapid transit, and making cycling more attractive and driving more costly



Dan	Jaffee	97211	
Joanne	James	97231	
Paul	Jeffery	97214	
Avery	Johnson	97215	
Bryan	Johnson	97217	The research is clear, adding more lanes only adds more traffic and that is certainly not the way to increase livability in this city. Adding congestion pricing and investing in serious public transportation and bicycle infrastructure is the best and easiest way to solve the congestion problem.
Love	Jonson	97214	
rick	kappler	97225	Congestion pricing is needed along with protected bike lanes and a reroute for TriMet bus 56 to Washington Park.
Mike	Kinnunen	97232	
Taylor	Klar	97209	
Zach	Klonoski	97203	This is common sense. Congestion pricing before spending tens of millions for expansion that may not be necessary.
Doug	Klotz	97214	If Portland is going to honor it's Climate Action commitments, we need to explore all alternatives to freeway widening, which is known to not solve congestion, and only brings more traffic, Greenhouses gases and other pollution.
Scott	Kocher	97204	
Jim	Kogler	97214	This is cheap and fast. Waiting for new construction is not.
Joy	Lansing	97201	If we're going to be a forward-thinking, sustainable city, we need to look for, and try, other solutions before resorting to expansion of SOV infrastructure.
John	Lansing	97201	Please remember that we elected you not as politicians but as skilled technocrats for our transformative sustained city. There is sufficient empirical evidence supporting the effectiveness of congestion pricing. This will create a proportional response to the single-occupancy vehicle crisis and incentivize public transportation, carpooling and biking. Thank you for your leadership in Portland.
Gregg	Lavender	97211	
Peter	Lee	97239	
Paul	Leitman	97213	
David	Levine	97227	



Scott	Lieuallen	97215	In spite of logic and evidence to the contrary, the city seems determined to spend hundreds of millions of dollars for "congestion relief". The best "relief" you can hope for will be short lived after which we'll be out all that money and have nothing to show for it.
Eric	Lindsay	97202	
Clyde Alan	Locklear	97221	
Joakim	Lord	97201	Portland was once a leader in putting citizens before automobiles. It was the loud voices of those citizens who made government see freeways were not the answer and led to the creation of our MAX light rail system - a system recognized for its success and used as an example for other cities. Let us be a leader and an example again now by creating 21st century solutions to 20th century problems. Freeway expansion belongs in the past when we were ignorant of the environmental, health, and human costs of decimating neighborhoods to satisfy our greed. Study after study shows freeway expansion does not improve congestion, and in fact only leads to increased driving. The health of residents and schoolchildren near the freeway, and indeed the health of our entire environment, is more important than providing more lanes automobiles.
armando	luna	97213	
Jeff	Lynott	97206	
Dustin	M	97202	
Mark	Martin	97219	
Lizzie	Martinez	97214	Portland is a city that values being different - we were leaders in bike infrastructure and street cars and light rail. Let's be leaders again. Instead of building more lanes and increasing congestion, please prioritize congestion pricing first. Together, we can create an equitable pricing scheme that helps our city be better together.
Lake	mctighe	97214	
Tom	McTighe	97202	
Matt	Meskill	97209	



			<p>ODOT's proposed widening of I-5 in the Rose Quarter will transparently increase GHG emissions by encouraging more people to attempt long-distance auto commutes. It will consume, for the foreseeable future, the state-level transportation funding that would be needed to make the city's most dangerous streets—82nd Ave, Powell Blvd, and Barbur Blvd—any safer.</p> <p>It is utterly reasonable that the city insist upon implementation of congestion pricing, the only policy proven to have any impact on urban traffic congestion, before pursuing such a disastrous project. Indeed, it is the only course of action, if the city's purported commitments to reducing GHG emissions and traffic violence are to mean anything.</p> <p>I expect that Portland will continue to be a city whose actions utterly contradict the lofty goals enunciated by our elected representatives. But I would love for you to prove me wrong.</p>
Esme D.	Miller	97206	
Ryan	Mosier	97202	Please stop prioritizing single-occupancy vehicles over our neighborhoods, mass transit and community health.
Wesley	Mueller	97266	
Rob	Mumford	97202	
Michal	Naka	97217	
Meghan	O'Neil	97212	
Brian	O'Grady	97202	
Nathan	ODonnell	97217	
Sarah	Page	97215	
Phil	Patton	97219	
Seth	Pellegrino	97202	
Alexis	Peterka	97212	
Nicholas	Raethke	97202	
Nathan	Ramsey	97204	Expanding I5 does not solve our traffic congestion problem. It also runs counter to vision zero, and is a shameful effort in comparison to improving the safety of 82nd. AFAICT all support for 5 is based on either ignorance or greed. Stop. Congestion pricing OTOH actually advances all of the city's goals. The choice is obvious.
marilyn	redwine	97218	
Paul	Richards	97201	Don't expand the hwy
Adam	Robins	97203	You cannot build your way out of traffic congestion.



Quinn	Rohlf	97227	I live extremely close to the I5 rose quarter project proposed location and use that part of I5 almost any time I have to drive. I firmly support congestion pricing before expansion.
Nathan	Roll	97217	I own a home and a business in Portland, and I oppose freeway expansion.
Brian	Rousseau	97203	
Allan	Rudwick	97212	
Max	S.	11249	
Melelani	Sax-Barnett	97222	
Amye	Scavarda	97214	
Shelby	Schroeder	97203	
Shelby	Schroeder	97203	
Samantha	Schurter	97218	Building larger freeways will not reduce traffic and will only increase pollution and further bisect the city.
Alisa	Scudamore	97212	
Richard	Sheperd	97227	
Howard	Silverman	97214	
Khris	Soden	97214	
David	Stabler	97202	
Lucy	Stone	97202	
Guthrie	Straw	97211	
Abraham	Sutfin	97217	
David	Sweet	97218	
Benjamin	Thomas	97206284 1	
Chris	Thomas	97211	
Rick	Till	97206	
Charles	Tso	97209	I strongly support implementing congestion pricing before funding any portion of the I-5 Expansion in Portland. If our City Council truly cares about providing equitable and efficient mobility to Portlanders, ensuring clean air for children going to schools near I-5, and improving traffic safety on high-crash corridors, City Council cannot allow I-5 Expansion to be invested with public money before implementing congestion pricing.
William	Vanlue	97202	
Paula	wade	97217	



Kate	Walker	97216	
Joanne	Walters	97217	
Evan	Ward	97206	Congestion pricing is the only way to reduce congestion.
Leann	Warren	97229	
Peter	Welte	97007	
Mike	Westling	97211	
Eric	Wilhelm	97219	ODOT claims to have no money for deadly state highways through Portland (Barbur, Powell, 82nd, Macadam, etc.)
Matthew	Williams	97206	Please examine the possibility of a bus only lane down I-5 through the City of Portland or at the very least a bus only lane through OR-99E. Congestion pricing and public transit are the best options available to keep the system flowing efficiently. Alternative transit options such as bus service from Trimet and C-Tran need to offer additional incentives to the public to effectively reduce single occupant motor vehicle usage. Implement bus only lanes across the bridges and introduce congestion pricing and tolling.
Aaron	Wolf	97045	My family moved to Oregon City specifically to be near my wife's work, especially given the congestion with commuting from Portland. Moving is a huge hassle. We would rather not want to move again when jobs change. However, if you make decisions that play to our individual desire to have an easy commute without moving, you'll be enabling the same from everyone else. What is good for each individual or family is horrible for everyone in aggregate. We would rather deal with moving, carpooling, paying congestion tolls, etc. as needed than to live in a place with all the horrors and congestion that inevitably come up when we attempt the impossible task of trying to satisfy everyone's desire to have an easy, cheap commute in a private car while living far from work. Please use all the other tools like HOV lanes and congestion pricing instead of kicking the can down the road with expensive and futile highway expansion.
Lisa	Wright	97212	Expanding highways will do nothing to improve traffic and will only increase pollution. We can't simultaneously try to reduce carbon emissions and put more trucks and cars on the road. The highway dollars should go to bridge seismic upgrades and deferred maintenance.
Jeffrey	Yasskin	97214	