



Date: Monday, April 30, 2018

To: Portland Region Value Pricing Policy Advisory Committee
Oregon Transportation Commission

CC: Portland City Council
Oregon Metro Council
Megan Channell, Project Manager, Oregon Department of Transportation

From: No More Freeway Expansions Coalition

The No More Freeway Expansions Coalition is submitting this letter outlining our grassroots organization's position to be included in public testimony for the current Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Value Pricing Open House.

Traffic congestion is miserable, and without policy change, it will only get worse. There is only one transportation policy that has ever been proven to improve traffic and stop congestion. We are heartened to see the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) move forward under the direction of the Oregon State Legislature to convene this committee of community partners to discuss how to implement decongestion pricing thoughtfully and equitably.

DECONGESTION PRICING INSTEAD OF FREEWAY EXPANSION: FASTER COMMUTES INSTEAD OF FREEWAY CONGESTION

Our advocacy in support of thoughtful decongestion pricing policy stems from our stark belief that the Portland metropolitan area needs to avoid giving the Oregon Department of Transportation a blank check to spend billions of dollars to expand freeways across the region. **There isn't a single city anywhere on the planet that has alleviated traffic gridlock by expanding their freeways.** It's important to be explicit here - every dollar the region can wrestle away from regional proposals to expand I-205, I-5, and Highway 217 is a dollar we can instead spend on transportation investments quantitatively proven to lead to healthier communities, cleaner air quality, anti-poverty initiatives, traffic safety, a reduction in carbon emissions, preservation of farmland, and (most importantly in the context of this advisory committee), less traffic congestion. Freeway expansion will do none of these things.

Given that we know this to be true, our coalition has taken a stance that **we are opposed to any expansion of capacity on the freeways inside the urban growth boundary unless decongestion pricing has been implemented and studied first before expansion.** It's senseless for our region to embark on these costly, dangerous, environmentally disastrous freeway expansions that won't solve congestion without first determining if decongestion pricing and robust investments in transit won't solve our traffic gridlock problems first.



Our organization's statement in opposition to the \$450 million Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion Plan has been endorsed by over 1,000 community members, dozens of local advocacy organizations and 9 of the eleven candidates running for Portland's two city council seats; this letter represents the specific opinions solely of the names signed below. Skepticism about ODOT's claims in their support for the freeway project have been covered repeatedly by local media including *Willamette Week*¹, *Portland Mercury*², *BikePortland.org*, *CityLab*³ and *City Observatory*.

We believe decongestion pricing is an important, progressive policy tool that must be thoughtfully implemented to address Portland's growing traffic woes while also working in concert with our region's goals for improved public health, carbon emission reduction and development of an inclusive regional economy.

DECONGESTION PRICING SUPPORTS A MYRIAD OF PUBLIC HEALTH INITIATIVES

Portland has some of the worst air quality in the nation.⁴ Minor upticks in daily walking and biking provide astronomical public health benefits, and building walkable communities where transit, biking and walking is safe and encouraged has been proven to encourage physical activity.⁵ Despite commitments at local and state levels of government to work towards eliminating traffic fatalities, crashes and collisions are on the rise, often on busy arterials with high speeds with poor sidewalks and crosswalks.⁶ The stress of driving through a daily traffic jam has been shown to be linked to significant stress, as well as pulmonary and cardiac disease.⁷

Given these realities, it's difficult to disagree that instituting decongestion pricing and using the revenue raised to fund reliable, dedicated transit service isn't a massive opportunity to improve public health across the region.

¹"State Officials Say I-5 in the Rose Quarter Poses a Deadly Danger. Police Reports Undercut That Claim." *Willamette Week*, October 11, 2017

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

²"A New Report Shows Highway Widening Won't Solve Portland's Congestion Woes" *Portland Mercury*, March 7, 2018

<https://www.portlandmercury.com/news/2018/03/07/19724128/a-new-report-shows-highway-widening-wont-solve-portlands-congestion-woes>

³"Portland Prepares for the Freeway Fight of the Century", *City Lab*, September 19, 2017

<https://www.citylab.com/transportation/2017/09/portland-prepares-for-the-freeway-fight-of-the-century/540273/>

⁴"Four Oregon cities among nation's worst for air pollution," *Salem Statesmen-Journal*, April 18, 2018

<https://www.statesmanjournal.com/story/tech/science/environment/2018/04/18/oregon-cities-among-worst-air-pollution-united-states/528926002/>

⁵"Walking and Cycling to Health: A Comparative Analysis of City, State, and International Data" John Pucher et al (2010) *American Journal of Public Health*. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2937005/>

⁶"Metro's 'State of Safety' report has new numbers. They're not good – UPDATED" *BikePortland.org*, April 12, 2018

<https://bikeportland.org/2018/04/12/metro-state-of-safety-report-has-new-numbers-theyre-not-good-275198>

⁷"Long commutes 'increase risk of depression, obesity and damaging employees' productivity" *The Independent*, May 22, 2017

<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/business/news/long-commutes-work-employee-depression-obesity-productivity-workers-research-travel-a7749206.html>



DECONGESTION PRICING IS EFFECTIVE AND NECESSARY CLIMATE POLICY

Forty percent of Portland's carbon emissions come from transportation. Last summer, 1,060 square miles of Oregon burned in wildfires, an area roughly the size of Rhode Island.⁸ Reports from the Antarctic this spring suggest that the polar ice caps are melting at a cataclysmic clip beyond what climatologists previously thought possible.⁹

Given these unpleasant realities, it seems wildly inappropriate that the Oregon Department of Transportation is moving forward with massive freeway expansion plans that perpetuate land use patterns with abysmally high carbon emissions. It flies directly in the face of Oregon's reputation as steward of our environment, champion of cogent land use law, and leader on climate action. Moving forward with auto-centric land use patterns that lock our region into further decades of carbon emissions, especially considering the lack of climate leadership at our federal level of government is nothing short of intergenerational theft and predatory delay.¹⁰ Even in the most optimistic world of electric automobiles and robust paradigmatic shifts towards clean energy, our efforts to meet our climate goals will be greatly assisted by efforts to encourage more transit, biking and walking for everyday trips, and no longer heavily subsidizing and encouraging the use of single occupancy vehicles. Oregon's Greenhouse Gas Commission reported last year that Oregon is way off track in achieving its statutorily mandated goal to reduce greenhouse gases by 10 percent from their 1990 levels by 2020.¹¹ An Oregonian born today is expected to be alive in 2100; acquiescence to our status quo transportation investments is complicity in asking children alive today to clean up our mess.

Decongestion pricing inherently provides the appropriate incentives to help encourage our region to develop climate resiliency. Failing to meaningfully address our regional transportation plans is a failure to act on climate. Period.

DECONGESTION PRICING CAN AND SHOULD SUPPORT EVERYONE IN AN INCLUSIVE REGIONAL ECONOMY

There are legitimate concerns from many disenfranchised communities about the implementation of decongestion pricing. With decades of rising housing costs, many low-income communities have displaced to the periphery of the region and rely on automobiles for the majority of their transportation; for many, it's the only reliable transportation option in low-density, sprawling suburbs in a region still lacking robust, reliable transit options in low-income neighborhoods that effectively and reliably provide access to employment centers and other destinations.

⁸ "These 9 iconic places burned in Oregon's wildfires. How badly were they damaged, and when will they reopen?" *Salem Statesman-Journal*, September 26, 2017

<https://www.statesmanjournal.com/story/travel/outdoors/2017/09/23/oregon-fires-chetco-bar-fire-eagle-creek-fire-columbia-gorge-whitewater-jefferson-park-crater-lake/679010001/>

⁹ "Underwater melting of Antarctic ice far greater than thought, study finds" *The Guardian*, April 2, 2018

<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/apr/02/underwater-melting-of-antarctic-ice-far-greater-than-thought-study-finds>

¹⁰ "Predatory Delay and the Rights of Future Generations" Alex Steffan, April 29, 2016.

<https://medium.com/@AlexSteffen/predatory-delay-and-the-rights-of-future-generations-69b06094a16>

¹¹ "Happy Earth Day, Oregon! Let's Widen Some Freeways!" *City Observatory*, April 22, 2018

<http://cityobservatory.org/happy-earth-day-2018/>



Our coalition is sympathetic to these concerns, and aspires to mitigate them by designing pricing policies that don't place undue burden on low-income communities already experiencing economic precarity. Everyone, especially low-income communities, benefits from the end result of decongestion pricing - the elimination of traffic congestion on our major freeways and arterials, which allows better and more reliable access to jobs and services. Initial research suggests that low income commuters are rarely on the freeways during peak travel times; studies published in *City Observatory* in 2017 and in the *Northwest Journal of Business and Economics* in 1998 suggest that peak travel time pricing on I-5 would raise more revenue from wealthier commuters.¹²

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. Decongestion pricing, designed with appropriate rebates and programs to mitigate harm to low income communities, provides us the opportunity to begin investing in reliable, healthy transportation options that serve people rather than vehicles. As UCLA Professor Dr. Michael Manville writes,

"It's easy to think of free roads as a subsidy for the poor, but it's more accurate to call them a subsidy for the affluent that some poor people are able to enjoy... It is appropriate to worry that priced roads might harm the poor while helping the rich. But we should also worry that free roads do the same, and think about which form of unfairness we are best able to mitigate. People who worry about harms to the poor when roads are priced, and not when roads are free, may be worried more about the prices than the poor."¹³

Dr. Lisa Schweitzer shares a similar diagnosis, noting that decongestion pricing as a form of taxation must be compared to other forms:

Those who use scarce public resources—including space on the roads—should pay for what they use, in proportion to what they use, and know that they are paying. Knowing that resources have a cost is essential to using those resources judiciously, and our road network will function better when drivers pay the costs of their travel.¹⁴

¹² "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). Decongestion 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*.

"Transportation equity: Why peak period road pricing is fair" Joe Cortright, *City Observatory*, September 27, 2017
<http://cityobservatory.org/transportation-equity/>

¹³"Is congestion pricing fair to the poor?" Dr Michael Manville, August 14, 2017.

<https://medium.com/100-hours/is-congestion-pricing-fair-to-the-poor-62e281924ca3>

¹⁴ "Just Road Pricing" Dr Lisa Schweitzer and Dr Brian Taylor, January 2016 *Access Magazine*.
<https://www.accessmagazine.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2016/01/access36-justpricing.pdf>



NO MORE FREEWAY EXPANSIONS - OUR POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Given these reasons, **The No More Freeway Expansions group ardently supports Concept 2 proposed by ODOT, which recommends instituting full, variable decongestion pricing tolls on all lanes of I-5 and I-205.** Additionally, in the interest of maximizing the full congestion relief, public health, anti-poverty and climate-based benefits that are inherently possible through the implementation of decongestion pricing, we propose additional stipulations. These recommendations represent our good faith effort to address concerns of implementing this policy thoughtfully, equitably, fairly, and with an eye towards data-driven outcomes for public health, climate, equity goals, most notably eliminating the amount of time Oregonians spend stuck in traffic.

- **Revenue raised from decongestion pricing should be directed towards investments in transit, biking, walking, not freeway expansion.**

We encourage TriMet and C-TRAN to work closely with ODOT to determine how funds from pricing mechanisms can best be channeled into cost-effective, reliable transit investments that will provide better opportunities for commuters who wish to avoid paying the price to drive on the freeway at peak hour. Our coalition believes that decongestion pricing revenue should be spent on investments that increase the frequencies, reliability and efficiency of transit service. This includes capital investments in bus-priority lanes and traffic signals, improvements to bus stops, better sidewalks and crosswalks near busy intersections, and other physical investments that fall within the constitutional limitations of the Oregon Highway Trust.

We're heartened to join organizations including The Street Trust, OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon, Oregon Environmental Council, and Verde in asking for revenue from decongestion pricing to be directed away from freeway expansion.¹⁵ As our coalition alluded in a recent article in BikePortland.org, spending revenue raised from decongestion pricing on freeway expansion is like spending money raised from a carbon tax on a new coal plant. We emphatically believe in induced demand, and that the only way to alleviate traffic congestion equitably is to both price our roads and channel our resources into alternatives to congestion instead of freeway expansion.

- **Low-Income Rebate/Refund Program**

We encourage ODOT to model and implement a peak road pricing scheme that provides a program to ensure that low-income workers are not unduly burdened by this anti-congestion measure. We're heartened by TriMet's work to establish a Low-Income Fare, funded thanks to OPAL - Environmental Justice Oregon's advocacy in the state

¹⁵ Their letter was sent to the Value Pricing Committee on April 9, 2018. A copy is available on our website: <https://nomorefreewayspx.files.wordpress.com/2018/04/strategy-on-congestion-pricing.pdf>



legislature, which is scheduled to launch this July. TriMet intends to allow “adults at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty level” to be eligible for “half-price fare,” and we encourage ODOT to conduct further study of how similar discounts or rebates could work for decongestion pricing. Ideally, applicants to TriMet’s “low income fare” program could also automatically enroll their vehicle in ODOT’s decongestion pricing program.

- **Mitigation for High Crash Corridors and Potential Cut-Through Routes**

Many community members across the region have expressed concern that pricing freeways will lead towards additional “cut-through” traffic on neighborhood streets. This is concerning both in low-trafficked neighborhoods that already suffer disproportionately from proximity to freeways in poor air quality, and on nearby busy arterials, many of which (such as 82nd Avenue) suffer disproportionately high rates of traffic violence. We encourage ODOT to consider setting aside decongestion pricing revenue for local neighborhood traffic remediation improvements, including bollards on neighborhood greenways, safety improvements for pedestrians on arterials (particularly near transit stops, schools, libraries and community centers), and traffic safety cameras. These investments should be done in direct collaboration with local neighborhood organizations and community partners.

- **Data Privacy**

Oregonians, Southwest Washingtonians, and all who drive on our freeways deserve assurances that the data collected on vehicle travel and address registration be kept appropriately secure. Many members of our community feel actively threatened by the presence of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), particularly Washingtonians using drivers cards. We strongly encourage ODOT to work closely with data privacy experts such as the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) to adopt best practices that allow ODOT maximum efficacy to study decongestion pricing implementation while protecting the security of families across the region.

We understand that this is a bold, unprecedented position. We also understand that our region has a history of bold, unprecedented action and leadership for designing our communities with public health, livability and equity as our top line values. Anything short of bold, visionary leadership is unacceptable for anyone who claims to care about acting on climate, designing public policy for public health, or addressing inequalities in our transportation system.

This letter represents our good faith effort to remind ODOT’s Stakeholder Advisory Committee of the urgent necessity of displaying similar leadership to vigorously support thoughtful decongestion pricing policy in Oregon. Our ability to innovate with unique, thoughtful answers to our regional transportation problems previously defined us. It’s up to elected officials,



community leaders, and advocates such as yourself to determine if this will be the legacy we leave to future generations of Oregonians.

The policy decisions championed by this committee should keep these values in mind as we address our myriad of overlapping, intersecting policy aspirations. We encourage this committee to double down on championing instituting pricing on our scarce freeway space, doing so deliberately to avoid undue burden to vulnerable communities, and prioritizing decongestion pricing over costly and ineffective freeway expansion proposals.

The names of community members who have signed on to our letter in support of decongestion pricing, and the necessity of instituting this policy before expanding any freeways inside Metro's Urban Growth Boundary, are provided below, with their additional commentary.

-No More Freeways Coalition

Name		Zip Code	Comments Submitted in Addition to No More Freeway Expansions Letter
Douglas	Allen	97215	In addition to the general arguments against freeway expansion made in this letter, the PAC and the OTC need to understand that the so-called Rose Quarter project is a particularly wasteful expenditure of money, purchasing very little of value for anyone. If safety were indeed the motivation, then a southbound braided exit lane to I-84 would be the obvious choice, and could be implemented at low cost, leaving the majority of funding available for projects that would actually improve safety and facilitate transit, bicycle, and pedestrian movement. This Rose Quarter project is not at all cost-effective, and clearly the implementation of "value pricing" would reduce congestion, improve safety, and improve travel time for freight. Now is the time to do the analysis, before the money is spent -- am I right?
Lauriel	Amoroso	97232	Freeway expansion has never helped solve congestion and ultimately makes our community less livable. We need to invest in walking, biking, and transit options, as well as implementing congestion pricing as a strategy.
Michael	Andersen	97213	It makes no sense for a growing region to invest in transportation that gets worse as more people use it. Instead we should invest in mass transit, which gets more efficient as more people use it.
Tom	Anderson	97201	
Jake	Antles	97218	As long as we consider and implement strategies to mitigate inequitable impacts of congestion pricing, we absolutely need to start congestion pricing before freeway dollars are spent. This is the 100 year solution. The one our (great) grand-kids will be glad we made when they are addressing transportation issues 100 years from now.
Aaron	Antrim	97211	I own a business in downtown Portland and have lived in Portland for 10 years. I regularly use transit and bike. I drive somewhat regularly. I'm convinced that decongestion is the most effective way of controlling highway demand and traffic, and spending my tax dollars smartly. I support this approach instead of freeway expansion.



Izzy	Armenta	97201	As some one who grew up in Los Angeles for 25 years I can attest that freeway expansion simply doesn't work. More lanes just leads to more cars and you can not build your way out of traffic. Decongestion pricing can help solve this and the funds collected from it can help provide equitable benefits for everyone if it is used wisely, such as reinvesting in active transportation. Take a hint from the traffic capital that is Los Angeles who has realized building more freeways doesn't work and investing in active transportation gets people out of their cars and cars of the road.
Blaine	Baker	97031	
Brad	Baker	97212	
Holly	Balcom	97232	Running a freeway through the middle of a city was a mistake. It displaced and impoverished communities with little political power. It allowed people to take their taxes away from the city while still using its resources. Portland should focus on serving people who live in Portland, and undo-ing the inequities of the past. This means cleaner air, more transit options, schools safe from traffic and pollution, more close-in housing, and reconnecting neighborhoods torn apart by freeways.
Tom	Baldwin	97267	
Stephanie	Bateman	97006	I believe it will help by reducing congestion, but it will also get people to commute by other means, which in turn may increase retail spending in local communities (cafe's, restaurants, etc) while commuters wait it out while raising money for new transportation methods. Because of this, Vancouver may grow as to have their own identity as a destination and not just a place to reside. It's really a win-win.
John	Beaston	97217	Due to induced demand, freeway widening never works for long. Decongestion pricing has worked in other locations. It's time to try it in Portland! And make sure the resulting funds go toward improving transit and other alternatives.
Jody	Bleyle	97215	
Elizabeth	Borte	97202	
Ovid	Boyd	97201	<p>Freeway infrastructure expansion will not only cost a fortune, but is unlikely to reduce congestion. Congestion charging will actually generate revenue that can be used to improve our transportation system, while actually reducing congestion. It is the smart choice.</p> <p>But more than that, it is the moral choice. People die on our roads. They die because cars crash. The more cars on our roads, the more crashes, and the more people who will die. More cars on our roads by expanding freeways will kill more people. Getting less cars on the road via congestion charging will mean less families are destroyed. Please implement robust congestion charging for this reason.</p>
Steve	Bozzone	97217	
Ann	Branson	97405	
Noah	Brimhall	97217	
Neon	Brooks	97212	
Aaron	Brown	97203	"Forget the damned automobile and build cities for lovers and friends."
Philip	Brunner	97217	
Ronald	Buel	97213	The Rose Quarter Freeway expansion will not solve the congestion problems on I-5. It's safety benefits will take us no closer to Vision Zero on fatalities. It takes out Flint Street, a heavily used bicycle street to cross the freeway.



			Decongestion Pricing is the best answer and should be implemented ahead of any freeway expansion within the urban growth boundary.
Clare	Burovac	97201	
Spencer	Bushnell	97239	
Reed	Buterbaugh	97203	The planet is melting!!!! Stop freeway expansion!
Nathaniel	Canfield	97206	
Thomas	Carrier	97217	
Aaron	Choate	97202	
Scott	Cohen	97217	there is but one solution to help alleviate congestion and improve freight and other high value transportation movement: implement pricing now!
Lucy	Cohen	97211	
Alicia	Cohen	97214	It is well understand from extensive research that increasing road size does not help solve traffic congestion. Knowing what we know how can we double down one of the fundamental failures of the 20th Century? The amount of money to be spent on the proposed expansion could be used more effectively elsewhere to meaningfully decrease congestion for the long term.
Chris	Coiner	97215	
Brendon	Constans	97217	
Marc	Czornij	97227	Because more lanes create more traffic!
camilla	Dartnell	97212	Freeway expansion keeps inducing demand: we know we will never be able to expand our way out of congestion. Let's make smarter decisions by pricing congestion appropriately!
Lenny	Dee	97212	
Alison	Dennis	97202	
Drew	DeVitis	97214	
Ethan	Disbrow	97203	
Stone	Doggett	97212	
Ted	Dreier	97219	More freeways bring more traffic, more pollution, more cars.
Marne	Duke	97206	I understand this section is a traffic problem, but it's too much money to solve an issue that should further down the queue of things to fix.
Lisa	Dupont	97211	As a car-less individual I'd love to see more resources put into public transportation and biking corridors. On the few occasions where I may borrow a vehicle I am glad to pay congestion prices to use the freeways. I believe making public transportation easier to use at an affordable price will encourage people to change commuting habits. As the city grows, expanded freeways will likely only lead to an expanded congestion problem.
KC	Eisenberg	97211	
Tsveti	Enlow	97211	I bike everyday to work because i can't stand the current car traffic situation. The bridge i commute to work on my bike makes me feel safe because there are not many cars or busses for that matter. it is a safe heaven. So yes, i support decongestion pricing over freeway expansion. You have to work to make the city less reliant on car transportation not just trying to patch things.



Angel	Falconer	97222	
Alexander	Fallenstedt	97201	<p>The future of our landscape, quality of air, and wellbeing of all Oregonians begins with the actions of every individual in this state. When we choose to walk, take the bus, ride a bike, or drive a car, these actions have an impact around us. The impact could be the air we all breathe or the time it takes to get to our destination.</p> <p>Expanding freeways will cost us in the long term. As a frequent person who both rides a bike and drives, I would gladly pay money to the state for decongestion pricing. Why? It's for our future. I would love to see the state of Oregon reduce it's deficit and not spend money wildly on freeways. No state has been able to successfully build its way out of congestion. There are many ways for Oregonians to get around, but over reliance on driving is the problem! Encourage people to take alternate methods of transportation instead of driving everywhere.</p> <p>City of Portland and Multnomah County leaders have pledged to make to transition to 100 percent clean energy by 2050. Adding freeways goes against this pledge as it will encourage Oregonions to consume for fuel that necessary.</p> <p>Bring money into the state, add congestion pricing and I, and many other Oregonians, will gladly pay for a roads with less car traffic. Don't dig our state further into debt.</p>
Steven	Farring	97206	Safer streets for all. Cleaner air too. Investing in community, not cars going by.
Naomi	Fast	97006	<p>It feels great to be in the good company of the many individuals & organizations who are signing this letter, & who've already signed similar petitions!</p> <p>I live in a suburb of Portland, & do not own a car. I love walking & biking in the outdoors, & I want to save remaining unpaved green spaces of Washington County from becoming roads. True to these values, my household relies on public transit to go to downtown PDX. I'd like more bus lines, bus lanes & transit options from Tigard/Beaverton/Hillsboro to Portland, & all the way into Vancouver, WA.</p> <p>I'm signing this letter for myself, & because I envision there are a lot of other people like me, who'd rather ride happily on a clean, efficient bus to commute than behind the wheel of a car they must drive & maintain themselves. And surely, many people would rather see expensive acreage be used for housing & shops served by bicycle & bus transit, instead of for ODOT road projects.</p>
Helen	Feild	97220	
Thomas	Fisher	97214	
Linda	Fitch	97221	
Adam	Foltzer	97202	Spending resources on transit rather than freeways means *everyone* benefits, not just the people driving cars.
Robert	Galanakis	97215	
Andrejs	Galenieks	97035	
Nona	Gamel	97209	
Shelly	Garteiz	97232	People need more options besides driving their cars. Carbon emmissions are ruining the environment and destroying our health. Please do the right thing for our environment and collective future and DO NOT expand the freeway. ODOT can be a leader and agent of change, rather than the last one on board. VLue pricing is a



			better option, and the community wants you to explore that option and everything we need to do to ensure it is equitable. Thank you.
Monique	Gaskins	97212	I live very close to the freeway and am also a runner, expanding the freeway would bring more air pollution and idling through my neighborhood. Furthermore, freeway on and off ramps are already difficult to maneuver in this neighborhood, adding more cars, more congestion and more lanes would make the problem worse. Studies show that adding lanes just adds more demand for freeways. Instead, we should add supply to bike lines, busses, and other non-car transport options. Spending \$450 Million on a project that will decrease quality of life for those who live in the neighborhood and won't improve congestion is an investment that we should not make.
Jacob	Gellman	98660	Widening freeways is expensive and doesn't reduce congestion. But congestion pricing does reduce congestion. Let's not waste money on projects that won't solve congestion!
barbara	gicking	97227	
Vladi	Gleba	97078	
Josh	Gold	97232	Decongestion pricing is a more financially sound and responsible way to get the same (or better results) than freeway expansion.
Anne	Goldfeld, MSW, MPH	97124	
Erinne	Goodell	97211	We have to make it more appealing to travel without personal autos. Our city is growing so much that we simply have to encourage people to opt out of driving whenever possible.
David	Goodyke	97227	
Karla	Gostnell	97212	
Blake	Goud	97217	People respond to incentives. Give more freeway away for free and people will fill it back up. Price it and they will use other ways when it is expensive and free up space for people with no other options but to drive.
Lucas	Gray	97211	The solution to traffic problems is to make less traffic, not bigger roads.
Kristin	Gross	97218	Expanding freeways creates more pollution and has a greater negative impact on people of color and low income folks.
Eric	Gunderson	97211	I want to keep congestion and pollution down while encouraging biking options.
Steve	Gutmann	97214	ODOT, please lead us into the future, rather than dragging the state backward with the same "add more capacity" policies that failed California and Houston. Enough already!
Jed	Hafner	97206	Please implement congestion pricing and use the funds to improve public transportation and high-crash corridors. The economic and human costs of congestion and traffic-related deaths and injuries are too high not to shift our focus toward easing congestion and promoting safer roadways for everyone.
Patrick	Halley	97202	Why would we spend any money to make driving easier? We can learn from the mistakes that LA and Houston made; Portland doesn't have to end up the same way. Single-occupancy vehicles should be the absolute lowest priority, something we make investments to REDUCE, not increase.



Marsha	Hanchrow	97214	<p>(Sorry for the second submission, please delete the first that has no additional comments.) I continue to oppose this project for all the reasons I opposed it at the time of this coalition's first letter. I work in this neighborhood, and suffer the polluted air every weekday. The State of Oregon, by the actions of ODOT, should not be making the jobs of Oregon Health Authority employees more difficult by encouraging more driving by the same polluting vehicles.</p> <p>Toll first, and toll every lane in the congested area. Toll properly, charging increasing rates until traffic moves at some specified rate, perhaps 90% of the posted limit (unless weather conditions require lower speeds). After a full year of this, have an independent auditor analyze the results, and present that audit to all stakeholders. And we are all stakeholders.</p>
Michael	Hanna	97216	
Craig	Harlow	97217	
Noah	hatz	97206	Freeway expansion won't make congestion any better and would waste an enormous amount of money that would be better spent on bike lane expansion/building sidewalks and pedestrian crossings in badly underserved neighborhoods.
Evan	Heidtman	97211	Decongestion pricing is the only thing on the table which can hope to actually improve congestion. And that's what many Portlanders want -- they don't want years of roadwork, they want change.
Kyle	Helland	97420	As a former resident and frequent visitor to Portland, I strongly support decongestion pricing on the freeways. I would gladly pay for decreased congestion on existing roads and increased funding for transit projects that move to a more sustainable, clean city.
Sean	Hellebusch	97206	Choosing to expand this freeway is blatantly ignorant of all research that has been done. The city should be ashamed of itself for even considering this option when the public is vehemently against it.
Topher	Henness	97222	Please, I'm begging you, don't turn our beautiful city into Los Angeles. The data shows expansion doesn't work.
Josh	Hetrick	97202	Expanding freeways, especially before implementing decongestion pricing, is a wasteful use of public funds. We deserve better — we can't claim to be addressing climate change while expanding freeways.
Nate	Hildebrand	97212	For the amount of money it will take to expand the freeway, we should definitely try other things first like making huge incentives for public transit and carpooling



Steven	Howland	97212	<p>Induced demand is a very real phenomenon. Adding lanes to the freeway - even an auxiliary lane as is proposed in Rose Quarter - will not solve the traffic congestion problem. The only way we truly get to the root of the problem is to get people to shift their behaviors and do that by making alternatives that are as comparable to driving as possible. That means easy, timely, and convenient. And more fully incorporating the costs of driving into their behaviors further shifts the comparability of transit to driving.</p> <p>Incorporating a decongestion charge, I full-heartedly believe the program should be equitable. The proposal in this letter is one step to do so. I have spent the last two years researching transportation behavior among low-income Black populations in Portland, and this will directly impact them. While they do not typically travel during peak-periods, they do sometimes. And that sometimes usually is a very important trip for them such as getting to the doctor, getting social services of some kind, or getting across the city to drop their kids off at school as their kids still go to school. These are data points not picked up in traditional data sets, but they represent very important parts of the lives of those in vulnerable and precarious positions in life. Similarly, there will inevitably be diversion traffic to avoid the charges. Already, neighborhoods along roads parallel to I-5 and I-84 experience large amounts of diversion traffic since they are seeking ways around the congestion. Charging people for their congestion causing activities will only exacerbate that problem. And it presents real problems for people living in these neighborhoods. People seeking alternate routes around the highways do so because they are impatient, and impatient drivers are the worst ones we can have on the road. They are less likely to cede space to vulnerable road users and more likely to break multiple traffic laws such as traffic control devices and speed limits. We should absolutely fund speed and red-light cameras along such roads and ensure adequate diverters (many of the current diverters that have been installed across the city are often run over - including curbs) are installed inside neighborhoods so these behaviors are not spread to areas where safety is an even greater concern.</p> <p>Any transit alternatives to supplement highway traffic should include substantially improving Portland - Vancouver routes with higher frequency, all day routes.</p>
Meghan	Humphreys	97206	
Amy	Hunter	97212	
Arya	Imig	97203	
Daniel	Jaffee	97211	
tel	jensen	97218	Expanding freeways is not a good solution for high traffic volumes. It costs taxpayers too much. It hurts public health too much. It degrades urban form. It disinsensitizes active transportation. It leads to induced demand. And it doesn't even reduce congestion.
David	Kafrissen	97217	Building more roads is not the answer to our congestion woes, we need pricing of high traffic times and single occupancy, we need to change people's behavior and reward transit, bike and walking
rick	KAPPLER	97225	i want a mass transit subway line, more street trees, and protected bike lanes, and better land-use planning for SW Canyon Road
Jason	Kidwell	97214	I think there is far too much traffic moving through the city. I advocate for congestion pricing to inspire reluctance for people to drive needlessly. This is not out of malice, rather - sometimes you have to give a little push for people to make the right choice. Left to their own complacency, folks would drive their cars as much as possible. I'd like to see that diminished.



Marley	Kinser	97219	Freeways don't make neighborhoods better. An expansion is wildly expensive, and won't serve many Portlanders. Investing in public transit, in walkability, in bike infrastructure is investment in the future of Portland, one which will be much cheaper and last longer. We deserve a well planned city, built for people, not for cars. Decongestion pricing will raise revenue, and actually work to stop traffic congestion.
Doug	Klotz	97214	We don't need to expand (or even add any lanes) to our freeways. Congestion pricing is the only effective way to make better use of the freeways.
Scott	Kocher	97204	Adding lanes to a freeway is like going on a diet by loosening your belt. Using freeways--at peak times especially--has a huge social cost. Let's price it so the marginal cost of driving at these costly times is the actual cost, instead of zero. The way it is, nobody can get anywhere at rush hour, because the "price" is... how much are you willing to wait in stopped traffic. Let's leverage decongestion pricing dollars to help the people who aren't served well by the mass transit. Trains, buses, and bike corridors can bring people to the central city at rush hour without the induced demand that makes freeway expansions fail. Please, be leaders on this, now.
Stefan	Kwiatkowski	97401	Too many cars slows down transit.
Brian	Landoe	97217	
John	Lansing	97201	This will make the air quality even worse in an area prone to temperature inversion, not to mention spoiling our city's attempts to combat climate change.
Paul	Lantow	97202	
Paul	Leitman	97213	Freeway expansion is an inefficient use of money and is bad public policy. The Portland region should be focusing on reducing vehicle use, not making it easier. Funds for freeway expansion can be directed to improved transit service, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and an effective roadway pricing system that charges people for their use public roadways, their emissions, and other negative externalities (such as noise pollution, pedestrian/bicycle deaths and injuries, and low-density auto-focused land use patterns).
Adrienne	Leverette	97215	Freeway expansion is a non-solution. Latent capacity will just fill up more lanes. We need to think bigger and be more pragmatic about what will actually alleviate congestion. Single occupancy vehicles are not the future.
David	Levine	97227	
Michael	Limb	97203	No matter how wider the freeways get, there will always be cars to fill them. Public transport is the future of urban mobility, not single-occupancy vehicles. More freeway space = more people taking their cars instead of taking the bus = more congestion. Decongestion pricing = less people taking their cars and taking public transport = more money to fund more public transport options and availability.
Clyde Alan	Locklear	97221	
Dan	Loda	97266	
Courtney	Longfellow	97005	I don't believe that additional lanes on the freeway resolves traffic congestion. It's been proven to be a short term solution that causes more traffic in the future. I would prefer to see funding used towards express bus lanes on all major freeways, highways, or heavily utilized roads/bridges. This will drive transit ridership up because it will give people options that not only are cost effective but faster than sitting in traffic in single occupancy vehicles.
Jesse	Lopez	97232	The farce of expanding the freeway for safety or decongestion has been thoroughly debunked. If you desire to improve the safety of roadways, I'd suggest doing something that will have an actual impact like redesigning Powell, Barbour, Lombard, or 82nd to accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists, increase transit speeds, and



			decrease the speeds of single occupancy vehicles. If you desire to decrease congestion on I-5, I'd suggest doing something that will actually work like imposing decongestion pricing.
Joakim	Lord	97201	The construction of Portland's freeways decimated traditionally minority communities, specifically the African American community of Albina, while also permanently dividing our city. Expanding I5 in the Rose Quarter is an insult to those communities who deserve much more attention and understanding. Adding lanes will only encourage more people to drive, negating any initial benefits with regards to speed of travel, and will only serve to further pollution, congestion, and a dependence on personal automobiles for transportation. Instituting decongestion pricing and channeling that money to improve transit is the right (and Portland) thing to do. We are the city that removed a freeway from the heart of our city when others were expanding left and right. We should not now be moving backwards in our thinking on transportation.
Sarah	Lundy	97266	
Phillip	Martello	98660	
Kendrick	Martin	97217	I am an avid cyclist and would love to see some money put into improving the quality of bike infrastructure.
Heather	Mathewson	97202	
Cait	McCusker	97227	INDUCED DEMAND.
Dan	McFarling	97078	You CANNOT build your way out of congestion by dedicating even more space to a mode of transport that is INHERENTLY INEFFICIENT in use of terrestrial space!
Katie	McGee	97212	We should not have cars on standstill on the freeways, it's bad for the air, and the people in the nextdoor neighborhoods. With decongestion pricing and improved transit, people will opt out of single occupancy vehicles.
Michelle	McGrath	97216	Portland needs to lead by example —new freeways is not how we embrace climate friendly transportation. And ODOT needs to embrace the science—new freeways will bring more congestion. Tolls will help ease it!
Matt	McNamara	97212	Private car ownership is not the future - support active transportation as well as spending the money on mass transit!
Matthew	Meskill	97209	
Christine	Meyers	97211-7010	Too many people are moving here let them pay for all our problems. This city was so beautiful and we have no infrastructure for all these people and in trying to make room old beautiful houses are being bulldozed and half the people moving here don't even GET OREGON LICENCE PLATES which makes me guess no OR driver's licences either so are NOT paying into our city or state. Too many gas hog cars. Now they want to bulldoze more houses for a freeway to encourage more to move here?
Mindy	Montgomery	97231	
Jenny	Mosbacher	97210	
Ryan	Mosier	97202	Let's make commuting more enjoyable for all by reducing congestion on our existing roads before investing taxpayer \$ in freeway expansions. Less cars on the road means a speedier trip from A to B for all users, whether you're in a SOV or on a bus.
Rob	Mumford	97202	
Colleen	Murray	97212	There is no time (in terms of climate and human health) to consider options that do not employ new technology, innovative solutions, and focus on reducing emissions and improving livability for Portland residents (air, noise, etc.).



Andrew	Neerman	97211	https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/25/opinion/cars-ruining-cities.html
Sarah	Newsom	97217	
Phil	Nishikawa	97215	
Brian	O'Grady	97202	The investment that need to be made is in alternatives to single occupancy vehicles, mass transit and cycling. We cannot pave our way out of this problem.
Nathan	ODonnell	97217	
Maria	Opie	97212	Congestion pricing supports a progressive vision for Portland and, instead of widening freeways and increasing related pollution, money can be put to use developing affordable mass transport!
Andrés	Oswill	97212	
Seth	Pellegrino	97202	Freeways are inequitable & unsafe fossil fuel infrastructure that we must be planning to tear down, not build up.
Chris	Perry	97211	Freeway expansion just means more cars will be driving on the freeway. Soon, the expanded freeway will be congested too. This is supported by facts. Get this toll in place, then expand the MAX to Vancouver. This would solve so many problems.
Joan	Petit	97212	Our current levels of air pollution, driven by traffic and congestion, are unhealthy and unsustainable. Decongestion pricing is one way to reduce these problems. We should invest this money in walking, biking, and public infrastructure and work to create a more sustainable transportation system.
Leon	Porter	97232	Freeway users should pay for any freeway expansions, as well as for all the damage to the environment and public health that such expansions cause. We're in the middle of a climate change catastrophe, and freeways contribute to that. It's not in the public interest to use general tax dollars to expand freeways and make that environmental catastrophe even worse.
Leslie	Poston	97217	Do not expand the freeway. Congestion pricing and more transit is the only way forward.
Leslie	Poston	97217	Multiple reports have shown that expanding freeways causes MORE congestion, not less. Additionally, freeway expansion will kill surrounding neighborhoods, a newly reopened school, and bike/greenway routes. Congestion pricing is a smarter idea, especially if coupled with local traffic directors that keep cars from avoiding it by speeding through nearby neighborhoods.
Anabel	Ramirez	97209	
Chris	Rawson	80138	Adding lanes means adding cars. Pricing congestion in the market place is smart.
Rick	Ray	97060	
Sean	Rea	97212-201	I support decongestion pricing because I support evidence-based policies. It has been repeatedly demonstrated that freeway expansion will increase car dependency and will fail to reduce congestion. On the other hand, decongestion pricing (when done equitably and intelligently) has been proven to take cars off our roads.
Piers	Rippey	97214	Don't double down on outmoded forms of transport! Take a bold stand on the kind of city we want to live in for the next century.
Shannon	Robalino	97212	Evidence shows the more roads you add the worse congestion gets. We need to encourage people to opt for greener alternatives to transport, not add more pollution.
Gerson	Robboy	97214	



Gerson	Robboy	97214	
Nathan	Roll	97217	
Joe	Rowe	97217	If done with social justice safeguards it can get everything moving faster in congested commutes
Allan	Rudwick	97212	Freeway expansion is a dead end. Return on investment (ROI) for new capacity is very limited, while maintenance & other modes have higher ROI. We need to work change the funding formulas to prioritize decongestion benefits of our investments - this analysis will show that freeway capacity increases are not the best value we can get
Edward	Sackinger	97601	In order to meet our climate goals we should be decreasing freeway lane miles rather than increasing them. As such we should REMOVE the East Bank Freeway. It's ugly, it's old, it's not needed, it blocks Portland from accessing the east side of the river, and already has transit that can soak up some of that travel demand.
Melelani	Sax-Barnett	97222	Road expansion just means more driving, and we need less of it! And it's so much more expensive and less effective than green transportation investments.
Kari	Schlosshauer	97202	
Shelby	Schroeder	97203	
Sydney	Scout	97210	
Ethan	Seltzer	97212	Doing the same thing and expecting a different result is the definition of insanity. Time to try something new and different. Freeway widening is not it.
Frank	Shen	97229	Freeways, especially downtown freeways, cut cities into separate sections. We should think more about the people live there; they want safe walkable places, not ever-growing freeways.
Richard	Sheperd	97227	
Jennifer	Shuch	97211	
Chris	Smith	97210	
Matthew	Smith	97211	Traffic is terrible in Portland. With more people arriving and limited space (and money) for freeways, there's only one way out -- more mass transit. Decongestion pricing is the only way to get there.
Steven	Snyder	97212	
Khris	Soden	97214	Fight climate change by not expanding freeways!
Lucy	Stone	97202	
Guthrie	Straw	97211	I support decongestion pricing over freeway expansion because spending \$450 million to widen freeways in one of the most negatively impacted neighborhoods in Portland with a rich history of exploitation by government agencies is simply put, bad policy at it's finest. I support any method that limits the spread of freeway-centric thinking in our communities and interlinked neighborhoods, and feel that upon review of the scientific data, it's frankly insulting that we're needing to re-visit this issue in the first place. I respect that members of ODOT are trying to work within the confines of their "role" as a transit agency, but now is not the time to sit back and fawn over the concept of "business as usual" but a time to reflect, re-prioritize based on scientific fact correlated with comprehensive public input, and to take definitive action through common sense decongestion pricing that will serve as a model for our city, and others for years to come.



Matthew	Sullivan	97223	Decongestion pricing should be the first step in reducing traffic problems. The money raised from this effort should be put into efforts like light rail, commuter rail, and commuter bike options. Adding lanes never works, and in the age of Waze and other apps that help people find optimal routes, drivers will simply flock to these additional lanes instead of modifying their commute times or employing other transit options. It's time for a change that puts our citizens and environment first.
David	Sweet	97218	Decongestion pricing is the only decongestion strategy that actually works. Freeway expansion creates induced demand leading to worse congestion. Things are already bad enough. Just do it, ODOT!
Nathan	Tang	98660	
Charles	Townsend	97212	Because freeway expansion is not the answer to our traffic problems. Plus if you use a resource you should pay for that resource.
Charles	Tso	97209	Freeway expansion exacerbates air pollution and respiratory diseases. Freeway expansion increases CO2 emission which causes climate change and extreme weather events. Freeway expansion inequitably subsidizes the wealthy at the expense of the poor. Freeway expansion wastefully divert precious public money from public transit, bicycle and pedestrian safety. Freeway expansion encourages sprawl and unsustainable land use development. Freeway expansion induces more traffic and worsens congestion. Freeway expansion is morally, economically, environmentally, and scientifically unsound and detrimental to the health and welfare of current and future generations of Oregonians.
Melody	Valdini	97202	My two children both have asthma and breathing issues, so they (and other kids and adults) will suffer if the air pollution gets any higher than it already is. Decongestion pricing will encourage people to consider other options, and thus help us to begin to address the air pollution choking our city. Please put the health of your citizens first! Our health should be the top priority of the government!
Charlotte	VanCleve	97202	
Yashar	Vasef	97209	
Joseph	Vasicek	97223	Want a healthy, livable city
Claire	Vlach	97214	
Mary	Vogel	97205	Freeway expansion will simply encourage more people to use the freeway.
Kate	Walker	97216	
JARRETT	WALKER	97206	
Evan	Ward	97206	The current freeways are not well-utilized. If the only way we deal with congestion is to build more freeways, and we can't sprawl out into the countryside (a good thing!), we're going to end up with really perverse development practices. Portland is small enough that transit should be able to take a large percentage of people where they need to go, and the roads will be clear for those who need cars only if we price roads appropriately.
Bjorn	Warloe	97218	
Mike	Warwick	97212	The project is supposed to address congestion and collisions resulting from weaving in the Broadway/Weidler area. The easiest and cheapest way to solve that problem is to remove the Broadway/Weidler ramps. No further construction would be needed. This is EASY to test and ODOT should do so BEFORE any other actions.
Peter	Weltë	97007	
Mark	Whitaker	97211	



Michael	Wolfe	97202	Properly priced SOV access will meet no additional capacity is necessary. Investing the proceeds in transportation alternatives is the only way to ensure equity and meet environmental and climate goals.
Garlynn	Woodsong	97211	The consensus view of transportation experts is that pricing is one of the most effective tools that can be used to manage congestion. Using the proceeds to widen freeways does not help to achieve GHG emission reduction goals, public health goals, congestion relief goals, or really any other public policy goals. Proceeds should instead be used to fund transit, walking and bicycling infrastructure.
A. J.	Zelada	97212	
Adam	Zielinski	97239	Congestion pricing should be implemented in advance of major freeway expansion and/or in advance of replacing the interstate bridge. Although I do still support modifying and fixing the Rose Quarter, and the Maywood Park I-84W to I-205N interchange with auxiliary lanes to improve traffic flow.