

Detailed Comments and Responses

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
1266	1	A	Mattson	Annette	Clackamas County Economic Development Commission	The Clackamas County Economic Development Commission fully supports the Sunrise Project, I-205 to Rock Creek Junction and encourages approval of the project. The Sunrise Project is critically important and is needed to address serious congestion and freight mobility issues in the project area. This project will help support the continued growth and prosperity of traded sector businesses and key industry clusters that have strong long term potential to thrive, invest and provide valuable family wage jobs in Clackamas County.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1267	1	A	Mattson	Annette	Clackamas County Economic Development Commission	Given the high project costs, we encourage the county to pursue a phasing strategy including implementing local improvements early so that businesses can benefit from greater connectivity and less congestion as soon as possible.	Implementing local improvements early in the project construction were considered in development of a Phasing Strategy, which has been prepared in conjunction with, but separate from, the FEIS.
1268	1	A	Mattson	Annette	Clackamas County Economic Development Commission	Support for the North Lawnfield Alignment (Alternative 2 & 3) – The EDC feels this option provides the best access to the area, impacts the fewest businesses and is preferred by Lawnfield area companies that are the most affected. This option provides much needed additional access to the north and appears easier for trucks to negotiate than the alternatives provided.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1269	1	A	Mattson	Annette	Clackamas County Economic Development Commission	Support for the 212/224 Overpass at 82nd Drive – This project should be constructed early in the first phase of the Sunrise Project to address one of the most congested intersections in the state. This \$100 million proposed improvement will add capacity a long standing bottleneck and will provide all of the turning movements available today.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1270	1	A	Mattson	Annette	Clackamas County Economic Development Commission	Support for a Midpoint Interchange: We support Alternative 2 - the construction of a single midpoint interchange because it will provide much needed additional access and freight mobility to Clackamas Industrial Area businesses, improved access to and through the area from the north (Portland and Milwaukie) and enhance regional multimodal freight connectivity including airport, marine, and rail. The	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						midpoint also improves access to the Clackamas Industrial Area easier to serve in terms of emergency and fire services provision. Quicker response times will save lives and property and potentially lower insurance rates for area businesses.	
1271	1	A	Mattson	Annette	Clackamas County Economic Development Commission	The proposed location of the midpoint at 122nd is strategically placed to provide direct access to and from several large distribution firms including Fred Meyer, Tree of Life, USF Reddeway as well as several large business parks in the immediate vicinity. We support the single point interchange because it is less expensive, will impact fewer surrounding businesses and require less right of way acquisition.	Thank you for your comment. The single interchange at SE 122nd Ave. was selected in the Preferred Alternative. Design Option B-2 (split-diamond interchange) was not selected. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1272	1	A	Mattson	Annette	Clackamas County Economic Development Commission	Support for Rock Creek Junction Alternative 2 and 3 with Design Option D-3: This option has the least impact on developable employment land and is the preferred option of a major future employer and property owner, Providence Health Systems. It also appears to be the least expensive option with \$5 million less in right of way acquisition costs.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1273	1	A	Mattson	Annette	Clackamas County Economic Development Commission	We encourage project engineers to find the most cost effective design that provides maximum access and freight mobility to area businesses while reduce business relocations, and impacts on developable employment land.	Thank you for your comment. In developing the Preferred Alternative, the project team, advisory, and policy review committees worked to understand how the different alternatives and design options compare to the project's stated goals and objectives (see Chapter 2 of the SDEIS).
18	2	A	Cassin	Mary Ann	Metro Regional Parks Planning and Development	We applaud the project partners involved in preparing the SDEIS for their excellent work and for their efforts to create opportunities for meaningful public involvement in the project.	Thank you for your comment. Metro's continued involvement in the project is appreciated.
10	2	A	Cassin	Mary Ann	Metro Regional Parks Planning and Development	Recent findings by a Metro appointed Blue Ribbon Committee for Trails show multiple benefits from optimizing the integration of non-motorized transportation facilities (on-street and off-street bike and pedestrian) with the motorized transportation system,	Thank you for your comment. As part of this project there is a planned continuation of the I-205 multi-use path between the northern and southern study area boundaries, Sunnyside/Sunnybrook Interchange and Clackamas Highway Interchange

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						including transit and high capacity transit. In keeping with this premise, we believe there are multiple benefits to be gained by maximizing the nexus of the two transportation systems in the project area. Given that congestion and safety are the prime reason for the Sunrise project, maximizing safe facilities for pedestrian and cyclists will encourage more use of those facilities and help address congestion by freeing the roadway for others.	respectively, as well as a spur that connects the multi-use path to the Rock Creek interchange via a pathway somewhat parallel to the Sunrise Project. Finally, based on input from the public and agencies, the project will now extend the bike path from the Midpoint Interchange to the Rock Creek Junction. The design of the pedestrian/bike facilities has been incorporated into the FEIS.
11	2	A	Cassin	Mary Ann	Metro Regional Parks Planning and Development	We strongly support recommended improvements to the bike and pedestrian system show in Figures 5-9 of the Executive Summary including: Improving connections to I-205 trail system by filling gaps in that system with multi-use path between 82nd Dr. and SE Roots Rd. and between I-205 and existing street facilities on 122nd Ave. Adding multi-use path between SE 162nd Ave. and SE 179th Ave. Adding bike lanes and sidewalks listed in table 6-22 and 6-23 in the Transportation Technical Report.	Thank you for your comment.
12	2	A	Cassin	Mary Ann	Metro Regional Parks Planning and Development	We also request that the following questions, opportunities and recommendations be considered when selecting and developing the Preferred Alternative and preparing the FEIS: Do the multi-use path options shown in Figure 6 in the Executive Summary of the SDEIS cross over, cross at grade, or cross under I-205? Do the designs for the multi-use path connections to I-205 promote a safe, convenient and pleasant experience for users?	The alignment of the bicycle and pedestrian paths shown in Figure 6 will cross under I-205. This path will be designed as a safe and convenient connection between existing routes to the north and south of the project area. An expanded description of the pedestrian/bike facilities has been incorporated into the FEIS.
19	2	A	Cassin	Mary Ann	Metro Regional Parks Planning and Development	On Figure 5 and 6 in the Executive Summary, there is a gap in the proposed multi-use path that runs from the I-205 interchange to SE 122nd Ave. The gap is east of the I-205 interchange to just west of Camp Withycombe. Is this simply a mapping issue, where the multi-use path is obscured by another road? If not, is there available right-of-way to fill this gap?	This was a mapping issue that has been corrected in the FEIS maps. The trail in that location is directly adjacent to the new loop road within the Lawnfield Industrial Area. The right-of-way for the trail in that location is available.
20	2	A	Cassin	Mary Ann	Metro Regional Parks Planning and Development	There is also a gap in the multi-use path between 122nd Ave and the eastern extent of the project at Rock Creek Junction? Is there available right-of-way to fill this gap? If not, is there available right-of-way to widen Hwy 212 between 122nd Ave and the eastern extend of the project	A bi-directional bicycle and pedestrian facility from 122nd Avenue to the current Rock Creek Junction has been added to the Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						to accommodate safer bike/ped path?	
14	2	A	Cassin	Mary Ann	Metro Regional Parks Planning and Development	Have opportunities to connect the non-motorized transportation system and the motorized transportation system been examined to the maximum extent within the project area? Are there other improvements on the on-street and off-street bike/ped system that would enhance safety and access for non-motorized users?	The project team explored crossing options where it seemed desirable and feasible - which meant primarily using the designed structures (bridges, ramps) wherever possible and connecting to the existing networks when possible. Though in the SDEIS the project team focused on connections to the existing bike/pedestrian facilities within the study area, the team did note that there were potential trail connections on some of the recommendation maps that were not included in the plans outlined in the SDEIS. The FEIS maps have been modified to highlight the additional proposed regional trails in the area. All local street improvements planned as part of the Sunrise Project will provide bicycle/pedestrian accommodations, as well.
15	2	A	Cassin	Mary Ann	Metro Regional Parks Planning and Development	The SDEIS mentions that there are regional trails in the project area and that some of them would cross beneath the expressway. What type of crossing design has been envisioned? Have overcrossings been considered? These are usually preferred from a user experience. There are 9 bridges and 17 ramps proposed, mostly in the areas of sensitive biological habitat. Has any consideration been given to using these bridges/ramps as locations for the regional trail crossings to occur? This may reduce impacts from trail to wildlife habitat. Has the idea been considered of applying mitigation required by the corridor project to constructing the overpasses where the regional trails intersect with the corridor?	The project team explored crossing options where it seemed desirable and feasible - which meant primarily using the designed structures (bridges, ramps) wherever possible. Given the vertical profile of the Sunrise Project, planned crossings of the Sunrise Project alignment to accommodate connectivity of local streets (Lawnfield Rd., 122nd Ave., 135th Ave., 142nd Ave., 152nd Ave., and 162nd Ave.), as well as to span creeks, present the most viable opportunities for accommodating proposed Metro and NCPRD recreational trails. The availability of these potential local roadway under-crossings of the Sunrise Project approximately every 10 blocks should provide sufficient opportunities for trail crossings to not require construction of more expensive over-crossings for trails.
25	2	A	Cassin	Mary Ann	Metro Regional Parks Planning and	The Transportation Technical Report of the SDEIS discusses the importance of the Sunrise expressway providing connections to the larger regional bicycle and pedestrian network, but does not mention several	Impacts on bicyclists and pedestrians were analyzed for each design option, and recommendations for improving the bike/pedestrian system to both enhance safety and access were made. In the SDEIS

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Development	regional trail connections in the project area including: North Clackamas Greenway (NCPRD), Clackamas River Greenway (NCPRD), East Buttes Trail (Metro), and Scouter Mountain Trail (Metro)	the project team focused on connections to the existing bike/pedestrian facilities within the study area, and noted the regional context of trails in the FEIS.
16	2	A	Cassin	Mary Ann	Metro Regional Parks Planning and Development	Much of the pertinent information about opportunities for connection to the existing and planned on-street and off-street bike/ped system is buried in the technical appendices (Land Use and Transportation) of the SDEIS and there is no map in the SDEIS showing the relationship of these facilities to each other or the project. As the project moves to the next phase, a map (in the FEIS document) showing existing and planned pedestrian and bike facilities (on-street and off-street) within the project area would greatly help to see the opportunities of integrating those facilities with the Preferred Alternative, transit and HCT. Figure 18 (Community Features) in the Land Use Technical appendix provides a good base to create this map. Clackamas County and Happy Valley have updated their bike/ped master plans since the SDEIS was prepared and the new information for those jurisdictions should be included in this map.	Thank you for your input. We have highlighted more of the pedestrian and bike facilities in the FEIS instead of just in the technical appendices. (See Figure PA-16 in the FEIS for details on existing and planned bicycle/pedestrian facilities in the project area.)
21	2	A	Cassin	Mary Ann	Metro Regional Parks Planning and Development	Metro has received ODOT MTIP funding to prepare a master plan for the Scouter Mountain Trail in the project area. The master plan work will begin in Spring of 2009. The project will connect the Springwater Corridor in the north and to the Clackamas River Greenway to the south. The master plan will also explore connections to the I-205 bike path and the new max station at Clackamas Town Center. Close coordination between the Master Planning work and development of the Preferred Alternative for the Sunrise project will be important to achieve these goals. Project partners include Happy Valley, North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District, Clackamas County, Portland Parks and Recreation and Portland Department of Transportation.	Thank you for this information; the project team coordinated with this group in the development of the Preferred Alternative that is described in this FEIS.
22	2	A	Cassin	Mary Ann	Metro Regional	Coordination between the Sunrise Corridor project and development in proposed Phillips Creek Greenway and	Thank you for your comment. The project team will continue to coordinate with Metro Regional Parks

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Parks Planning and Development	Clackamas River Greenway will also be important.	Planning regarding these projects, as well as North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District, which have proposed similar trails in the project area.
30	3	A	Navas	Nicole	DSL	Executive Summary pg ES-26 delete "Pre-Construction Assessment Permit" under DSL section.	Thank you for the comment. This adjustment has been made in the FEIS.
31	3	A	Navas	Nicole	DSL	Executive Summary pg ES-28 Under wetlands-the list in that first sentence consist of avoidance and minimization measures, not mitigation.	Thank you for the comment. The mitigation section for the Preferred Alternative has been rewritten in the FEIS. Your comment has been addressed.
32	3	A	Navas	Nicole	DSL	Chapter 3, pg 170 Under "Potential Mitigation Measures" revise sentence to read "Wetlands impacts <i>that cannot be avoided</i> must be minimized".	Thank you for the comment. This adjustment has been made in the FEIS.
33	3	A	Navas	Nicole	DSL	Chapter 3, pg 171 last sentence in paragraph above Table 22, change "impacts" to "mitigation"	Thank you for the comment. The mitigation section for the Preferred Alternative has been rewritten in the FEIS. Your comment has been addressed.
34	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	The proposed alignment will impact this wildlife corridor by lessening the width, increasing noise, and increasing light during the dusk to dawn periods when many of these animals are making daily migrations	All of these items are concerns and were addressed to the extent possible through design elements such as locating the facility at the edge of the corridor rather than the middle, selection of design options that minimize impacts, directing light away from wildlife corridors, and developing specific wildlife mitigation elements. Further opportunities to minimize impacts will be explored in final design. Regarding noise, the project will increase noise to the wildlife corridor in the area of the Clackamas Bluffs. While noise modeling has not been done for anything other than AM and PM peak traffic hours, traffic modeling predicts a substantial decrease in large trucks and other vehicle types during the nighttime hours when larger mammals would tend to travel through the corridor. Note that large mammals continue to use a very narrow corridor immediately adjacent to I-205 from Mt. Scott Creek to the Three-Creeks area. Traffic volumes on the Sunrise are predicted to be less than those on I-205.
36	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department of Fish and	ODFW supports alternatives and design options that create the least amount of negative impacts to fish and wildlife populations. Riparian corridors are often hotspots	The design includes bridges over Mt. Scott Creek at SE Ambler Road; two new bridges over Dean Creek (immediately east of I-205 and at Tolbert); and at

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Wildlife	of amphibian as well as mammal corridors and ODFW suggests utilizing bridges at stream crossings with designed wildlife benches. These types of crossings also allow for improved fluvial performances that are important for habitat forming processes.	Rock Creek. A bridge is also proposed on the North Lawnfield extension. These bridges are in locations where the facility crosses wildlife corridors and will not obstruct wildlife movement. New culverts are proposed at Graham Creek, Sieben Creek, an unnamed tributary to Rock Creek between (Rock Creek and Sieben Creek), an unnamed tributary to Trillium Creek (between Rock Creek and Trillium Creek), and Trillium Creek. These locations are parallel to and generally south of the main wildlife corridor and would not restrict the movement of large mammals. Through the CETAS process, ODOT will work with ODFW and other resource agencies to assure that potential impacts on wildlife are minimized.
51	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	When the final alternative and design options are chosen, ODFW looks forward to working with the Oregon Department of Transportation to assist in the final design or mitigation measures that provide the most benefit to fish, wildlife and their habitats.	Comment noted. ODOT will continue to work with ODFW and other resource agencies through the CETAS process to identify issues and mitigation measures as the project is refined and developed.
52	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	ORNHIC data query is dated 2004. ODFW suggests obtaining and using updated query information. Query should include all species of concern (e.g. State Sensitive Species), not just Federal T&E and Federal SOC.	The US Fish and Wildlife Service list of Federally Listed, Proposed, Candidate Species and Species of Concern for species which may occur in Clackamas County, Oregon was accessed on February 3, 2009. The list was last updated on January 31, 2009. This updated list differs from the list supplied by the USFWS in 2004. The FEIS and Biology Technical Report were revised based on this new information. A new query of the ORNHIC database occurred on February 5, 2009. This list differs from the previous list received from ORNHIC. The FEIS has been revised based on this new information.
53	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Incorporate the Oregon Conservation Strategy (Feb 2006) into project analysis. Address presence of OCS species and habitats within the project area, potential impacts to strategy species and habitats, proposed mitigation measures, etc.	The FEIS addresses the potential presence and impacts to Oregon Conservation Strategy species and habitats. OCS Habitats within the API include aquatic freshwater habitats, wetlands, and riparian areas. Impacts to each of these habitats are

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							discussed (see Chapter 3, Biology).
54	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Address other wildlife resources of concern (e.g. osprey nest sites, wintering waterfowl areas, great blue heron rookeries). There are several osprey nests within 1/2 mile of the project alignment. Potential disturbance from visual and noise impacts should be addressed.	The FEIS addresses the potential impacts to osprey nest sites, wintering waterfowl areas, and great blue heron rookeries. No direct impacts to these resources would occur as a result of this project. These resources may be indirectly impacted by noise during construction, though blasting is not planned. Indirect impacts to these resources would be related to potential noise during construction. Table 3 in the FEIS outlines the following mitigation measures for impacts to these species: To minimize take of migratory birds and conflicts with the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (including osprey nests and great blue heron rookeries): 1) During project development and prior to the Design Acceptance Package (DAP), coordinate with the ODOT APHIS/Wildlife Services Liaison to develop migratory bird protection measures, including non-contractual measures and contract special provision. 2) Schedule vegetation clearing outside of a common bird nesting season, or between August and March (or as recommended by Wildlife Services). 3) Create an anticipated item for migratory bird protection services (contact Wildlife Services for a cost estimate).
55	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Include mitigation measures to avoid impacts (e.g. direct mortality during project construction) to Protected Nongame Wildlife Species. E.g. Develop "salvage" plan to locate and remove wildlife from the construction zone.	The only legally protected wildlife species known within the corridor is the bald eagle. ODOT will survey for bald eagle prior to construction. Protection measures will be established should bald eagle be found within the construction limits.
56	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Federal MBTA-address potential impacts to protected birds and their active nests. Include avoidance measures and contingency plans.	The FEIS addresses potential impacts and mitigation measures to MBTA species. ODOT includes standard specification related to the MBTA in construction projects. These specifications are described in the FEIS and will be included in construction contracts.
57	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department	Include as a mitigation measure the installation of remote monitoring devices (i.e. cameras) at bridge and culvert	Wildlife monitoring is beyond the purview of ODOT. ODOT may consider providing funds to ODFW to

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					of Fish and Wildlife	underpasses to monitor wildlife movement.	purchase, maintain, and monitor wildlife movement.
69	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Bridges are strongly recommended to provide for wildlife movement.	The design includes bridges over Mt. Scott Creek at SE Ambler Road; two new bridges over Dean Creek (immediately east of I-205 and at Tolbert); and at Rock Creek. A bridge is also proposed on the North Lawnfield extension. These bridges are in locations where the facility crosses wildlife corridors and will not obstruct wildlife movement. New culverts are proposed at Cow Creek, Sieben Creek, Graham Creek, an unnamed tributary to Trillium Creek (between Rock Creek and Trillium Creek), and Trillium Creek. These locations are south of the main wildlife corridor and close to OR 212/224. Constructing bridges at Cow Creek, Sieben Creek, and Graham Creek would allow wildlife access to OR 212/224 increasing the possibility for vehicle / wildlife collisions. The project is attempting to reduce the probability of vehicle / wildlife collisions.
42	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Wildlife passage areas should incorporate design elements (e.g. fences, vegetation barriers, etc.) to guide wildlife to provided crossing areas.	ODOT has developed and incorporated specific mitigation measures into the design to direct wildlife away from the new facility and to safer crossing areas. The FEIS describes the design elements to be used for wildlife crossings, which include the following: 1) Coordinate with Wildlife Services and ODFW District Wildlife Biologist when developing Roadside Development plans and fence/bridge/culvert designs, so that the future condition of the project area minimizes the potential for animal-vehicle collisions and long-term impacts to nesting birds and wildlife access. 2) Where 'full wildlife access' is specified below, it should be designed at least 10 feet wide and vertical clearance, with adjacent exclusionary fencing along the highway and/or connected to wing walls of crossings, designed to 'direct' animals (deer and small animals) away from highway and towards

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							<p>crossings. Coordinate with a biologist for all access, right-of-way and property fencing associated with this project to avoid blocking important wildlife corridors.</p> <p>Further refinements will be made in coordination with USFWS and ODFW in final design. (See Chapter 3, Biology.)</p>
43	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Chapter 4 address invasive species	<p>Invasive species are addressed in the FEIS. Past ground disturbing activities without attention to invasive plant species have provided opportunities for these aggressive non-native species to colonize and dominate vegetative communities in some areas of the project corridor and the surrounding area. Once established, invasive species can dominate plant communities, simplifying the ecosystem by reducing species richness and thus altering habitat for wildlife. This process typically favors non-native, generalist wildlife species at the expense of specialist, native species. This process is expected to continue as new development takes place. Mitigation measures are proposed to address invasive species (see Table 3 in the FEIS).</p>
35	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Construction: Address impacts to wildlife resources from noise (e.g. blasting), project lighting, increased truck traffic (road mortality) and loss of habitat functions (cover, foraging, nesting, movement) over time (short term impacts vs. long term impacts vs. permanent impacts)	<p>Discussions of road mortality were added to the Technical Report prepared for the project. Within the project's API, there is only one recorded wildlife / vehicle collision within the past ten years (ODOT 2009). The area is not a hotspot for wildlife / vehicle collisions. ODOT is committed to work with USFWS, APHIS, and ODFW during final design on mitigation measures related to wildlife movement corridors.</p> <p>There may be some blasting required, but likely it would be minimal. There currently isn't enough geotechnical information to say that blasting will be required. If it is, there are established procedures for project site blasting that take into account</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							<p>location, surrounding land uses, and time of day restrictions. Should blasting be required it would take place during daylight hours when wildlife are less likely to be traveling through the corridor. This information is presented in the FEIS.</p> <p>Blasting would be restricted during critical nesting seasons as directed by ODOT APHIS/Wildlife Services Liaison. Related mitigation measures are: 1) During project development and prior to the Design Acceptance Package (DAP), coordinate with the ODOT APHIS/Wildlife Services Liaison to develop migratory bird protection measures, including non-contractual measures and contract special provision. 2) Schedule vegetation clearing outside of a common bird nesting season, or between August and March (or as recommended by Wildlife Services).</p>
58	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Applicable laws/approval requirements: add reference to ODFW OAR regulating fish passage. Add reference to ODFW OAR regulating protection of Nongame Protected Wildlife (OAR Div. 44). MBTA-clarify it is a federal law and applicable also to active nests of protected migratory birds.	References to ODFW OAR regulating fish passage and the MBTA were be added to the list of applicable laws/ approvals needed. The purpose of ODFW OAR Div. 44 is to regulate the holding and propagation of game birds, tiger salamanders, and native wildlife. The project will not pursue these activities.
44	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Tech Report, Page 44, Table 1: Species list is federal-centric. Expand to include all State Sensitive wildlife species that may occur within the project area. E.g. Willow Flycatcher (SSC)-likely occurs within the project area and suitable habitat is present within the project area. Western painted turtle (SS-c)-occurs within Clackamas River. Western gray squirrel (SS-U)-occur on Mt. Talbert. Include current information on species presence within the project area. E.g. Northwestern pond turtle are present within the Clackamas River. Indicate which species are Oregon Conservation Strategy species.	The FEIS addresses the potential presence and impacts to State Sensitive wildlife species that may occur within the API (see Chapter 3, Biology). The FEIS details mitigation measures ODOT proposes for impacts to these species.
45	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon	Tech report: Include other sensitive wildlife species of	Osprey and great blue heron are both protected

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Department of Fish and Wildlife	local concern (i.e. osprey, great blue heron rookeries). Note: there are several osprey nest sites within 1/2 mile of alignment	under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. During project development and prior to the Design Acceptance Package (DAP), ODOT will coordinate with their APHIS/Wildlife Services Liaison to develop measures to minimize impacts to migratory birds, including osprey nests and great blue heron rookeries. See Recommended Mitigation Measures for Wildlife and Botanical Resources section.
63	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Tech report, Page 100, Permits required: Suggest renaming this section "Applicable Laws and Regulations"	The title has been changed in the Technical Report.
64	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Tech report, Page 101, MBTA: Statement that migratory birds would be protected in accordance with the MBTA is not addressed in the Mitigation Measures Section	The FEIS describes MBTA mitigation in the Mitigation Measures Section (Chapter 3, Biology). ODOT includes standard specification related to the MBTA in construction projects. These specifications are described in the FEIS and will be included in construction contracts.
65	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Tech report, Page 103, Mitigation Measures: Oversized culverts should not be limited to providing passage just for small mammals. Culverts should also provide for medium and large mammals (e.g. coyote and deer).	ODOT evaluated all culvert locations to determine the suitability for large culverts in each location. New culverts are proposed at Cow Creek, Sieben Creek, Graham Creek, an unnamed tributary to Trillium Creek (between Rock Creek and Trillium Creek), and Trillium Creek. Culverts at Sieben, Graham, and Trillium Creeks would be designed to allow for medium-sized wildlife passage. East of the Clackamas Bluff, the Preferred Alternative places the Sunrise very close to OR 212/224. Constructing oversized culverts large enough to allow deer passage would only encourage deer to move closer to the highway and increase the possibility of a deer strike.
47	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Tech Report: MBTA compliance is not addressed. Include a plan to prevent disturbance to migratory birds and their active nests.	ODOT includes standard specification related to the MBTA in construction projects. Compliance with the MBTA is described in more detail in the Biology Technical Report, Applicable Laws and Regulations section.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
67	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Mitigation measures related to wildlife movement corridors should be based on most current information, directives and BMP's. E.g. Draft Best Practices Manual: Wildlife Vehicle Collision Reduction Study-Report to Congress (Nov 2007), Oregon's Wildlife Movement Strategy-an OCS Initiative. Provide monitoring component (e.g. remote cameras).	ODOT developed and incorporated specific mitigation measures into the design and recommended mitigation measures to direct wildlife away from the new facility and to safer crossing areas. New information on wildlife crossings had been developed since the Biology Technical Report was written and was reviewed and incorporated in the findings and the mitigation strategy. ODOT is committed to work with USFWS, APHIS, and ODFW during final design on mitigation measures related to wildlife movement corridors.
68	4	A	Brick	Jim	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Include a wildlife "salvage" plan to prevent direct mortality from project construction. Appropriate permits would be needed from ODFW.	The only legally protected wildlife species known within the corridor is the bald eagle. ODOT will survey for bald eagle prior to construction. Protection measures will be established should bald eagle be found within the construction limits.
75	5	A	Hess	Mark	City of Damascus	The attached sketch map illustrates one of the concepts in the Damascus 10-31-08 comment memo that suggests a partial closure of the east leg of the Goosehollow/OR-224 intersection.	In the Preferred Alternative, the Goosehollow Drive leg of the OR 224 intersection would be closed and traffic would be alternatively served by a new right-out-only access at the northern end of Orchard View Lane and from a new 162nd undercrossing of Sunrise with connection between OR 212 and the northeastern most terminus of SE Goosehollow Dr. The western leg of this new intersection (the "Jug-Handle" from the current OR 212 intersection down to OR 224) has to have a curve when approaching the intersection. A four-leg intersection would result in safety concerns, primarily related to sight distance.
72	5	A	Hess	Mark	City of Damascus	My intent is to illustrate the concept and explore the feasibility of retaining Goosehollow Drive immediately east of OR-224-restricted to one-way westbound to northbound traffic (with no signal and yield to pedestrians).	See response to Entry # 75.
77	5	A	Hess	Mark	City of Damascus	The drawing includes a channelized right-turn into a northbound lane (or acceleration lane) on Hwy 224, which should eliminate the queue of cars extending east	See response to Entry # 75.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						into the Orchard Lake subdivision, since there is no stop sign or signal phase.	
74	5	A	Hess	Mark	City of Damascus	With the exception of east and west bound pedestrians and bicyclists crossing Hwy 224 at the south leg, the new "jug handle" access road that forms the west leg of the Hwy 224/Goosehollow Drive intersection would function independent of the un-signalized northbound egress from Orchard Lakes.	See response to Entry # 75.
73	5	A	Hess	Mark	City of Damascus	Please let me know your comments and feedback on this or other build alternatives that might avoid a full closure of Goosehollow Drive east of OR224	See response to Entry # 75.
88	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	Our concern is that the proposed solution would impact locally important habitats and open space, including forest and some agricultural land, wildlife corridors, riparian areas, and would fill 32 or the 41 remaining wetland acres in the project area, for which no conceptual mitigation has yet been proposed.	ODOT has developed conceptual mitigation strategies for these resources. These strategies are described in the FEIS in Chapter 3, Biology.
82	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	Cumulatively, the SDEIS describes a construction and build-out scenario for the project area and land use planning area that would largely replace remaining natural ecosystem components and their functions with a built environment. Thus, we encourage the use of context sensitive solutions in project design, such as natural area avoidance and/or preservation, bridging of wetlands, habitat restoration, low impact development techniques, and redevelopment/reuse of disturbed sites as ways to maintain ecological functions and livability in the project area. We also highlight the CETAS as a good forum to vet mitigation strategies to achieve the greatest possible environmental benefits.	The project team remains aware of the potential impacts to the natural environment and has made strong efforts to design a facility that protects the functions of the natural areas to the extent possible. Design considerations included attention to wildlife corridor findings of the <i>Wildlife Corridor Enhancement and Mitigation Strategy</i> , to maintain the corridor for wildlife as much as possible. The profile and horizontal alignment of the facility through the mid-section of the corridor was located proximal to the industrial areas in order to preserve the functions and minimize impacts to the wildlife corridor. The braided ramp from the Sunrise Project interchange to Sunnybrook interchange is proposed to span Mt. Scott Creek with a bridge, instead of culvert, to preserve/enhance an identified wildlife corridor along the south/east side of I-205. Further refinements of design elements to avoid or minimize impacts to wildlife and wetlands have been pursued in the development of the Preferred

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							Alternative. ODOT will continue to work with ODFW and other resource agencies through the CETAS process to identify issues and mitigation measures as the project is refined and developed.
79	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	We are encouraged by the efforts to develop design options, such as Design Options A-2 and C-2, to avoid or minimize impacts to natural and cultural resources.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
102	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	With respect to environmental justice, we have concerns regarding potential disproportionate adverse effects from the project on low and very low income populations, including but not limited to loss of housing without good prospects for replacement. The SDEIS needs more information regarding the outreach to, concerns of, range of impacts and response to low income/environmental justice populations.	<p>The FEIS presents a finding that the project will not have a disproportionate and adverse impact to EJ populations. This analysis is included in Chapter 3. A shortage of replacement housing is not expected and the project has accounted for the potential to use housing of last resort if necessary.</p> <p>For this project, a seat was created on the Project Advisory Committee to provide general representation for EJ communities. The Project Advisory Committee member shared information back to her constituents at the Clackamas Community Action Agency Advisory Board. The Community Action Agency provides services to those in the County living in poverty. The County Project Manager also presented project information at one of their board meetings.</p> <p>The director of Clackamas County Social Services was interviewed to help identify issues that may be of concern. One major concern was whether the project would affect any housing that had public subsidy and was specifically designated and available for low-income residents. Other issues included displacement from older manufactured</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							<p>home communities and access to services. The project received a map of all housing specifically identified by the Housing Authority. All this housing was avoided by the project. However, the build alternatives still affect some multi-family and manufactured home units, as well as some properties not assumed to be occupied by EJ communities.</p> <p>At the onset of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement process, the project team offered to meet with all the managers of the manufactured home parks in the project area. A meeting was held with three of the park managers in June 2004. These representatives have been active participants throughout the process by attending committee meetings and other public meetings. All the other managers were added to the project mailing list. Many residents of the various manufactured home communities have attended public open houses and followed the project over the last five years. On several occasions, flyers and newsletters were distributed door-to-door in the manufactured home communities to invite residents to meetings. Many neighbors from the Old Clackamas area have also attended meetings over the years.</p> <p>The project offered to hold small group meetings at several of the nearest manufactured home communities to share project information that was in the SDEIS and the later about the Preferred Alternative. Several managers attended public meetings, including some of the committee meetings, but none chose to host a small group meeting for their individual manufactured home communities. A couple of managers expressed</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							interest in final design and construction issues, rather than about the selection of a Preferred Alternative. One manufactured home community located just east of 152nd is located adjacent to the Preferred Alternative and does have concern about the proximity of the alignment. The manager for this community is interested in further involvement during final design.
83	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	We particularly recommend and appreciate the efforts to develop a Wildlife Corridor Habitat Enhancement and Mitigation Strategy. We fully support this work and ask that it include provisions to ensure multiple wildlife corridors that are as wide as possible and protected to remain viable into the future.	<p>ODOT developed a Wildlife Corridor Enhancement and Mitigation Strategy for the proposed project. This strategy is based on identification of existing wildlife habitat and corridors and efforts to minimize the project impacts on wildlife and to preserve habitat connections. The SDEIS identified several locations along the project route where parcels or easements could be acquired, or where design elements could be provided, to continue and enhance wildlife movement.</p> <p>ODOT will develop and incorporate specific mitigation measures into the design to direct wildlife away from the new facility and to safer crossing areas. The FEIS describes the design elements to be used for wildlife crossings (see Table 3 in the Executive Summary for a list of commitments).</p>
80	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	We are concerned that impacts to wetland and other aquatic resources are anticipated to be high (between 26 to 34 remaining wetland acres) with any build alternative proposed. The entire project sub-basin has already been heavily impacted by urban development, loss of riparian vegetation, and pollutant loadings from surface water runoff and storm water outfalls. Therefore, additional impacts to the scarce and declining aquatic components within the Cow Creek, Rock Creek, Sieben Creek and the Clackamas River watersheds should be avoided. We would support, for example, Design option A-2 and	Mitigation measures have been provided consistent with federal regulations for highway projects (23 CFR 771.105). In order to receive federal funding, mitigation must be reasonable for the impacts of the proposed actions. The mitigation strategy for the project has been developed to address project impacts following these regulations. FHWA/ODOT will continue to work with CETAS to evaluate issues and mitigation measures as the project is refined and developed. The US Army Corps of Engineers, EPA, USFWS, ODFW, and NOAA Fisheries are all

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						similar avoidance measures. Work closely with the Corps of Engineers, EPA, USFWS, ODFW, and NOAA Fisheries to select a least environmentally damaging practicable alternative (LEDPA).	members of the CETAS group. Together, the designers, environmental team, and agency representatives worked together to select the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) and worked on avoidance and minimization measures for environmental resources.
118	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	Other areas in which the SDEIS would benefit from more analysis, disclosure, and mitigation, include the potential for stimulated travel and growth pressures and associated environmental effects, air toxics and greenhouse gas emissions, ground water resources, and water quality and quantity impacts that could affect threatened Lower Columbia Chinook, Coho, and Steelhead, and their designated critical habitat. The SDEIS provides no information about potential effects on these species. Based on the above, we rate the SDEIS as EC-2, Environmental Concerns, Insufficient Information.	The SDEIS necessarily presents a summary of the important impacts of the alternatives. For more background detail on the existing conditions of groundwater, surface water quality, and fish, please refer to the technical reports. The increased impervious surface will result in an increase in water quality impacts, and attendant effects on fish. Additionally, because building the Sunrise Project would provide additional capacity, the VMT is higher than for the No Build Alternative. Overall levels of air toxics are expected to decline due to improved controls on vehicle emissions over the next 25 years. These impacts are disclosed in the SDEIS (air toxics, p. 134-7; GHG, p. 138-9; groundwater, p 177-8; water quality and T&E fish, p. 149-50). All of the land to be served by the Sunrise Project is expected to be developed with urban levels of growth over the next 20 years. Consequently the facility would not stimulate growth beyond what is already planned.
85	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	The SDEIS is vague in describing how compensatory mitigation is likely to be provided for this project through development of a comprehensive wetland mitigation strategy. With the realization that some of the impacted wetlands are former mitigation sites, the amount of compensation required would likely be increased to cover those additional losses. The SDEIS seems to emphasize wetland creation and enhancement due to the limitation of finding restoration opportunities. We recommend that a combination of on-site and off-site mitigation options be considered that includes localized functions, such as	ODOT has developed a specific wetland mitigation plan. Recent direction from the US Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of State Lands encourage the use of wetland mitigation banks as the first preference in compensatory wetland mitigation. The project is within the service area of the Foster Creek Wetland Mitigation Bank. ODOT is currently evaluating the use of this bank for mitigating impacts on parcels closer to the project. The FEIS describes the wetland mitigation strategy (see Chapter 3, Biology).

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						water quality as well as larger landscape functions, such as wildlife migration corridors and habitat. The interagency structure that exists through the CETAS would be a good forum to vet development of a comprehensive mitigation strategy before inclusion in a Final SEIS.	
86	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	In some watersheds, such as Dean Creek and Cow Creek, the amount of impervious surface to be created by the project is likely to double. Expectations that these impacts would be reduced by storm water detention facilities are somewhat optimistic as the siting of these facilities to optimize control and treatment of pollutants would be constrained by the same features of the project that prevent additional avoidance and minimization of existing aquatic resources. In situations where a significant redevelopment project results in an increase of more than fifty percent of the impervious surface of a previously existing development, and the existing development was not subject to storm water measures, then the entire project must be included in the treatment measure design. We believe that this project provides some opportunities to employ ODOT's newly developed Storm water BMP Selection Process to establish the most effective storm water treatment objectives for this project.	The project team will detain/treat stormwater from contributing surfaces as well as all new impervious surfaces, consistent with Best Management Practices identified collaboratively by ODOT, FHWA, and natural resource agencies (NMFS, DEQ, USFWS, EPA, ODFW), as provided in ODOT Geo-Environmental Stormwater Management Guidelines (GE09-02[B]; 1/27/09).
96	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	The SDEIS provides limited information about groundwater resources in the Geology and Soils section. Because natural areas are expected to be replaced with built structures due to project construction and area land use planning, it is important that impacts to groundwater be well understood. Needed information includes a clear characterization of groundwater resources, their condition, vulnerabilities, recharge areas, their role in maintaining base stream flows and temperatures, importance as drinking water supplies (including a map for drinking water wells), and other relevant factors. There is need for more analysis of potential direct and	Runoff from the project will be collected, treated, and routed to natural surface drainages - not infiltrated back into the groundwater. Drinking water for the project area is provided by the Clackamas River. Individual drinking water wells will be identified during the project's final design with appropriate protective or decommissioning measures applied to the design. Groundwater is discussed in more depth in the Geology and Soils Technical Report on page 38 with respect to location and depth. The only exception may be for small portions of the Lawnfield area where infiltration

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						indirect project effects on groundwater and means to mitigate identified impacts.	<p>may occur due the very shallow slopes that will be encountered in this area.</p> <p>Generally, upper layer cohesive soils are shallow and not typically ground-water bearing. Shallow groundwater levels are present in wetland areas. Underlying gravels contain groundwater at levels that fluctuate with river levels in the Clackamas River and with the amount of rainfall infiltration. Shallow groundwater and groundwater seeps are present along slopes north of the alignment. Groundwater is expected to occur at relatively shallow depths in the project area, estimated to be from 5 to 30 feet below the ground surface, except for wetland areas.</p> <p>The project is not expected to affect groundwater substantially. Trenches or below-grade cut slopes in areas of shallow groundwater may require dewatering.</p>
100	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would also be greater with the build alternatives. The SDEIS does not analyze impacts of GHG's. We believe it is feasible and reasonable to at least qualitatively compare alternatives with respect to these pollutants, and it is important to factor them into decision making.	<p>While the Build Alternatives (Alt. #2 with mid-point interchange, and Alt. #3 without mid-point interchange) are estimated to generate approximately 20% higher vehicle mileage traveled (VMT) than the No-Build Alternative (Alt. #1), with corresponding implications for GHG emissions generated, it should be noted that the increased VMT are not new trips in the region, but a redistribution of trips in the region, as well as an incentive for longer trips. As such, the impacts from the Sunrise Project on GHG emissions and climate change would be regional in context, and difficult to attribute to the project corridor.</p> <p>Nor would such a limited analysis reflect the off-setting impacts on GHG emissions from faster travel speeds on the proposed Sunrise Project, which contribute to a reduction in GHG emissions, compared to stop and go traffic on congested,</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							<p>signalized arterials. The Sunrise Project Build Alternatives would result in significant reduction in congestion in the corridor in 2030 (Alt. 2 = 4.0 hours congestion; Alt. 3 = 5.5 hours congestion), compared to the No-Build Alternative (Alt. 1 = 9.0 hours congestion), with corresponding reduction in GHG emissions.</p> <p>The issue of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and global climate change is an important national and global concern that is being addressed by various state and federal agencies, including ODOT and FHWA, even though no national regulatory thresholds for GHG emissions or concentrations have been established through law or regulation. A more complete exposition of current ODOT policy on GHG and global climate change is described in the Cumulative and Indirect Impacts section of the SDEIS.</p>
101	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	<p>Recommendation: with respect to GHG emissions that would result from the proposed alternatives. Include also a discussion of the likely effects of climate change (not due specifically to the GHG contributions from this proposed project) that are projected to occur within this geographic area and region based on the current best available science.</p>	<p>As stated in the Sunrise Project SDEIS (Air Quality, GHG impacts and global climate change, pp. 138-139), and the current ODOT policy on addressing GHG impacts in NEPA documents, ODOT and FHWA have determined that in the absence of federal regulations, and a regional or national framework for considering the implications of project-level GHG analysis, that GHG emissions cannot be usefully evaluated in the same way that other vehicle emissions are within a local project-level context. And, as such, any attempted analysis would have limited effectiveness in informing project decision-making.</p> <p>The project team has relied on Metro for its modeling services, including overall travel-demand modeling, air quality conformity modeling, and Mobile 6 hot-spot modeling. Metro is often on the</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							<p>cutting edge of new modeling tools and applications. The modeling tool currently most likely to provide useful comparative analysis of GHG emissions by alternative, is the EPA “MOVES” model. This model may potentially be an effective tool for addressing GHG emissions, as it is able to account for changes in travel speeds (e.g., free-flow traffic on expressway vs. stop-and-go traffic through congested, signalized roadways). However, this model is still in demonstration mode. The Mobile 6 model does not calculate changes in travel speeds.</p> <p>Without a regional or national consensus on effective and appropriate methodologies for calculating GHG emissions and associated impacts on climate change, simply listing the difference in GHG emissions as derived from VMT and fuel usage between alternatives would not provide useful information for decision-makers in selecting a Preferred Alternative.</p>
89	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	We are concerned about the upland, riparian, and wetland habitat losses that would result from the proposed project and the effects it would have on local fish and wildlife populations, particularly the threatened fish species. No biological assessment has been provided, and consultation with the Services has apparently not been initiated.	At the time of the issuance of the Supplemental Draft EIS, coordination with National Marine Fisheries was being conducted and, as indicated in the SDEIS, formal consultation with NMFS under Section 7 regulations was anticipated. Prior to publication of this FEIS, a Biological Assessment and Endangered Species Act Section 7 consultation has been completed. The Biological Opinion is attached to the FEIS in Appendix D.
91	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	To avoid residential and commercial displacements, the remaining natural areas and open spaces in the project area have been targeted for the new alignment. This carries with it a suite of impacts that go beyond fish and wildlife to impacts upon human communities and individuals who will no longer benefit from the ecological services provided by these natural areas. We believe it is important to openly disclose these losses and tradeoffs	The range of alternatives was evaluated and determined through the CETAS process. The alternative development process included review of 22 design options during public workshops, CETAS consultations, Project Advisory Committee public meetings, Policy Review Committee meetings, and public open house events. Agencies participating in the CETAS process were provided with information

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						and how they affect the ecology, economy, social fabric and overall quality of life in affected communities.	<p>on the range of alternatives considered for the project, and a presentation was made to these agencies, on December 13, 2005. Criteria considered during screening of the alternatives included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does it meet the project's purpose and need? • Is it acceptable to the community and jurisdiction? • How well does it meet the project goals and objectives? • Is it informed by the resource information in the Environmental Baseline Report? • An additional alternative consideration was that the narrow point along the corridor is urbanized, fragmented, and contains resources. <p>Meeting notes from the December 13, 2005 CETAS presentation indicated that EPA was comfortable with the range of alternatives evaluated for the proposed project and would like to see additional analysis for mid-point, indirect development impacts and assumptions. Subsequently, EPA provided concurrence on the range of alternatives in the CETAS Concurrence Form dated December 19, 2005 as signed by Yvonne M. Vallette, Aquatic Ecologist. Impacts on natural areas and open space are identified in the Supplemental Draft EIS and addressed for the Preferred Alternative in the discussion of Biology impacts in Chapter 3.</p>
90	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	We believe the SDEIS does not provide sufficient information about the effects of the proposed or threatened fish species, including Lower Columbia Chinook, Coho and steelhead.	There is additional detail included in the Biology Technical Report. Substantial additional detail is included in the Biological Assessment prepared for the project.
92	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	It is also important to mitigate the natural area conversions that occur directly and indirectly as a result of the proposed project. We encourage the use of context sensitive solutions in project design, such as natural area avoidance and/or preservation, bridging of wetlands, habitat restoration, low impact development	ODOT is committed to mitigate impacts to natural areas commensurate with project impacts. ODOT developed a <i>Wildlife Corridor Enhancement and Mitigation Strategy</i> early in the design process to help guide the design process. Design considerations included attention to the <i>Wildlife Corridor</i>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						techniques, and redevelopment/re-use of disturbed sites as ways to maintain ecological functions and livability in the project area. We also highlight the CETAS as a good forum to vet mitigation strategies to achieve the greatest possible environmental benefits.	<i>Enhancement and Mitigation Strategy</i> in order to maintain the functions of the wildlife corridor to the extent possible. The profile and horizontal alignment of the facility through the mid-section of the corridor was located proximal to the industrial areas to preserve the functions and minimize impacts to the wildlife corridor. The braided ramp from the Sunrise Project interchange to Sunnybrook interchange is proposed to span Mt. Scott Creek with a bridge, instead of culvert, to preserve/enhance an identified wildlife corridor along the south/east side of I-205. ODOT will continue to work with ODFW and CETAS to vet issues and mitigation measures as the project is refined and developed.
93	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	In the Final EIS include the discussion of impacts and consider mitigation as described above.	This information is included in the FEIS in Chapter 3 (Biology, Wetlands sections).
112	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	We commend FHWA and ODOT for their efforts to maintain the existing wildlife corridors.	Thank you.
94	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	Corridors are of critical importance for use by wildlife currently inhabiting the project area, as well as for a means of adaption to climate change where a corridor may be needed for migration, re-colonization, and/or genetic exchange. It is important to provide more than one viable corridor to and from remaining blocks of habitat to improve options in the future in the face of natural disasters, unforeseen development, or other impediments that may preclude the use of a single movement corridor. It is also important to ensure the corridors are as wide as possible and that the corridor lands are preserved to ensure the corridors remain viable into the future.	Wildlife corridors play a critical function in maintaining healthy wildlife populations in a fragmented urban setting. In recognition of the importance of the corridor, ODOT developed a Wildlife Corridor Enhancement and Mitigation Strategy early in the design process to help guide the design process. As a result of the strategy, ODOT adjusted the profile and horizontal alignment of the facility through the project alignment's mid-section to locate it as close to industrial areas as possible in order to preserve the functions and minimize impacts to the wildlife corridor. A wildlife mitigation strategy has been developed and is described in Table 3 of the FEIS. The enhancement and mitigation strategy identifies sites where opportunities for enhancing wildlife habitat and movement exist. These opportunities

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							range from removing or modifying fences to improve passage, and restoring habitat with upland and riparian plantings.
103	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	The Sunrise Project would potentially result in direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to project area neighborhoods and communities (such as, the Old Clackamas area and manufactured home parks) that meet the criteria under Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice as being inhabited predominantly by low income and/or minority populations. Some census block groups in the project area also include those that have unusually high populations of children, elderly and disabled residents. Due to the disadvantaged characteristics of the affected populations, EPA believes that extra measures may be necessary to ensure effective public participation and sufficient and appropriate mitigation for project impacts.	The study area contains nine block groups, of which, six contain minority and low-income populations in larger concentrations than are found at the state level (see Figure 31 in the FEIS). Based on methodology from the "Draft National Guidance for Conducting Environmental Justice Analyses" (EPA, 1998), meaningfully greater is used to mean more than 1.2 times the state ratios. (Clackamas County data are provided on Figure 31 and in the Socioeconomic Technical Report for context.) Regarding outreach methods, see response above (Entry # 102). This information has been added to the FEIS (see Chapter 3).
104	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	The SDEIS indicates that some outreach, including selective door to door distribution of flyers and meeting invitations, has occurred. However, there is not sufficient information to determine the extent and quality of the public involvement efforts. More information is needed about how and whether the low income, minority, elderly and disabled residents were effectively contacted, about the concerns they identified and about the response to their concerns.	See response above (Entry # 102). This information has been added to the FEIS (see Chapter 3).
105	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	In the Final Supplemental EIS, disclose more information about the outreach techniques, participation levels, the concerns of the residents, what was learned in the process of trying to reach and involve these communities, and indicate how public input was incorporated into the project and decision making. If the low income populations were not effectively engaged in the process, consider additional outreach efforts to include them.	The details of public outreach through October 2008 were provided in the Executive Summary of the SDEIS (pp 5 - 7). The public outreach conducted for the project is summarized in Chapter 1 of the FEIS. Two public hearings were held in November 2008 and additional meetings were held with the public advisory committee developed for the project. Information on the public hearings/open houses during the public comment period (location, times, participation) is included in the FEIS (Appendix F, Public Involvement Materials).

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
106	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	<p>With respect to impacts, the SDEIS does a good job of analyzing and disclosing information about business and residential displacements, including those in low income neighborhoods. The environmental justice analysis should also include other potential impacts that may disproportionately affect the disadvantaged communities, such as air pollution/air toxics, health effects, noise and vibration, light and glare, visual/aesthetic impacts, community resources and cohesion, increased traffic and congestion access and safety issues, construction impactions and the cumulative impacts on the physical mental and economic health conditions (such as rates/occurrence of asthma or other respiratory conditions, premature deaths) among these populations and neighborhoods.</p>	<p>The SDEIS, Socioeconomic Technical Report and Land Use Technical report do qualitatively report potential impacts to EJ sensitive communities for the topic areas listed.</p> <p>There are no identified air quality impacts from the proposed Sunrise Project build alternatives that would adversely affect the community at large or EJ communities. The tools and techniques for assessing project-specific health impacts from Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT) are limited. This impedes FHWA's ability to evaluate how mobile source health risks should factor into project-level decision-making under NEPA. The analysis required and conducted for this project was a qualitative analysis, as outlined in the Interim Guidance on Air Toxic Analysis in NEPA Documents from FHWA. For projects with low potential MSAT effects, a qualitative assessment of emissions is conducted.</p> <p>Additional noise and vibration, and visual impacts were qualitatively assessed in the Socioeconomics and Land Use Technical Reports; however, there is no identified disproportionate adverse noise impact to EJ communities.</p> <p>Community resources are addressed in the EJ section of the SDEIS. There are no religious or fraternal organizations, service centers for low income populations, or similar facilities that are necessarily associated with EJ populations and that are impacted by the project.</p> <p>Increased traffic and congestion, and access and safety issues are discussed in the travel patterns and accessibility section of the EJ chapter and in the Transportation section of the SDEIS. Certain block</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							<p>groups within the project area have higher percentages of carpooling, and using transit, and walking and biking. There would not be a disproportionate impact to EJ sensitive communities. Congestion and safety are issues for the entire project-area population. Under the Preferred Alternative, delay in the OR 212/224 corridor would be reduced, therefore improving congestion and safety for all area populations.</p> <p>Construction impacts would be temporary and would be borne equally through out the project alignment and are listed in Chapter 4 of the SDEIS. These would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased use of local and arterial roads by construction equipment and truck traffic resulting in traffic delays; • Temporary traffic rerouting and road and access closures; • Construction noise from heavy equipment operation and the construction of bridges and wall forms; • Blasting noise and dust; • Dust from excavating and placing fill; and • Lighting in construction areas in the evening. <p>Additional impacts on businesses include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic rerouting, temporary road and driveway closures and delays; • Temporary loss of visibility from key roadways; and • Difficulty maneuvering trucks. <p>Mitigation measures taken for impacts would be applied equitably.</p>
102	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	With respect to environmental justice, we have concerns regarding potential disproportionate adverse effects from	There are some known and assumed areas of EJ populations, such as the Old Clackamas

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						<p>the project on low and very low income populations, including but not limited to loss of housing without good prospects for replacement. The SDEIS needs more information regarding the outreach to, concerns of, range of impacts and response to low income/environmental justice populations.</p>	<p>neighborhood and several manufactured home communities. For this project, a seat was created on the Project Advisory Committee to provide general representation for EJ communities. Bear Morris shared information back to her constituents at the Clackamas Community Action Agency Advisory Board. The Community Action Agency provides services to those in the County living in poverty. Ron Weinman, the County Project Manager, also presented project information at one of their board meetings.</p> <p>The director of Clackamas County Social Services was interviewed to help identify issues that may be of concern. One major concern was whether the project would affect any housing that had public subsidy and was specifically designated and available for low-income residents. Other issues included displacement from older manufactured home communities and access to services. The project received a map of all housing specifically identified by the Housing Authority. All this housing was avoided by the project. However, the build alternatives still affect some multi-family and manufactured home units, as well as some properties not assumed to be occupied by EJ communities.</p> <p>At the onset of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement process, the project team offered to meet with all the managers of the manufactured home parks in the project area. A meeting was held with three of the park managers in June 2004. These representatives have been active participants throughout the process by attending committee meetings and other public meetings. All the other managers were added to the</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							<p>project mailing list. Many residents of the various manufactured home communities have attended public open houses and followed the project over the last five years. On several occasions, flyers and newsletters were distributed door-to-door in the manufactured home communities to invite residents to meetings. Many neighbors from the Old Clackamas area have also attended meetings over the years.</p> <p>The project offered to hold small group meetings at several of the nearest manufactured home communities to share project information that was in the SDEIS and the later Preferred Alternative. Several managers attended public meetings, including some of the committee meetings, but none chose to host a small group meeting for their individual parks. A couple of park managers expressed interest in final design and construction issues, rather than about the selection of a Preferred Alternative. One park just east of 152nd is located adjacent to the Preferred Alternative and does have concern about the proximity of the alignment. The manager for this park is interested in further involvement during final design.</p>
107	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	In the Final SEIS, provide analysis and disclosure of any other project-related direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts that would potentially affect the low income populations in the project area.	The FEIS includes this information (see Chapter 3, Environmental Justice section and Chapter 4, Cumulative Effects). The intent of the FEIS is to identify direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts of the Preferred Alternative, as well as possible mitigation actions.
108	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	To mitigate the impacts to disadvantaged neighborhoods in the project area, the SDEIS discusses potential relocations for displaced homes and businesses. However, there is no mitigation discussed for impacts with partial takings/displacements that do not result in relocation, or for impacts such as encumbered home	Impacts that do not result in displacements would be non-compensatory under the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						sales and business leases due to potential project impacts. A means to mitigate these impacts should be discussed and developed with those affected.	
109	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	For full displacements, mitigation should also be discussed with affected parties. It may be that relocation would be a lesser impact than avoiding displacement due to the suite of cumulative effects that could potentially result from living in close proximity to the new roadway.	The property acquisition process for purchasing road right-of-way is governed by specific Federal and State laws identified on page 105 of the Right-of-Way Technical Report. In addition to the information for the potential displacement or partial acquisition included in the SDEIS, all property owners from whom it is determined property will be needed are contacted when the exact property need is known. They are given maps of the purchase area, brochures such as ODOT's "Acquiring Land for Highway & Public Projects" and "Moving Because of the Highway or Public Projects?" which outline the process, as well as contact information for questions. They are then asked if they wish to meet with the appraiser for the property inspections. This type of contact opportunity is offered throughout the acquisition process, wanting to keep the owners informed and involved.
110	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	Disabled and elderly individuals could be especially impacted by project construction within their neighborhoods, and by increased traffic and congestion resulting from the north-south barrier effect of the new roadway. To mitigate safety hazards to disabled and elderly pedestrians, it may be helpful to provide shuttle services to meet their transportation needs both during project construction and to access public transit once the project is operational.	Currently there are four TriMet bus routes within the study area, all of which are wheelchair-accessible. Access to these routes will be maintained during construction. The only transit center within the study area is located at Clackamas Town Center. It is being redeveloped as part of the new Light Rail Transit that began operation in the fall of 2009. There are two Park-and-Ride Lots within the study area. The Park-and-Ride lots are handicapped accessible. In addition to the existing service, which is assumed to continue, the Financially Constrained RTP includes new bus routes connecting the Oregon City Transit Center with Carver (and Clackamas Town Center Transit Center) via Holcomb Boulevard and

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
111	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	Consider adopting these mitigation measures [listed in entry #s 108-110] and/or others not listed here that are reasonable and recommended by concerned individuals and organizations, to lessen the project impacts on affected residents.	Forsythe Road. ODOT and Clackamas County will work with concerned individuals and organizations to implement mitigation that is reasonable and appropriate.
113	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	The SDEIS briefly discusses the subject of project indirect effects on land use and growth, but dismisses the potential for such impacts outside of planned growth, stating (on p. 213) that large scale urban land development in Oregon is not primarily driven by the development of the highway system to the same extent that it is in other states. However, the traffic analysis projects 22% higher VMT due to the added capacity from the Sunrise Project, which indicates a stimulated travel effect, and the SDEIS states that constructing the highway may accelerate development of currently undeveloped and open lands, especially in east Happy Valley and Damascus. This indicates that planned growth may occur sooner than the twenty year land use planning horizon and potentially lead to unplanned growth outside the UGB. The SDEIS should analyze and disclose where and to what extent this could potentially occur.	Construction of either of the Build Alternatives will result in increased capacity in the corridor and approximately a 22% increase in VMT in comparison to the No-Build Alternative, as the increased benefits from shorter travel times, reduced congestion, and enhanced accessibility accommodate longer trips in the region. However, this increase in VMT does not represent new trips in the region, as much as a redistribution of trips in the region. Any new infrastructure project in a region will have similar effects on length of trips and VMT, in response to improved accessibility. The project is in response to planned growth forecasts of Metro and in the comprehensive plans of communities within the Sunrise Corridor (urban Clackamas County, Happy Valley, and City of Damascus). The Sunrise Project has been identified in the comprehensive plans of these communities, as well as the Metro Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), as needed to implement community comprehensive plans. The timing of that growth is uncertain. Enhanced accessibility and mobility provided by the Sunrise Project would support development in the corridor, however, water and sewer service would likely facilitate development even more so. The Sunrise Project is estimated to be a \$1.2B undertaking, which will likely be constructed in multiple phases over the 20-year planning horizon, providing some constraint on development throughout the corridor.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							<p>Given the relatively tight urban growth boundary (UGB) advocated by Metro, the regional governing body charged with periodic expansion of the UGB, any acceleration of planned growth within the UGB will not necessarily result in unplanned growth outside the UGB. Only rural land uses are permitted outside of the UGB under state policy and statute.</p> <p>To assess the implications of land-use assumptions used in the travel-demand modeling of likely expansion of the UGB by 2030 into currently rural lands in the east and south of the Sunrise Corridor, and the associated need for a six-lane Sunrise Project, the project team analyzed alternative land-use assumptions that significantly reduced planned future growth outside the UGB. The project team desired to understand the level of regional land use that could reasonably be shifted from the Sunrise Corridor area and expected change in resulting regional travel demand. The project team also desired to ascertain whether resulting Sunrise travel demand could be acceptably served by fewer lanes.</p> <p>Assumed land-uses were reduced in this scenario, and new travel demand models run. This exercise first started with the approved 2030 Regional land use allocations. Focus was placed on exception lands just beyond the UGB near Boring, Orient/Springwater, and east of Oregon City. 2030 population and employment allocations were reduced in these areas by 80% to reflect downshift from future urban density to more rural development. This resulted in a shift of approximately 9,500 households and 12,000 jobs.</p> <p>The effect of reducing land uses in the currently</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							rural areas adjacent to Sunrise Corridor, however, was relatively modest: approximately 150 fewer eastbound Sunrise vehicles during the PM peak period, and approximately 250 fewer westbound Sunrise vehicles during AM peak period. It was determined that these reductions would not be sufficient to eliminate a through lane on the Sunrise Project (six through lanes still needed). Further analysis would be needed to determine if one or more auxiliary lanes could be eliminated.
114	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	In addition, there should be a discussion of potential mitigation measures that would help to prevent unplanned development and future congestion both within and outside the project area. For example, Alternative 2 midpoint interchange and roadways, integrated planning of bike and pedestrian facilities with transportation oriented development, compact mixed uses, affordable housing and preservation of open spaces and natural areas.	<p>The Sunrise Project is intended to address significant congestion along the OR 212/224 – Sunrise Corridor, that undermines the economic viability of the Clackamas Industrial Area, including a number of major regional truck distribution centers (Fred Meyer, Safeway, USF Reddaway), as well as accommodate the planned growth of the cities of Happy Valley and Damascus. The project has developed various mitigation measures to prevent unplanned development and future congestion within the project area, and larger metropolitan region.</p> <p>With the Metro regional planning agency as a partner to the Sunrise Project, this project has been designed to be consistent with the Portland metropolitan region’s adopted 2040 Growth Concept Plan (1995). The 2040 Plan represents a long-range blueprint for the future, intended to guide growth and development for the next 50 years, by focusing urban-level development within a relatively tight urban growth boundary.</p> <p>Policies in the region’s long-range plan encourage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • safe and stable neighborhoods for families • compact development, which uses both land and money more efficiently

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a healthy economy that generates jobs and business opportunities • protection of farms, forests, rivers, streams and natural areas • a balanced transportation system to move people and goods • housing for people of all incomes in every community <p>Regional measures encouraged to achieve these objectives include compact, mixed-use communities (town centers/regional centers); enhanced transit/bike/pedestrian facilities; transit-oriented development (TOD); transportation system management (TSM) and transportation demand management (TDM) initiatives; and the creation of urban and rural reserves. The latter effort offers the region new tools that will allow more efficient accommodation of future residents while also preserving farmland, forest land, and natural resources over the long term. Regional partners will be working together to decide what lands should and should not be urbanized in the coming decades. This should provide both more flexibility and more predictability to the growth management process and reduce the level of controversy associated with urban growth boundary expansion decisions.</p> <p>Urban and rural reserves will enable Metro and the counties of the region to establish urban reserves – areas outside the urban growth boundary that, based on a number of factors, may be better suited to accommodate population and job growth over 40 to 50 years – as well as rural reserves, which are areas outside the urban growth boundary needed to protect valuable farm and forestland for a similar period.</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							<p>Recognizing that the Sunrise Project primarily traverses a freight distribution and industrial corridor, with no established town centers, and existing lower-density residential neighborhoods, project-specific mitigation measures were developed to implement the comprehensive plans of the local jurisdictions along the corridor; maintain and enhance multi-modal connectivity throughout the corridor; coordinate bike/pedestrian facilities with recreational trails; and preserve open spaces and natural areas.</p> <p>The Sunrise Project will complete the I-205 multi-use path through the project area, a missing link in this 16 mile bike/ped facility that parallels I-205. A separated multi-use path will parallel the Sunrise Project from I-205 to Rock Creek Junction., where it will join the existing shoulder bikeways on OR 212 and OR 224. Opportunities were explored to provide connection between the multi-use path and proposed recreational trails in the corridor. Additional bus service is proposed for OR 212/224 and Sunrise Project, as well as other TDM measures, to minimize single-occupant vehicle travel in corridor. The project team developed a Wildlife Corridor Enhancement and Mitigation Strategy as a pro-active means for preserving and protecting wildlife habitats and passages in the corridor.</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
115	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	<p>Include analysis in the Final SEIS, using identified methodology(ies), that would illustrate the differences among alternatives with respect to stimulated travel and growth, such as the differences with and without a midpoint interchange, the No Build Alternative build out scenario vs. Alternatives 2 or 3 using the different design options that would or would not access different locales within the project area. There should be discussion of how this project would affect the growth plans for the Damascus Boring areas, to US 26 and beyond the UGB. Include potential mitigation measures for stimulated travel and growth impacts, including those that may not be within the authority or capability if the lead agency to implement.</p>	<p>Relative to today, the Sunrise project area experiences the following conditions (see table):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • study area travel demand increases sharply; • recurring morning and afternoon congestion along Hwy 212/224 increases to 9 or more hours daily; • PM peak period VHD increases by 70%; • a 175% increase in freight trucks experiencing congestion on Hwy 212/224 (14% trucks); • continued mixing of regional and local trips on Hwy 212/224; • Expected higher number of annual auto crashes. <p>With the Sunrise Project regional growth is accommodated, and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3X more vehicles/people access and move to, from, and through the corridor daily relative to today; • regional and local trips align with appropriate facilities • transportation system users travel faster; • duration of congestion reverts to near existing levels; • mid-day period preserved for truck freight movement; • enhanced bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities/service • potential exists for enhanced industrial area accessibility.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response																								
							<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Performance Measure (PM peak period)</th> <th>Existing (2005)</th> <th>No-Build (2030)</th> <th>Alternative 2 – Build w. Mid-point IC (2030)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ADT (Hwy 212/ 224 x 106th Ave.)</td> <td>38,000 vehicles 2,630 trucks (7%)</td> <td>52,500 vehicles 7,240 trucks (14%)</td> <td>~41,000 vehicles 2,700 trucks (7%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD)</td> <td>860 hours</td> <td>1,450 hours</td> <td>940 hours</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Back of queue on Hwy 212/224</td> <td>WB @ 106th Ave.</td> <td>WB @ 162nd Ave.</td> <td>WB @ 135th Ave.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Duration of congestion on Hwy 212/224</td> <td>~ 2 hours (~4 hours daily)</td> <td>~5 hours (~9 hours daily)</td> <td>~2 – 3 hours (~4 – 5 hrs daily)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Failing signalized intersections</td> <td>2 out of 20</td> <td>20 out of 23</td> <td>10 out of 32</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Performance Measure (PM peak period)	Existing (2005)	No-Build (2030)	Alternative 2 – Build w. Mid-point IC (2030)	ADT (Hwy 212/ 224 x 106 th Ave.)	38,000 vehicles 2,630 trucks (7%)	52,500 vehicles 7,240 trucks (14%)	~41,000 vehicles 2,700 trucks (7%)	Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD)	860 hours	1,450 hours	940 hours	Back of queue on Hwy 212/224	WB @ 106 th Ave.	WB @ 162 nd Ave.	WB @ 135 th Ave.	Duration of congestion on Hwy 212/224	~ 2 hours (~4 hours daily)	~5 hours (~9 hours daily)	~2 – 3 hours (~4 – 5 hrs daily)	Failing signalized intersections	2 out of 20	20 out of 23	10 out of 32
Performance Measure (PM peak period)	Existing (2005)	No-Build (2030)	Alternative 2 – Build w. Mid-point IC (2030)																												
ADT (Hwy 212/ 224 x 106 th Ave.)	38,000 vehicles 2,630 trucks (7%)	52,500 vehicles 7,240 trucks (14%)	~41,000 vehicles 2,700 trucks (7%)																												
Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD)	860 hours	1,450 hours	940 hours																												
Back of queue on Hwy 212/224	WB @ 106 th Ave.	WB @ 162 nd Ave.	WB @ 135 th Ave.																												
Duration of congestion on Hwy 212/224	~ 2 hours (~4 hours daily)	~5 hours (~9 hours daily)	~2 – 3 hours (~4 – 5 hrs daily)																												
Failing signalized intersections	2 out of 20	20 out of 23	10 out of 32																												
95	6	A	Reichgott	Christine	United States EPA	Continue efforts to ensure that existing wildlife corridors are preserved, are as wide as possible, and that they remain intact into the future. As compensation/mitigation for habitat losses due to the proposed project, consider establishing new or re-established previous wildlife corridors that would increase the options for wildlife movement with design and function as described above.	Given the selection of the Preferred Alternative, ODOT has developed a wildlife mitigation plan commensurate with anticipated impacts. ODOT will continue to work with ODFW and the CETAS group to vet issues and mitigation measures.																								
127	7	A	Simmons	Devin	National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)	NMFS has chosen not to support one alternative over another. The current level of design and scale does not enable NMFS to delineate significant differences between the alternatives and associated impacts to NMFS' trust resources.	Significant additional detail was developed in Biological Assessment and is documented in the FEIS.																								
129	7	A	Simmons	Devin	National	The SDEIS notes that all new culverts within the project	The FEIS states that all new and reconfigured,																								

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)	area "would be designed to comply with state laws". It is recommended that this be changed to state that all new and reconfigured permanent water crossings within the current historic range of anadromous will be designed to meet state law and federal guidances. Those are solely within the range of resident migratory fish will comply with state fish passage law.	permanent water crossings within the current historic range of anadromous fish will be designed to meet state law and federal guidance. Those culverts that are solely within the range of resident migratory fish will comply with state fish passage law (the Oregon Fish Passage Act rules [OAR 635-412-0010 through 0040]). Fish passage exemptions may be obtained if providing passage creates no benefit or would not provide access to usable habitat, and fish passage waivers allow for mitigation at other locations.
128	7	A	Simmons	Devin	National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)	Page 147 of the biology chapter state that the project may affect fish resources primarily through three mechanisms. NMFS also recommends that hydroacoustic impacts associated with construction be discussed within the biology chapter if pile driving is considered to be part of any in or near water construction technique.	This issue was addressed in the Biological Assessment. In-water pile driving is unlikely because of the narrow size of streams within the area of potential impact.
132	8	A	Taylor	Willie	Dept of Interior	..planned parks, recreational areas, wildlife refuges and waterfowl refuges may receive Section 4(f) protection if the public agency that owns the property has formally designated the resource and determined it to be significant as a park recreational area, etc.	<p>In preparing the Final EIS, additional analysis was incorporated into Chapter 3 in a stand-alone Parks and Recreation section regarding the planned parks and trails in the project area. In several meetings with North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District (NCPRD) and Metro in early 2010, parks representatives pointed out that the planned trails are conceptual in nature and potential alignments have been loosely identified. No property has been acquired for the planned trails and, while some trail segments would cross public property, the location of most of the planned trails is shown on private property. For the short segments of trails that happen to be on publicly owned property, the owner of the land is not the agency which has identified the planned trail.</p> <p>At meetings with Metro and NCPRD in January and March 2010, the Sunrise multi-use path was discussed. It was agreed that the potential</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							alignments of proposed trails, as currently identified, could join with roadway facilities in places along the proposed roadway route. It was also noted that the Sunrise Project would not prevent future trail crossings of the proposed roadway in places, and therefore, construction of the Sunrise project does not preclude future trail plans. The Sunrise Project includes improvements to the existing multi-use path system adjacent to I-206 and an east/west, multi-use path along the Sunrise mainline (see Figure PA-16). It was noted that the multi-use path would partially address the desire for a trail in the Sunrise Project area, including the planned Camp Withycombe and planned Clackamas Bluffs Trails. For these reasons the planned trails are not considered Section 4(f) resources.
133	8	A	Taylor	Willie	Dept of Interior	It is also not entirely accurate to state that all of the parks and trails are not publicly owned, since the SDEIS later acknowledges that some, in fact, are publicly owned. See SDEIS p. 14. Therefore, Section 4(f) does apply to those portions of proposed future trails located on publicly-owned property, of the other factors of formal designation and significance as a park or trail also apply.	While portions of some of the some of the planned trails are located on publicly-owned property, the owners of the properties with the trail designations, have not designated their land for planned trails. In addition to the uncertainty regarding planned trails, as indicated above, the majority of trails are currently planned to cross private, not public land. Metro and the North Clackamas Park and Recreation District each countersigned letters which provide an analysis of why Section 4(f) does not apply to their planned facilities. FHWA has found that Section 4(f) does not apply to these planned trail facilities. Additional analysis, including specific analysis regarding the future potential of each planned trail, is provided in the Parks and Recreation Section of Chapter 3.
134	8	A	Taylor	Willie	Dept of Interior	First, we do not agree with the statement that the public lands for planned trails are not designated for public recreational use with regard to the NCPRD. In fact, the NCPRD seems to have formally designated future trails	The Parks and Recreation section of Chapter 3 finds that these documents do not rise above a mere expression of interest or desire. Neither Metro nor North Clackamas Parks and Recreation district have

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						and parks for recreation by identifying them in the North Clackamas Parks District Plan and the 2002 Master Plan Update. It is unclear whether Metro's naming future trails and parks in the "Regional Trails and Greenways: Connecting Neighborhoods to Nature" publication would be considered formal designation.	acquired any land for any of the trails that they have planned.
135	8	A	Taylor	Willie	Dept of Interior	Second, we do not agree that "the exact location" of a trail must be known in order to receive Section 4(f) protection. There is always a degree of uncertainty for any planned trail until the trail is actually built; some level of uncertainty is inherent in any plan or design. Yet this is not a precluding factor under Section 4(f). We believe the identification of future trails as shown in the SDEIS is based on NCPRD's plan and Metro's publication is sufficient.	<p>The Parks and Recreation section of Chapter 3 of the FEIS provided additional background regarding the planned trails from each document. This section acknowledges that the production of a high quality map in the SDIES and FEIS may have provided an inaccurate perception regarding the level of planning efforts that have preceded these documents. We have included the source maps in Appendix C, so that the foundation of the analysis can be reviewed.</p> <p>We agree that the "exact location" is not necessary to receive Section 4(f) consideration; however, in the case of these two documents, the level of planning has been minimal with little, if any, coordination on the part of those designating the trails. In fact, the agencies have not, nor do they plan to coordinate their separate documents, which in many cases depict very similar trails in very similar locations.</p>
136	8	A	Taylor	Willie	Dept of Interior	We note that portions of the following trails might be protected, since they appear to be located on publicly-owned land and are part of NCPRD's planned recreation trail network: 1. Camp Withycombe Trail (unclear what "Development Agency" on Figure 8: Metro and NCPRD Planned Recreational Trails means) 2. Unnamed trail.	It is correct to note that the planned Camp Withycombe Trail would conceptual traverse through the Camp Withycombe military facility. This secure military facility would not allow a multi-use path access through the facility. Camp Withycombe has not designated their property for the planned Camp Withycombe Trail. Additionally, the Sunrise project will provide for a multi-use path that parallels the new facility including an area adjacent to Camp Withycombe. In this area the Sunrise multi-use path construction, will serve the function

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							envisioned for the Camp Withycombe trail from approximately Mather Road to 135 th Avenue. For the planned Unnamed Trail which would be approximately 5,500 feet in length, 500 feet is publicly owned. However, again, the agency which has designated this trail does not own the property upon which they have designated the trail. Additionally, construction of the Sunrise project is only adjacent to the planned Unnamed Trail and would have not impact on the planned Unnamed Trail.
137	8	A	Taylor	Willie	Dept of Interior	In conclusion, we recommend a clearer analysis in the Final Supplemental Impact Statement and Final Section 4(f) Evaluation of the Metro and NCPRD planned recreational resources, and clarification of whether camp Withycombe Trail and the Unnamed Trail should receive Section 4(f) protection, and if so, subsequent Section 4(f) analysis.	In response to your comments, we have provided a separate Parks and Recreation section in Chapter 3 of the FEIS regarding Section 4(f) applicability to the planned trails. We have provided analysis of each trail, regarding Section 4(f) applicability, public and private land ownership, potential impacts from the Sunrise project, as well as analysis of how each planned trail would not be precluded from being built when the Sunrise project is completed. We believe this new section will completely address all of your comments.
1260	9	A	Flisakowski	Reah	City of Happy Valley	The future findings are based on the 2030 travel demand model and the associated RTP project list (Figure D-7). This is appropriate due to the start date of the IAMP, however it should be noted that the analysis doesn't include the 162nd Avenue extension project (Highway 212 to Clatsop Street) that is on the current RTP list.	While Figure D-7 does specifically call out the 162nd Avenue extension project, it is assumed in the underlying Metro Model. The Intersection of 162nd Ave at OR 212 was not included in the SDEIS analysis, but was analyzed in the FEIS.
1261	9	A	Flisakowski	Reah	City of Happy Valley	The future findings assume the Sunrise Project would be a 6 lane expressway. What are the impacts to the IAMP findings if the Sunrise is a 4 lane facility? Does the IAMP have to be updated if a 4 lane facility becomes the Preferred Alternative?	Neither Build Alternative includes a 4-lane Sunrise facility. A 4-lane facility was investigated early in the project development and was rejected because it would be inadequate to meet travel demand.
1262	9	A	Flisakowski	Reah	City of Happy Valley	How does the proposed Happy Valley Comprehensive Plan land use changes impact the IAMP future findings? I don't think that question was evaluated, therefore the IAMP can't claim compliance.	The East Happy Valley Comprehensive Plan land use assumptions are compatible with the Metro Regional 2030 Forecast (Gen 2.3 Jurisdictionally Reviewed) which is part of the Regional

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							<p>Transportation Planning Process. There are no compatibility issues with the assumptions used in the SDEIS and the evaluation conducted as part of the IAMP process.</p> <p>The IAMP will be in “compliance” with both the SDEIS and the Regional Transportation Plan.</p>
1263	9	A	Flisakowski	Reah	City of Happy Valley	The study shows operating conditions (Figures D-15 and D-16) outside the Rock Creek Junction area but does not provide the 2030 forecasts or geometries that were assumed. This makes it difficult to review the 172nd Ave/Sunrise findings.	Figures 6-48 through 6-53 of the Transportation Technical Report depict lane configurations, traffic control and operations at this intersection.
1264	9	A	Flisakowski	Reah	City of Happy Valley	It appears the IAMP future findings are based on 2030 forecasts developed for the Sunrise SDEIS. The SDEIS technical appendix operation analysis at Highway 212/172nd Avenue (Figure 6-47) shows a significantly different roadway network than shown in the SDEIS roadway alternative maps (Figure 16 and 17). There is a major inconsistency in the configuration of the east terminus of the Sunrise project.	The eastern boundary of the project is the Rock Creek Interchange. The analysis of 172nd Avenue is outside of the project boundary and is considered a transition area. In this transition area, the traffic analysis evaluated the year 2030 system planned for in the Regional Transportation Plan financially constrained model, which includes five lanes of capacity on Highway 212. Other technical analysis evaluated the Sunrise facility transitioning back to the existing footprint of Highway 212 east of Rock Creek.
1265	9	A	Flisakowski	Reah	City of Happy Valley	I have also reviewed the Adoption and Implementation write up for the various jurisdictions. It is unclear what would trigger an update of the IAMP. Would it be required for any rezone that adds trips to the Rock Creek interchange? IS there a minimum trip threshold that would be allowed without an IAMP update? Please clarify.	The IAMP process is a separate state process that reviews the relationship between future land uses and their traffic impacts on future interchanges. As noted in the response to comment 1262, the same 2030 regional land use forecast is used in both the SDEIS and IAMP process. An update of the IAMP would be triggered by a major change in local land uses beyond those envisioned in the SDEIS process for the year 2030.
4	10	A	Flisakowski	Reah	DKS Associates, City of Happy Valley	The proposed roadway network shown in Figures 16 and 17 should be revised.	The local roadway network was revised as part of the FEIS process to match City and County roadway networks shown in their Transportation System Plans.
1	10	A	Flisakowski	Reah	DKS	The new cul-de-sac shown on Armstrong Circles west of	The local roadway network was revised as part of

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Associates, City of Happy Valley	172nd Ave is inconsistent with the plans for the 172nd Ave corridor. The cul-de-sac note should be removed.	the FEIS process to match City and County roadway networks shown in their Transportation System Plans.
5	10	A	Flisakowski	Reah	DKS Associates, City of Happy Valley	The draft East Happy Valley Comprehensive Plan map includes a collector roadway system north of the Sunrise Corridor between 162nd Ave and 172nd Ave. This roadway network could be added to Figures 16 and 17 to more accurately show the planned roadway system in the Rock Creek Junction Area.	The local roadway network was revised as part of the FEIS process to match City and County roadway networks shown in their Transportation System Plans. A note was made in Figure PA-8 to reflect Happy Valley's plans.
6	10	A	Flisakowski	Reah	DKS Associates, City of Happy Valley	The alignment of Rock Creek Boulevard should be updated to reflect the draft East Happy Valley Comprehensive plan map.	The Rock Creek interchange will be compatible with Happy Valley plans to build Rock Creek Boulevard. ODOT design will continue to coordinate with Happy Valley as the process moves forward.
7	10	A	Flisakowski	Reah	DKS Associates, City of Happy Valley	Clackamas County staff has indicated that 162nd Avenue will retain its intersection with Highway 212 when the Sunrise Corridor is in place. Figures 16 and 17 should show 162nd Ave continuing under the Sunrise Corridor and connecting to Highway 212.	The local roadway network was revised as part of the FEIS process to match City and County roadway networks shown in their Transportation System Plans. (See Chapter 3 for updated information.)
3	10	A	Flisakowski	Reah	DKS Associates, City of Happy Valley	The east terminus for the Sunrise Corridor is unclear. There seems to be an inconsistency between the roadway network shown in the study and the one used for modeling and analysis purposes.	The eastern boundary of the project is the Rock Creek Interchange. The traffic analysis of 172nd Avenue is outside of the project boundary and is considered a transition area. In the transition area east of the Rock Creek interchange the traffic analysis evaluated the year 2030 system planned for in the Regional Transportation Plan financially constrained model, which includes five lanes of capacity on Highway 212. Other technical analysis evaluated the Sunrise facility transitioning back to the existing footprint of Highway 212 east of Rock Creek.
8	10	A	Flisakowski	Reah	DKS Associates, City of Happy Valley	Figures 16 and 17 indicate that the Sunrise Corridor would intersect with Highway 212 east of 172nd Ave and a new traffic signal would be located at the 172nd Ave/Sunrise intersection.	The transportation analysis modeled the system in the 2030 RTP, which includes five lanes of capacity on Highway 212. The environmental and social technical analysis evaluated the Sunrise facility transitioning back to the existing footprint of Highway 212 east of Rock Creek.
9	10	A	Flisakowski	Reah	DKS	The operational analysis included in the technical	See response to Entry # 3.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Associates, City of Happy Valley	appendix (Figures 6-44 to 6-47) assumed the Sunrise Corridor would be grade-separated from 172nd Ave and a new traffic signal would be at the 172nd Ave/Highway 212 intersection. How can a traffic signal be located on Highway 212 at 172nd Ave if Highway 212 is a cul-de-sac just west of 162nd Ave (Figures 16 and 17).	
2	10	A	Flisakowski	Reah	DKS Associates, City of Happy Valley	The 2030 operational analysis (summarized Figures 20 through 25) for the 172nd Avenue/Highway 212 intersection does not include east-west traffic on the Sunrise Corridor (assumes grade-separated). The roadway network and proposed traffic signal shown at the 172nd Ave/Sunrise intersection in Figures 16 and 17 was not analyzed.	See response to Entry # 3.
1150	11	A	Horn	Kenneth	Clackamas County Fire District # 1	Clackamas County Fire District and specifically the operations division would like to support and encourage midpoint access to the Sunrise project. From early in the project, the Fire District has been involved in the planning process and has always encouraged a mid point access to accommodate a rapid response from Station 8 located at 16100 SE 130th.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1151	11	A	Horn	Kenneth	Clackamas County Fire District # 1	From early in the project, the Fire District has been involved in the planning process and has always encouraged a mid point access to accommodate a rapid response from Station 8 located at 16100 SE 130th. Rapid access is crucial to emergency responses for both east and west travel, especially when dealing with traffic accidents and medical emergencies along the corridor.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
138	1	B	Grillo	Phillip	Miller Nash for Clear Channel	In 1996, the cost to mitigate the damage to the KEX three-tower array and transmitter facility on site was projected at \$1 million, excluding wetland mitigation costs and other unanticipated expenses. Off-site mitigation, if possible, was projected at \$3 - \$5 million. In the intervening twelve years, these projected costs have risen significantly. We currently estimate the on-site damage mitigation cost to be at least \$3.5 million, per station. We currently do not have an estimate of the off-site mitigation costs due to the complexity to relocate	ODOT has acknowledged its obligation to mitigate any adverse impacts to the integrity and range of radio frequencies allocated to Clear Channel. That obligation would extend to any FCC allocation study required as a component of mitigation/relocation.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						both KEX and KPOJ. Relocating each station will require an FCC allocation study to be performed for each station at a significant cost per station analyzed. The allocation results are only accurate at the time the study is conducted. The study results and possible relocation search area are continuously changing based on other AM allocations in both the United States and in neighboring countries. It is impossible to predict what relocation options will exist in the future for KEX and KPOJ. The possibility of relocating both KEX and KPOJ to a common site, as constructed today, is very unlikely, thereby necessitating the acquisition, permitting and construction of two separate transmission facilities. The climate of the local zoning and permitting process for new tower and construction does not favor the likelihood of approval for additional multi-tower antenna arrays in any surrounding area.	
139	1	B	Grillo	Phillip	Miller Nash for Clear Channel	...it is imperative that the real-time costs and logistics be considered as the draft DEIS is prepared. For example, it is critical that we have an alternative plan in place prior to the final EIS, to accomplish off-site relocation, if it becomes necessary. The consequences of not knowing the impacts to our operation until after the project is constructed have significant implications for Clear Channel Radio, and for the project itself. We would like to initiate a more detailed conversation about the real-time consequences of any "build" option that may be selected by ODOT, so that we are not left with a series of poor mitigation options once project construction begins. Our ability to maintain signal strength and coverage throughout the construction process, particularly as a 4(f) resource, is paramount.	ODOT is willing to initiate a more detailed conversation about the real time consequences of any "build" option that may be selected. As earlier agreed to by ODOT (3/1996), in order to maintain the viability of KEX signal before, during, and after construction, a radio expert and recognized real estate appraiser would be retained to determine the value and compensable impacts to KEX's property at the time of property acquisition for the Project. ODOT further agreed to make acquisition of the KEX property one of the earliest acquisitions initiated, in order to allow time to work out an agreement regarding compensation and mitigation, and for KEX to make the necessary changes. ROW acquisition for an initial phase of the Sunrise Project mainline is anticipated to take approximately 2 years. It should be noted, however, that under direction of the Oregon Department of Justice, ODOT has been advised not to proceed with entering into any type of agreement for future compensation to KEX as a

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							<p>result of anticipated impacts from the Sunrise Project. ODOT has committed – at the time of acquisition for the project – to hire a radio expert and recognized real estate appraisers to determine the value and compensable impacts to the KEX property. Agreeing to any form of compensation at that time was not considered in conformance with FHWA procedures for acquisition.</p> <p>Funding availability for this \$1.2B project is uncertain at this time. A phasing strategy for the Sunrise Project will not be a component of the FEIS, but a separate understanding among project partners. Early phases may be limited to off-system/local street improvements, or ROW acquisition and construction of a section of the Sunrise Project mainline from I-205 to SE 122nd Ave.</p>
140	1	B	Grillo	Phillip	Miller Nash for Clear Channel	As for both a practical and legal matter, it is important to understand the significance of our 4(f) resource not just in terms of its physical properties such as the buildings, towers, and ground arrays, but also in terms of its unique electromagnetic properties, signal strength, coverage, and the highly regulated environment in which this facility operates and is licensed in. On an ongoing basis, both KEX and KPOJ must maintain their signal strength and coverage, and must be able to make adjustments to that signal to maintain the licensed operating parameters as required by the Federal Communications Commission.	The Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation of the KEX site impacts reflects these unique resource elements. The intent of this project is to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any adverse impacts to this resource.
141	1	B	Grillo	Phillip	Miller Nash for Clear Channel	It is expected that the Sunrise Project will substantially impair our 4(f) resource because it will significantly affect our signal strength, coverage and ability to operate in HD digital and will make it difficult to maintain these standards while maintaining our FCC-authorized parameters. Unfortunately, the degree of impact cannot be predicted at this time, and likely will not be known until the project is constructed. In the meantime, it must be assumed that substantial impairment will occur. If the	ODOT acknowledges the difficulty in accurately predicting, at this time, the degree of impact on KEX resources from construction of Sunrise Project. Any impacts on resources realized from project construction will first pursue mitigation on-site. If such mitigation on-site does not prove feasible, appropriate off-site mitigation will be pursued.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						project is built, we hope that these impacts can be fully mitigated on site. If not, sufficient resources must be identified and budgeted by ODOT to accommodate off-site relocation, without any loss of signal strength, coverage, or air time. ODOT and other agencies should plan "to the maximum extent possible...to minimize harm to the historic resources," namely our ability to continue to broadcast from this historic site.	
142	1	B	Grillo	Phillip	Miller Nash for Clear Channel	In 1996, the cost to mitigate the damage to the KEX three-tower array and transmitter facility on site was projected at \$1 million, excluding wetland mitigation costs and other unanticipated expenses. Off-site mitigation, if possible, was projected at \$3 - \$5 million. In the intervening twelve years, these projected costs have risen significantly. We currently estimate the on-site damage mitigation cost to be at least \$3.5 million, per station. We currently do not have an estimate of the off-site mitigation costs due to the complexity to relocate both KEX and KPOJ. Relocating each station will require an FCC allocation study to be performed for each station at a significant cost per station analyzed. The allocation results are only accurate at the time the study is conducted. The study results and possible relocation search area are continuously changing based on other AM allocations in both the United States and in neighboring countries. It is impossible to predict what relocation options will exist in the future for KEX and KPOJ. The possibility of relocating both KEX and KPOJ to a common site, as constructed today, is very unlikely, thereby necessitating the acquisition, permitting and construction of two separate transmission facilities. The climate of the local zoning and permitting process for new tower and construction does not favor the likelihood of approval for additional multi-tower antenna arrays in any surrounding area.	See response as to Entry # 138.
143	1	B	Grillo	Phillip	Miller Nash for Clear	...it is imperative that the real-time costs and logistics be considered as the draft DEIS is prepared. For example, it	See response to Entry # 139.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Channel	is critical that we have an alternative plan in place prior to the final EIS, to accomplish off-site relocation, if it becomes necessary. The consequences of not knowing the impacts to our operation until after the project is constructed have significant implications for Clear Channel Radio, and for the project itself. We would like to initiate a more detailed conversation about the real-time consequences of any "build" option that may be selected by ODOT, so that we are not left with a series of poor mitigation options once project construction begins. Our ability to maintain signal strength and coverage throughout the construction process, particularly as a 4(f) resource, is paramount.	
144	1	B	Grillo	Phillip	Miller Nash for Clear Channel	We would oppose any alternative that includes the Lawnfield Road extension, because of its direct and severe impact on our broadcasting facilities and its impact on our ability to comply with FCC authorizations.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
145	1	B	Grillo	Phillip	Miller Nash for Clear Channel	Design Option A-2 provides local access to/from the Lawnfield industrial area and to I-205, without severely impacting our facility. If the freeway is built, Design Option A-2 would be preferable.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
146	1	B	Grillo	Phillip	Miller Nash for Clear Channel	We favor Alignment 1, because the no-build option avoids impacts to our operation. We are, however, willing to work with you to select a build alignment that has the least possible impacts to our broadcast operation, so long as the resulting impacts are better understood and fully mitigated, at no cost to us.	Acknowledged. ODOT is willing to work with Clear Channel to address comments raised, to minimize any adverse impacts to broadcast operation. The design/alignment of the North Lawnfield Rd. Extension was modified in the design of the Preferred Alternative to avoid direct impacts to the copper ground mat, towers, and transmission building of the KEX property.
147	1	B	Grillo	Phillip	Miller Nash for Clear Channel	In the DEIS, Alternates 2 and 3 both propose an extension of Lawnfield Road that would directly and severely impact our ground array and would significantly damage our	The alignment of the North Lawnfield Rd. Extension has been revised as a part of the Preferred Alternative. The new alignment will avoid any direct

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						signal and property. Additionally, the ground array would no longer comply with the requirements set forth by the FCC. These impacts must be avoided.	placement on KEX/Clear Channel Radio ground mat, and transmission facilities.
149	1	B	Grillo	Phillip	Miller Nash for Clear Channel	In 2002, KPOJ (620 AM) began broadcasting from the array owned by Clear Channel Radio on the Lawnfield Road site. Impacts from the Sunrise Project will now affect two AM radio stations of regional significance, not just one. Because the signal patterns and FCC license requirements for both stations are unique, the impacts on both stations must be taken into account in the DEIS.	Acknowledged.
150	1	B	Grillo	Phillip	Miller Nash for Clear Channel	In 2006, KEX (1190 AM) began broadcasting in HD digital from the array owned by Clear Channel Radio on the Lawnfield Road site. Impacts from the Sunrise Project will now affect the coverage of the HD broadcast and may preclude the ability to operate HD in the future. The antenna array environment greatly affects the quality and ability to transmit the digital signal. Any significant changes in the immediate area will impact the ability to broadcast in HD digital.	Acknowledged.
154	2	B	White	Dana	Providence Health & Services		Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
155	2	B	White	Dana	Providence Health & Services		Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
157	2	B	White	Dana	Providence Health & Services	Design Option D-3 is the only option that enables PH&S to retain 30 net acres for development from the 69-gross acre site.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
156	2	B	White	Dana	Providence Health & Services	If the PH&S/Happy Valley Medical Center cannot be built at this site for lack of an adequately-sized building site, development of the entire Rock Creek Employment Area	Happy Valley has applied the Rock Creek Mixed Employment (RC-ME) Comprehensive Plan and Development Code designation to this site and

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						will lag substantially, significantly affecting the number, quality and timing of job creation there.	other adjacent sites west of SE 162nd. Permitted uses in this zone include offices, creative arts, small-scale manufacturing, research and development, and medical centers. Therefore, if the Providence Medical Center and Hospital were not to develop, this area is expected to develop with similar, employment-intensive uses at some point in the future. To account for uncertainty, the transportation model does not assume full build-out of the Providence site over the 20-year forecast period.
158	2	B	White	Dana	Providence Health & Services	To preserve the health of the local watershed, Design Option D-3 minimizes the disturbance area and enhances lower Rock Creek watershed's environmental resources where possible. By using the tighter urban profile and narrower right-of-way, Design Option D-3 will have less impervious surface than the other design options, while maintaining the same roadway capacity, safety and design speed. Narrowing the freeway would allow ODOT to have less responsibility for protection of the watershed health and greater opportunities for "in-basin/on-kind" compensatory mitigation for wetland or riparian habitat impacts.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
159	2	B	White	Dana	Providence Health & Services	To preserve the health of the local watershed, Design Option D-3 minimizes the disturbance area and enhances lower Rock Creek watershed's environmental resources where possible. By using the tighter urban profile and narrower right-of-way, Design Option D-3 will have less impervious surface than the other design options, while maintaining the same roadway capacity, safety and design speed. Narrowing the freeway would allow ODOT to have less responsibility for protection of the watershed health and greater opportunities for "in-basin/on-kind" compensatory mitigation for wetland or riparian habitat impacts.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
168	3	B	La Noue	Mark	Clackamas Commerce	We are now threatened with the loss of our direct access to I-205 which will create an insurmountable hardship.	At this time, the intent of the project management team is to advance both the Tolbert overcrossing as

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Center	The current interchange design leaves big holes in the access solution from Lawnfield Road...	well as the north Lawnfield extension forward into the Preferred Alternative. As part of the Sunrise Corridor project, a connection between Lawnfield Road and Hwy 212/224 is provided in all build alternatives. This connection will allow access to the Interstate system from the Lawnfield Industrial Area.
163	3	B	La Noue	Mark	Clackamas Commerce Center	The "New North Lawnfield Alignment" must be part of the overall I-205 plan. It offers our only reasonable access back to the freeway and without that access the Lawnfield basin businesses will be forced to relocate over time, leaving this area to deteriorate to a third class industrial market.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
160	3	B	La Noue	Mark	Clackamas Commerce Center	A significant part of the interchange plan must include the "Tolbert Avenue" railroad bridge crossing with direct connection to SE 82nd Dr. for all of the obvious reasons.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
161	3	B	La Noue	Mark	Clackamas Commerce Center	I understand that the Tolbert Avenue crossing is being considered as the alternative access solution to the North Lawnfield Road Alignment and the only access to the freeway for the Lawnfield basin businesses, that plan is not acceptable. This kind of thinking at our expense will lead to a major battle. Such a plan will destroy this valuable industrial sanctuary and render our properties worthless as a viable manufacturing and distribution location.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
162	3	B	La Noue	Mark	Clackamas Commerce Center	I cannot state strongly enough that without both ingress and egress points, Tolbert Avenue Crossing and the New Lawnfield Road Alignment, all of our financial livelihoods are in peril.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative. Both the Tolbert over-

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							crossing and the North Lawnfield extension are included in the Preferred Alternative.
169	4	B	Coombes	James	Fred Meyer Stores		Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
170	5	B	Bresko	Donovan	Estacada Oil	...and I'm in favor of the A-2 modification, with the Lawnfield extension, and then also the Talbot Road extension in conjunction with the Lawnfield extension. And that's mainly off truck traffic and movement out of the Lawnfield area.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
176	6	B	Warman	Jim	Can-Am Chains	I would like to start by saying we are very much in favor of the Sunrise Project.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
173	6	B	Warman	Jim	Can-Am Chains	We suggest the Sunrise project committee should be working with Camp Withycombe and the Federal Government and put funds to the continuation of Industrial Way to meet up with Lawnfield Rd. and improve Lawnfield to 4 lanes to better access I-205 and Milwaukie Expressway.	Connecting Industrial Way to Lawnfield Road is a part of the Preferred Alternative. The projected traffic volumes on Lawnfield Road do not warrant it being widened to four lanes.
174	6	B	Warman	Jim	Can-Am Chains	Use Clackamas Road it already exists all the way to the railroad tracks and continues to the other side.	Due to ODOT Rail requirements there cannot be an at-grade crossing of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks at Clackamas Road. A grade-separated structure at Clackamas Road would be the only crossing possibility in this location and would cause more access and acquisition impacts than an overcrossing at Tolbert Road.
175	6	B	Warman	Jim	Can-Am Chains	Build the Sunrise overpasses onto I-205; Milwaukie Expressway and provide an on ramp from Industrial Way.	A direct connection from a local collector street onto the limited-access Sunrise Project cannot be accommodated. Such a connection would be too close to I-205/Sunrise Hwy ramp terminal signal and would not meet state interchange spacing standards.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
177	7	B	Doane	Mick		This project would enjoy more support from the business community and general public if they would be reasonable regarding compensation for property and displacement.	The property acquisition process for purchasing road right-of-way is governed by specific Federal and State laws identified on page 105 of the Right-of-Way Technical Report. As stated in the Mitigation Measures on the same page, "just compensation is based on valuation of the needed property by an experienced and qualified right-of-way agent or by an independent fee appraiser." That valuation must be determined by comparison with recent sales of similar properties sold. The laws that govern the process will not allow the compensation to be based on a historic value of the property. These same laws govern the assistance that business owners, homeowners and business and residential tenants receive when they have to move. A summary is provided in the ODOT brochure entitled, "Moving Because of the Highway or Public Projects."
178	7	B	Doane	Mick		I am a business owner who is being displaced and I am very disappointed in the way Clackamas County Development is handling our situation.	The potential business displacement discussed in this comment is related to a local project. The Clackamas County Development Agency is in the process of preparing to rebuild 102nd Avenue, Clackamas Road, Industrial Way, Mather Road and 98th Court between OR 212/224 and Lawnfield Road. This comment is directed towards that project and not towards the Sunrise Project.
180	8	B	Spitznagel	Carl	Spitznagel Family LLC	Widen Highway 212 from Evelyn Street to SE 122nd Ave as part of this project.	Preferred Alternative includes construction of a third westbound travel lane on OR 212/224, from SE 98th Ave. to the I-205 southbound on-ramp. Widening in this segment of highway will enhance capacity and storage, and complement a third eastbound lane, constructed from I-205 to Evelyn St. in 2005.
179	8	B	Spitznagel	Carl	Spitznagel Family LLC	Entrance and exit to and from this property (Plaid Pantry at Evelyn and Highway 212) is presently very difficult.	The Preferred Alternative design extends to SE 98th Ave. on OR 212/224. As proposed, there are no impacts to businesses at OR 212/224 x Evelyn St.
181	9	B	Schoppert	Fred	Alice's Country	We own Alice's Country Market at 15252 SE Hwy 224. The proposed improvements seem to eliminate access to 224	Direct access to property off of realigned OR 212/224 or OR 224 will not be provided under the

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Market	- an out of direction access is provided to gain access to the store. This will have a very negative impact on the viability of our business.	new Sunrise Project. Any access near the revised intersection would create difficult turning movements due to storage at the signal, and present unsafe driving conditions for OR 212 and the interchange connector.
185	9	B	Schoppert	Fred	Alice's Country Market	Furthermore, this proposed access will be a private drive which we understand may not even be possible due to the need to traverse other private properties. We would like the design to be reconsidered to provide more direct access or to clarify whether a private drive is even possible.	The Sunrise Project will replace the current access to this property with a new public access which will connect to the road system via the new arterial which is some times referred to as the jug handle.
182	9	B	Schoppert	Fred	Alice's Country Market	Although we are still not pleased with the out of direction access, we would like to have a decision soon to provide more clarity to allow us to better plan for future development of this site.	The Preferred Alternative represents the anticipated design of the Sunrise Project but does not identify the timing of actual improvements. Continued coordination with Clackamas County on a project phasing strategy is recommended.
186	9	B	Schoppert	Fred	Alice's Country Market	In Figure 15 access appears to be provided. However, in subsequent conversations with the staff, even that access appears to be in doubt due to the need to cross intervening private property, which by state law is prohibited.	The proposed alternative access to property was originally perceived as a private access, but given multiple property-owners requiring access, a public access road will be built. (See Figure PA-7 in the FEIS,)
183	9	B	Schoppert	Fred	Alice's Country Market	What are our options?	Regarding right-of-way, the property acquisition process for purchasing road right-of-way is governed by specific Federal and State laws identified on page 105 of the Right-of-Way Technical Report. In addition to the information for the potential displacement or partial acquisition included in the SDEIS, all property owners from whom it is determined property will be needed are contacted when the exact property need is known. They are given maps of the purchase area, brochures such as ODOT's "Acquiring Land for Highway & Public Projects" and "Moving Because of the Highway or Public Projects" which outline the process, as well as contact information for questions. They are then asked if they wish to meet with the appraiser for the property inspections. This

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							type of contact opportunity is offered throughout the acquisition process, wanting to keep the owners informed and involved.
187	10	B	Dennison	Milt	Clackamas Education Service District	On behalf of the members of the Clackamas Education Service District (ESD) Board, I would like to express concerns with the proposed Lawnfield extension. This extension would have a negative impact on property and facilities owned by the Clackamas ESD.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
188	10	B	Dennison	Milt	Clackamas Education Service District	...the extension would dissect Clackamas ESD property and run right through the middle of the data center that services not only Clackamas ESD and our local school districts but Clackamas Community College and Clackamas County as well. Even though this facility could be relocated, it would come with a very high price tag.	Thank you for this information. While relocation cost was considered in the SDEIS, the updated information assisted in determining the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would require the displacement of the building. The property acquisition and relocation is governed by specific Federal and State laws identified on page 105 of the Right-of-Way Technical Report. If it is determined that a business can no longer operate at a location, even though only part of the property has been acquired, then that business would be eligible for relocation. This would be determined on a case by case basis with ODOT and the County following Federal and State rules.
189	10	B	Dennison	Milt	Clackamas Education Service District	The proposed Lawnfield extension could make the main building unusable as well, given the nature of the work that occurs. As proposed, the extension would serve as a truck route and would be adjacent to an area that requires limited interference from outside noises.	See response for Entry # 188.
192	10	B	Dennison	Milt	Clackamas Education Service District	I am discouraged that when we acquired the property two years ago we were not informed of this potential by the previous owner. I am also disappointed that when we worked with Clackamas County on permits to remodel the facility, at no time was this proposal ever mentioned.	Property owners who are selling property and the realtors representing them have an obligation to disclose any conditions that exist or other pertinent information concerning the property that is for sale. Buyers of property are responsible for their own due diligence. The latest phase of the Sunrise Project has been actively underway since 2004, with aggressive public notification, meetings, and media attention.
199	11	B	Aarnio	Terrance	Oregon Iron	The new plans for the Sunrise Expressway eliminates the	The Preferred Alternative includes both the Tolbert

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Works	current link to I-205 and instead provides a much less desirable alternative to and from our location, including very long and confusing connections to the Sunrise and Milwaukie Expressways.	overcrossing and the north Lawnfield extension. As shown in all of the Build Alternatives, the Preferred Alternative includes a connection between Lawnfield Road and Hwy 212/224. These three connections will replace a single existing access and allow access to not only the northbound Interstate system, but also to/from areas to the west, south, and east. All routes will be appropriately signed as required by the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.
193	11	B	Aarnio	Terrance	Oregon Iron Works	To provide adequate replacement access from our location at 9700 SE Lawnfield Road to I-205 in both directions, the following two routes shown on the plans must be included in the Sunrise Expressway SDEIS: 1. The relocated Lawnfield Road extended up the hill over "KEX" property; then over the Education Service District property to 97th and Sunnybrook Road. 2. The route down Industrial Way to the railroad overpass that connects with 82nd Drive at Tolbert Street.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
202	11	B	Aarnio	Terrance	Oregon Iron Works	The products that come into and out of our facilities are carried by large trucks and trailers - many with long and heavy loads. They currently have access to our facilities from Lawnfield Road in the North, Mather Road to the South, and 98th Court on the east. Some of the vehicles are oversized to accommodate both raw materials and the weight and physical size of finished products. All of the grades and cures of the revised local street system, including those curves at the street corners, must take these trucking needs into account.	All grades and horizontal curves and intersections are designed for interstate-sized trucks (WD-67), but not specifically for over-dimensional vehicles. However, the proposed roadways will have flatter curves, and wider pavement, that will accommodate such vehicles better than existing roadways.
197	11	B	Aarnio	Terrance	Oregon Iron Works	If we and other Lawnfield Road businesses only have the southern access to Highway 224, we will become a "backwater" area. It will lower our property values and increase operating costs, damaging our business. If this happens, Oregon Iron Works will consider relocating. The southern route over the railroad tracks to 82nd Drive is an improvement over the latter, but is not sufficient to lift the "backwater" stigma.	Two alternative accesses were part of the SDEIS and were included in the Preferred Alternative to mitigate for the closure of access at Lawnfield and 82nd Drive: Lawnfield North (to SE 97th Avenue) and the Tolbert Crossing, which would include a bridge over the railroad tracks from the Lawnfield industrial area to 82nd Drive. Both of these options would provide another access

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							for the industrial area as well as alternative access to I-205. - Lawnfield North provides better access to I-205 via the Sunnybrook Interchange. - The Tolbert Crossing provides better access to local business and service providers
194	11	B	Aarnio	Terrance	Oregon Iron Works	What we all need, and especially Oregon Ironworks, is the revised route of Lawnfield Road up the hill, as previously described, in #1 above, the connection of 98th Court to Mather Road, and then to our most southern building off of Mather. This route, combined with the route over the railroad to 82nd Drive (#2 above) which takes us to the post office, banks, restaurants, gasoline and diesel service stations, and other retail opportunities, restores the integrity of our access needs.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
203	12	B	Parks	Wilda	North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce	The proposed Sunrise Corridor highway expansion should include an extension at Lawnfield, an intersection at 122nd with a single diamond and an alternative for the Rock Creek Junction for a specialized intersection that reduces the land needed and provides for a larger amount of buildable employment land....	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
205	12	B	Parks	Wilda	North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce	The Chamber notes that right-of-way acquisition on the entire project should be a top priority, even if the project itself will be built in phases.	The purchase of right-of-way is a priority for the project. However, final decision on the timing of such purchase will be made by the appropriate jurisdictions after considering the availability of financial resources.
206	12	B	Parks	Wilda	North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce	We also note that immediate small fixes should happen as soon as possible to relieve current congestion. Due to the challenges with funding a project of this size, the ability to complete it in phases should be a requirement of the final design, regardless of which alternatives and options are chosen.	Finding funding for a project of this size is very difficult. Project team members have worked on a phasing strategy and are proposing not only long term but also short term phases of the project that could relieve some of the existing congestion along Hwy 212/224, but would still keep the ultimate design moving forward.
207	12	B	Parks	Wilda	North Clackamas	After conversations with key industrials in the Clackamas Industrial area by 212/224 the Chamber recommends the	While the Preferred Alternative does not include an overpass at the 212/224/82nd Drive intersection, it

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Chamber of Commerce	addition of an overpass at 212/224/82nd Drive. The ability for this piece to be completed in Phase 1 of the overall project, coupled with the significant short term relief it will provide as the other phases are constructed, signal it as one worthy of inclusion in the recommendation.	does include removal of all left-turns at this intersection. Instead of turning left, drivers will have the ability to use alternative routes (no more than 1/3 of a mile of diversion) or to utilize U-turn lanes to the north and south of 212/224 on 82nd Drive at Clackamas Road and at the northern Fred Meyer shopping center access.
209	13	B	Smith	John		Access road from 82nd to Herbert Court runs right through our parking and a 15,000 sq ft. concrete tilt up refrigerated building. This building was built in 2005 - apparently your aerials were taken in 2004.	2008 aerial photos are available for the area and were used in FEIS. The Preferred Alternative shows a proposed alignment that avoids the building and minimizes impacts to the parking lot.
211	13	B	Smith	John		Should really look at leaving the access to Herbert Ct. off 82nd alone - could put merging lane in and out.	The project team reviewed the design in this location. Herbert Ct. is too close to ramp terminal to north, and left-turning movements will conflict with operations on 82nd Dr. and proposed ramp terminal. The close proximity of Herbert Ct. to ramp terminal (~550') also does not meet access spacing standards (750') for right-in/right-out access.
213	14	B	Stearns	Nick		My company recently developed and built a 36 unit housing project in the SW quadrant of the Hwy 224 and Johnson Road interchange and approx. 200 ft south of the Lake Rd and Johnson Road intersection. The homes are not shown on your maps or photos in the EIS. the project is 100% complete.	Updated aerial photos from 2008 are used for the FEIS, in conjunction with a subdivision plat map from Clackamas County. The Land Use Technical Report and FEIS have been updated to reflect this development which occurred after the 2006 analysis of land use within the Sunrise Project Land Use Study Area.
214	14	B	Stearns	Nick		I am concerned about the location of the median down Johnson Road that is in front of the new street that accesses all 36 homes (SE Sporri Ln). I do not want to create a "right-in, right-out" situation where SE Sporri Ln intersects SE Johnson Road.	A median was shown in the SDEIS design, however, revised designs show no median. Johnson Rd. at this location to be 2-lane roadway, with no median. Full access is allowed.
215	14	B	Stearns	Nick		If the median ended 100 ft to the north of the currently proposed median end, this "right-in; right-out" situation would be avoided.	See response to Entry #214.
216	14	B	Stearns	Nick		Alternatively, if the Johnson Rd. and Hwy 224 intersection was eliminated and Johnson Rd. traffic put through Lake Rd. to the Webster Rd and Hwy 224 interchange, then a median could be avoided in its entirety on all of Johnson	See response to Entry #214.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						Rd.	
217	15	B	Warren	Cameron	Clackamas Business Center	One of our biggest concerns is the plan to put road access adjacent to our largest distribution building here at the park, which would prevent access into the building on the west end. Design should be changed to allow for access into this building at the west end! Please contact us to discuss.	Under the Preferred Alternative the access road alignment has been moved to the west approximately 14' – 16', to allow for better access. The cross-section of this County street is 32' wide (curb to curb), with sidewalks on both sides of street. In the preparation of final construction plans for this access road, the County would work with the adjacent businesses to make sure access is available. The potential changes could include narrowing the road from 32' to 28', and having sidewalk on only one side.
221	16	B	Sauer	Brandon	Stonecreek Development	This design option (C-3) converts the most acres of land into highway and creates more impervious surface when compared to other options in the midpoint area.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
224	16	B	Sauer	Brandon	Stonecreek Development	Curving the highway towards the hillside would require the removal of a lot of forest area resulting in a greater displacement of wildlife due to less habitat.	As described in the SDEIS, curving the highway toward the hillside east of SE 135th Avenue (Design Option C-3) would impact substantially more Class B upland wildlife habitat than either Alternatives 2 or 3, or Design Option C-2. Option C-2 was incorporated into the Preferred Alternative.
227	16	B	Sauer	Brandon	Stonecreek Development	Removing this forest area would also result in a visually less appealing character to this area.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
218	16	B	Sauer	Brandon	Stonecreek Development	The C-3 option would also increase the fuel usage during construction as well as future highway use, which creates an ongoing expense.	Thank you for your comment. The project team is working to analyze how the different alternatives and design options compare to the project's stated goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria. The cost-efficiency of the project is an objective under Goal 1: Transportation/Operations (see Chapter 2 of the SDEIS).

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
219	16	B	Sauer	Brandon	Stonecreek Development	Running the highway towards the hillside would also require deeper cuts during construction, which results in higher costs. The cost estimates verify that construction of the C-3 option would cost millions of dollars more than the other options.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
220	16	B	Sauer	Brandon	Stonecreek Development	As indicated by the EIS, it seems to us that Alternative 3 is the best alternative, but the C-3 design option is the least desirable when the objectives are the preserve natural resources and to be cost effective.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
229	17	B	Hager	Wayde	Precision Cast Parts Corp	The plan shown for the new alignment of Deer Creek Lane shows the Sunrise project acquiring a large section of our property (SW corner).	The Preferred Alternative would reduce the impact to your property (see #228). While Deer Creek Lane will still be widened to 5 lanes, the envisioned improvements are planned to equally impact both sides of the road.
232	17	B	Hager	Wayde	Precision Cast Parts Corp	PCC has done three plant expansions in the last 3 years and these are not shown on the plots being used.	<p>The SDEIS for the Sunrise Project began about 5 years ago in 2004. The 2004 aerial images were replaced when the newer images, which were taken in the winter of 2005, became available. The design layouts were submitted to CETAS for an initial review in late 2005 and became a draft document for field assessment and further analysis/review in the fall of 2006. During this time, there were no region-wide flights or photos taken or available for update until July 2007.</p> <p>The 2007 aerial photos were referenced in all maps displayed at the November Public Hearing. The November Public Hearing maps do show the 16,000 square-foot building expansion, but not the 9,000 square-foot expansion which appears to be under construction as stated in the comment. Updated aerial photos from 2008 are presented in the FEIS.</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
228	17	B	Hager	Wayde	Precision Cast Parts Corp	If this section of our property is acquired from us, it will not allow us to further develop our property to expand the plant and create more manufacturing jobs. PCC cannot expand the manufacturing plant to the north, west or east due to setbacks and property lines. The only option is to expand onto the south side of the property. The proposed property acquisition will prevent this expansion. If current business trends continue, PCC will need to expand to keep up with customer demand.	The Preferred Alternative adjusted the future alignments of Johnson Road and Deer Creek Lane north of Highway 224. The roads will be located closer to their original location and would be widened with minimal impacts to adjoining properties.
234	17	B	Hager	Wayde	Precision Cast Parts Corp	PCC is also concerned about the routing of Deer Creek Lane. We would like to know what the new proposed traffic volumes will be. Currently there is no signal shown to turn from Deer Creek Lane to Johnson Road. We believe a signal will be needed to prevent backups from blocking the intersection. PCC would also like to see Johnson Rd. routed as it currently is, just east of the Lowes' property. This will prevent the acquisition of the property that PCC will need for a southern expansion.	The year 2030 traffic volumes are 20,000 ADT. The Preferred Alternative removes the realignments of Johnson Road and Deer Creek Lane north of Highway 224 that were proposed in the SDEIS. In the Preferred Alternative, a traffic signal is shown at the current location of the Lowes signal at Deer Creek Lane and Johnson Road (see Figure PA-6 in the FEIS for a map of the I-205 area).
231	17	B	Hager	Wayde	Precision Cast Parts Corp	Access to Lowes is also not clearly addressed in the Sunrise project plan.	The Preferred Alternative would remove the realignments of Johnson Road and Deer Creek Lane north of Highway 224. If this alternative is implemented, Lowes would have access using the existing traffic signal at Deer Creek and Johnson Road.
235	17	B	Hager	Wayde	Precision Cast Parts Corp	PCC would like to see this plan, as Lowes generates a lot of traffic which would compete with our truck traffic.	The Preferred Alternative for the Deer Creek/Johnson Road area was developed using a public process to get feedback on its elements.
230	17	B	Hager	Wayde	Precision Cast Parts Corp	This project, whatever the final alignment turns out to be, should be phased in such a way that it will not adversely impact access to our plant. PCC would like to see the final plan when available.	The Preferred Alternative removed the realignments of Johnson Road and Deer Creek Lane north of Highway 224 and will simply improve the capacity of the current alignments. All refinements followed a public review process, as described in Chapter 1 of the FEIS. One of the challenges on the project has been finding sufficient funds to build the project. Strategies for phasing as a way to build the project in affordable stages are being considered.
233	17	B	Hager	Wayde	Precision Cast	Alternate suggestion: Provide an alternate route to get	Clackamas County is proposing extending

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Parts Corp	from 224 to 82nd Ave. 1. Extend Sunnybrook west of 82nd and have it run NW to connect to Harmony Road. (5 lane road) 2. Widen Harmony Road from Sunnybrook (new) to 82nd from 3 lanes to 5 lanes. 3. Extend Johnson Rd. north to connect to Sunnybrook. (sketched diagram in comment form)	Sunnybrook and anticipates starting construction in 2010 or 2011. Improvements to Harmony Road are identified within the County's TSP. There is not adequate funding available to undertake all of these improvements at this time. Extending Johnson Road was considered as an alternative during a recent evaluation of project alternatives for the Harmony Road project but it was determined to not be a feasible alternative due to cost and environmental impacts.
240	18	B	Kopca	Christopher	Gremer Properties for PCC Structural	Please understand that we would very much like to become supporters of this proposal. Improved circulation, access and traffic flow for this area and southeast Portland is certainly a worthy objective and supportive of ongoing business needs. But currently, our concerns greatly outweigh our interest.	The comment is noted. The west end design refinements that leave Johnson Road in its current right-of-way and widen Deer Creek Lane equally on both sides would minimize the impact to this parcel.
244	18	B	Kopca	Christopher	Gremer Properties for PCC Structural	The reconfiguring of SE Deer Creek Lane, which provides service directly to this site and others, presents a real and serious problem to us as currently envisioned.	The comment is noted. The Preferred Alternative leaves Johnson Road in its current right-of-way and widens Deer Creek Lane equally on both sides; this design minimizes the impact to this parcel.
241	18	B	Kopca	Christopher	Gremer Properties for PCC Structural	We are also concerned that you appear to be working off of area photos that are several years old and do not reflect current conditions. To this point, we completed a 16,000 square foot building expansion in 2005-2006, and we are currently finishing another 9000 square foot expansion, which are not shown in your area photos.	The SDEIS for the Sunrise Project began about 4 years ago in 2004. The 2004 aerial images were replaced when the newer images which were taken in the winter of 2005 became available. The design layouts were submitted to CETAS for an initial review in late 2005 and became a draft document for field assessment and further analysis/review in the fall of 2006. During this time, there were no region wide flights or photos taken or available for update until July 2007. The 2007 aerial photos were referenced in all maps displayed at the November Public Hearing. The November Public Hearing maps do show the 16,000 square-foot building expansion, but not the 9,000 square-foot expansion which appears to be under construction as stated in the comment. Updated aerial photos from 2008 are

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
238	18	B	Kopca	Christopher	Gremer Properties for PCC Structural	The proposal shows ODOT acquiring a portion of our property along the southern end of the site for the widening of SE Deer Creek Lane. As we mentioned, this facility is an active and expanding operation for PCC Structural, Inc. Your photos do not reflect two major building expansions. While neither addition is in the proposed additional right-of-way, the entire site is being more intensively used to serve this expanding operation. This proposed taking will impact PCC's ability to carry on its intended plant operations and the Landlord's future ability to re-market the facility/site.	presented in the FEIS. Thank you for this information. The updated information was used by the project team to assist in the development of the Preferred Alternative. The property acquisition and relocation is governed by specific Federal and State laws identified on page 105 of the Right-of-Way Technical Report. If it is determined that a business can no longer operate at a location, even though only part of the property has been acquired, then that business would be eligible for relocation. This would be determined on a case by case basis with ODOT and the County following Federal and State rules. An appraiser will look at any market impact to the property that the project has. If it is determined there is an impact, the appraisal will calculate compensation to be offered to the owner. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative removes the realignments of Johnson Road and Deer Creek Lane north of Highway 224 that were proposed in the SDEIS. Johnson Road would remain in its current location. Both changes would reduce the impact to the adjacent properties. The aerial photo that was used was the best information that was available at the time the design was developed. Updated aerial photos were used as the team developed the Preferred Alternative and are included in the FEIS.
237	18	B	Kopca	Christopher	Gremer Properties for PCC Structural	You should also be aware that we have had discussions about needing to further develop this site to accommodate business needs. Thus, you should not consider this site as being fully built out.	The comment is noted. The Preferred Alternative in this area would reduce the impact to your property based on design modifications to improve avoidance.
245	18	B	Kopca	Christopher	Gremer Properties for PCC Structural	The proposal suggests that both SE Johnson Rd. and SE Deer Creek Lane will be relocated and rebuilt as they intersect between Highway 224 and our site. We did not come away from this meeting understanding how your proposal would handle the traffic to our site (during or	The proposal has been refined as shown in the Preferred Alternative. Proposed access to Lowes is from a signalized intersection located at the existing intersection of Deer Creek Lane and Johnson Road (see Figure PA-6 in the FEIS for a map of the I-205

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						after construction). We also did not understand the plan for access to Lowe's or the other sites in the area.	area). As part of access management, the contractor will have a plan that shows how they will provide access to the adjacent properties during construction. Updated information is presented in the FEIS in Chapter 2.
243	18	B	Kopca	Christopher	Gremar Properties for PCC Structural	There are high volumes of truck traffic in this area, and the current drawings show an intersection with no signal at the SE Johnson Rd/ SE Deer Creek Lane intersection. Having no signal at this intersection would make it very difficult for trucks to turn east on SE Deer Creek Lane. Furthermore, there is an incline at the intersection that would make truck maneuvering very difficult. This intersection will need a signal, and the include and cross-slopes of these roads and the intersection will need to be carefully developed for better access and traffic safety.	The Preferred Alternative shows a traffic signal at Deer Creek Lane and Johnson Road at the current location (Lowes). The improvement would include upgrading the signal and adding appropriate additional turn lanes to make this intersection function.
248	18	B	Kopca	Christopher	Gremar Properties for PCC Structural	The proposal suggests very limited and tight left turn lanes at the SE Johnson Rd and SE Deer Creek Lane intersection. The left turn lanes are not of sufficient length to handle the queue of even a couple of larger vehicles. The inbound traffic of Highway 224 could back up onto the intersection of SE Johnson Rd and Highway 224, interfering with the flow and capacity of Highway 224. We want to review your projected traffic counts in all directions for both SE Johnson Rd. and SE Deer Creek Lane.	The traffic counts and analysis are part of the transportation technical report. This report is on the CD that was attached to the SDEIS. The Preferred Alternative simplifies and improves the operation of all of the intersections within this area. Under the Preferred Alternative, the lane configurations and traffic control will adequately accommodate predicted traffic and queuing.
249	18	B	Kopca	Christopher	Gremar Properties for PCC Structural	In addition, we are very concerned that SE Johnson Road north of the intersection with SE Deer Creek Lane is proposed to have only 1 travel lane in each direction. One left hand turning vehicle could greatly disrupt traffic egress out of this area.	The Johnson Rd/ Deer Creek intersection is sized to provide the needed lanes to make this intersection operate at an acceptable level of service.
239	18	B	Kopca	Christopher	Gremar Properties for PCC Structural	This proposal shows some of the property east of the current SE Johnson Rd. being taken. This property is part of our required landscaping.	The comment is noted. The proposal is to widen Deer Creek Lane equally from both sides to create 5 lanes. (See Entry # 228.)
252	18	B	Kopca	Christopher	Gremar	Also, not too far off the curb is a series of utility poles and	The utilities are one of the elements that are part of

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Properties for PCC Structurals	overhead utility lines that would be impacted.	the evaluation and design of a project. The anticipated impacts to utilities are described in Chapter 3, Utilities.
247	18	B	Kopca	Christopher	Greomar Properties for PCC Structurals	The relocated and re-elevated SE Deer Creek Lane could impact our existing south gate entrance. Use of this second access point is critical to the growing and future operations of this site. The proposed routing of SE Deer Creek Lane will reduce the ability of vehicles to enter our site, and the elevation of SE Deer Creek Lane may require the closure of this entrance. This would greatly affect the carrying capacity and/or internal circulation of this property.	Comment is noted. The proposed grade change is only a few feet.
257	19	B	Kopca	Christopher	Greomar Properties for PCC Structurals	How the property/business access major roadways in this area (224, I-205, 82nd, etc) - The proposed new Johnson Rd/Deer Creek Way alignment and traffic volumes appear to diminish this access in the future. A signalized and well designed intersection allowing Johnson road traffic to enter/exit onto Deer Creek is essential.	Business access would be available to both OR 224 and 82nd Avenue. The Preferred Alternative has a signal at Johnson Road and Deer Creek Lane.
260	19	B	Kopca	Christopher	Greomar Properties for PCC Structurals	As presently designed, there does not appear to be enough "throat" or queue distance between Johnson Road and Hwy 224 to allow reasonable right and left hand turn movements to and from Johnson Road.	The refined alignment of the Preferred Alternative allows adequate queuing distance for turn movements.
256	19	B	Kopca	Christopher	Greomar Properties for PCC Structurals	The current plan does not in any way address how Lowes traffic would be serviced and not further impact our site.	Access to Lowes will be provided at an upgraded traffic signal located at the current Lowes signalized access at Deer Creek Lane and Johnson Road (see Figure PA-6 in the FEIS for a map of the I-205 area).
254	19	B	Kopca	Christopher	Greomar Properties for PCC Structurals	The proposed alignment requires a taking of some of our property and may eliminate existing access points due to grade changes.	The proposed grade changes are only a few feet and it is expected that the Preferred Alternative would not impact this access point.
253	19	B	Kopca	Christopher	Greomar Properties for PCC Structurals	Precision has expanded two times since project photo/reconnaissance work was done for the Sunrise proposal, and as a result, the overall size and layout of the site as currently operates has become increasingly important. Moreover, Precision has contemplated further plant expansions or even a second building on this site.	The aerial photo that was used was the best information that was available at the time the design was developed. Updated aerial photos were used in the refinement of the Preferred Alternative. The FEIS includes aerial photos from 2008 (the most recent currently available) in the maps depicting the Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
255	19	B	Kopca	Christopher	Gremar Properties for PCC Structurals	How the project is phased is absolutely critical to the performance and daily operation of this site. Improper phasing of even a good solution could be as detrimental as an improper solution.	A phasing strategy has been developed for the Preferred Alternative. The plan is based on funding and when the phases are needed.
259	19	B	Kopca	Christopher	Gremar Properties for PCC Structurals	Three additional improvements that could greatly facilitate area traffic circulation and potentially relieve some pressure on the proposed/expanded Deer Creek Way are: a) The widening of Harmony Road to the west (Sunnybrook is already wider) b) extend Sunnybrook Road west to connect with Harmony Road and c) extend Johnson Road north to the extended Sunnybrook Road.	Improvements to Harmony Road are identified within the County's TSP. No funding is available for these improvements at this time. Clackamas County is proposing extending Sunnybrook Road, with construction beginning in 2010. Extending Johnson Road was considered and was not found to be feasible due to cost and environmental impacts.
263	20	B	Kraus	Edward	Kraus Music Products	I cannot see the reason to build this project at all, unless the access at 122nd Ave (near Fred Meyer Warehouses) is included. If trucks are to get on the freeway and avoid surface streets, this is crucial. Otherwise, the trucks will continue to clog the 212/224 and 205 intersection, even if improved as per the interchange plan being discussed.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative includes a midpoint interchange.
261	20	B	Kraus	Edward	Kraus Music Products	I cannot understand why the Tolbert Road option would be built. The Lawnfield area will be well served by the new road north to Sunnybrook/Sunnyside, and by the improved connections south to the 224 interchange. 82nd Drive cannot handle additional traffic, if you are building this much infrastructure, doesn't this sufficiently replace the Lawnfield grade crossing?	If there is an impact to an existing access, reasonable alternative access must be provided. Currently the Lawnfield Industrial Area has direct access to 82nd Drive. The Tolbert Road option is intended to replace that access.
265	20	B	Kraus	Edward	Kraus Music Products	In addition, the draft EIS fails to acknowledge that putting a bridge in place of Tolbert Road blocks the only access to about ten businesses in the area...the downstairs suites of 15140 SE 82nd Dr and several businesses along Tolbert would be completely blocked.	The Preferred Alternative continues to provide access to the business north of Tolbert Road on 94th Avenue by means of 94th Avenue. 94th Avenue passes under the Tolbert overcrossing.
268	20	B	Kraus	Edward	Kraus Music Products	If another connection to 82nd Drive across the tracks is necessary, a better location would be north of 14800 SE 82nd and south of the building currently housing Michele's Chocolates. This is an empty lot on 82nd, and vacant land on the other side of the tracks. An access road here would impact fewer businesses than a Tolbert	The topography in relation to UPRR tracks at this location makes this connection difficult. A requirement to achieve 23' vertical clearance over the UPRR tracks makes a connection to realigned SE Lawnfield Rd./ Industrial Way difficult.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						bridge would.	
262	20	B	Kraus	Edward	Kraus Music Products	I cannot see why you need the Tolbert [option] at all, and object to its inclusion in any further plans.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
274	21	B	Walter	Michael	Hubbard Terrace Homeowners Association	Due to the proximity of the nineteen HTHA homes of the bluff above the intersection of SE 135th/SE Hubbard Road and Highway 212/224, we are concerned about the impact the changes proposed in this area will have on noise, views, and light levels at night.	See response to (Entry #273), above, regarding light and view impacts. The noise impacts are primarily a function of the location of the alignment and moving the alignment to the south could reduce the noise impacts on the bluff but would increase impacts on other residential areas. Predicted noise impacts to the Hubbard area were similar between Alternatives 2 and 3 and no sound walls for that area would meet the feasibility criteria. As of the writing of the FEIS, no further mitigation is proposed.
293	21	B	Walter	Michael	Hubbard Terrace Homeowners Association	First and most importantly, any alternative selected for the Sunrise Project, I-205 to Rock Creek should take into account that Hubbard Terrace can only be accessed from SE Hubbard Rd. Any increase in traffic along SE Hubbard Rd caused by vehicles trying to get to and from the new highway will lead to backups at the intersection of SE 135th/SE Hubbard Rd and Highway 212/224 as well as the intersection of SE Hubbard Terrace and SE Hubbard Road.	The analysis has shown that the Sunrise Project will draw vehicles that today are using Hubbard, 142nd Ave, and 152nd Ave to move between Hwy 212/224 and Sunnyside/Sunnybrook. The volumes on these roadways are expected to decrease when the Sunrise Project is constructed.
292	21	B	Walter	Michael	Hubbard Terrace Homeowners Association	Additionally, the increased traffic, and the lack of a marked turn lane at the entrance to the HTHA neighborhood, is a safety concern.	The area you are commenting on is outside of the study area for this project. Please contact the County's Transportation department for safety concerns about existing infrastructure in this area.
294	21	B	Walter	Michael	Hubbard Terrace Homeowners Association	When the temporary detour was in place during the recent Sunnyside Road widening project, vehicles were lined up all the way back to the apartments located northwest of Hubbard Terrace which blocked the only access we have to get to our homes.	The analysis has shown that the Sunrise Project will draw vehicles that today are using Hubbard, 142nd Ave, and 152nd Ave to move between Hwy 212/224 and Sunnyside/Sunnybrook. The volumes on these roadways are expected to decrease when the Sunrise Project is constructed. Impacts during the construction of this corridor will not resemble those felt when Sunnyside Road was under construction.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							When an existing roadway is under construction, the drivers that typically use that route have to find alternative routes. When the Sunrise Project is being constructed, existing routes would be minimally impacted because the Sunrise Project is a new expressway and therefore adverse effects along Hubbard Terrace should be minimal, if at all.
271	21	B	Walter	Michael	Hubbard Terrace Homeowners Association	HTHA recommends Alternative 3 build with no midpoint. This option would have the least amount of impact on the intersection of SE 135th/SE Hubbard Road and Highway 212/224.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
270	21	B	Walter	Michael	Hubbard Terrace Homeowners Association	If a midpoint must be included then we would recommend the single point interchange at SE 122nd. We do not want the split interchange as a midpoint solution. Although it will divide the traffic flow onto the highway between SE 122nd and SE 130th this will significantly impact the intersection of SE 135th/SE Hubbard Road and Highway 212/224 with increased noise from vehicles accelerating onto the highway and visually with overhead lights and additional ramps.	Thank you for your comment. The single interchange at SE 122nd Ave. was selected in the Preferred Alternative. Design Option B-2 (split-diamond interchange) was not selected. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
275	21	B	Walter	Michael	Hubbard Terrace Homeowners Association	HTHA recommends Design Option C-2. Although the noise report found minimal differences in noise levels between the options, it was still higher with option C-3 (see page 55 of noise report) and option C-3 would bring the highway much closer to the bluff at SE 135th/SE Hubbard Road and Highway 212/224 and would have more significant visual impact.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
278	21	B	Walter	Michael	Hubbard Terrace Homeowners Association	The [noise] study did not include the row of homes behind location 99, 100, and 101. Unlike the second row of homes along SE Bluff Drive which will not be mitigated, the second row of homes on SE Myra Lane and SE Hubbard Terrace are on a graduated slope on the bluff. The first row of homes only partially block the second row of homes and in many cases on one side of the home there is no obstruction between the home and the proposed highway. Therefore, HTHA believes that the	The noise study did not include receptors at the second row of homes behind locations 99, 100, and 101. From visual observations, it did not appear that these homes would have a direct line of sight to the potential new road alignments and it is unlikely that all 19 homes in the Hubbard Terrace development would be impacted by the project alternatives. Partial blocking of noise commonly reduces noise levels below the noise impact

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						impact of build alternatives will impact all of the nineteen homes in the HTHA and necessitates the mitigation of all nineteen homes.	guidelines. The SDEIS results showed the trade-offs in noise levels between the alternatives under consideration. There was generally little difference with or without a midpoint interchange, but there were differences between the alignment design options (design Options C-1, C-2, and C-3). There are very specific FHWA and ODOT guidelines for noise mitigation. In order for noise mitigation to be recommended for a project, mitigation measures must meet specific criteria for feasibility and reasonableness (see the ODOT Noise Manual 2009 and FEIS Chapter 3, Noise for more information). Because of the topography in the Hubbard Terrace area, no reasonable or feasible noise mitigation was identified or recommended for the noise impacts.
288	21	B	Walter	Michael	Hubbard Terrace Homeowners Association	The noise study reviewed all of the normally available options for mitigation, such as truck restrictions, speed restrictions, building noise barrier walls on the bluff or the north side of the highway, covering the highway, quiet pavements and realignment of the highway. HTHA would recommend all of these solutions.	<p>Because of substantial potential noise increases in the Bluff neighborhood, additional mitigation measures were evaluated for the Bluff area. Three additional mitigation options for the Bluff neighborhood were explored: 1) provision of a wall at the north edge of the proposed Sunrise Project, 2) a wall in the center median (in combination with the wall at the north edge), and 3) a partial cover for the proposed highway.</p> <p>The evaluation was based on procedures used to determine whether noise abatement would meet federal funding criteria as provided in the ODOT Noise Manual. In particular the criteria noted that: 1) Mitigation must provide a 5dBA reduction in noise levels at the first row of receivers; 2) Cost of abatement should not exceed \$35,000 per benefited residence; and 3) Environmental impacts---effects such as visual issues and effects on cultural and wildlife resources must be considered.</p> <p>None of the additional options evaluated would</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							<p>meet this criterion. All potential mitigation measures studied for the Bluff neighborhood, including the wall at the top of the bluff, were expected to have very high costs, with preliminary estimates in the range of \$100,000 to \$1,000,000 per residence. None would provide effective mitigation without excessive heights. The need for additional height and/or right-of-way area would have other potential environmental impacts and add to the costs of these measures.</p> <p>No other options were identified that would effectively reduce potential noise impacts while also preventing additional project-related impacts, and meeting cost requirements for mitigation under FHWA and ODOT policies. Therefore, it was concluded that no feasible and reasonable methods of noise reduction were available for potential impacts to the Bluff neighborhood north of the proposed project alignment.</p>
279	21	B	Walter	Michael	Hubbard Terrace Homeowners Association	HTHA's recommendations on alignment are listed in the alignment section above but the alignment options still will not bring decibel levels below reasonable levels, according to the study..... We require some form of compensation for the impact the Sunrise Project will have on our homes. We have developed a list of additional alternatives that should be considered and discussed with HTHA.	Because of the extremely high mitigation costs, no federal or state funds are available to financially mitigate properties along Bluff Drive and 135th Avenue that face noise and visual impacts if the Sunrise Project is constructed as proposed in the Sunrise Project SDEIS and FEIS, nor does the County have the resources to financially mitigate these properties. At this point, no source of such a large amount of mitigation funds is in sight.
295	21	B	Walter	Michael	Hubbard Terrace Homeowners Association	Prevent Hubbard Road from connecting with Highway 212/224 at SE 135th. Instead, as SE Hubbard Road travels down the hill have it wrap east where it could connect with the proposed road in the SDEIS that will run along the bluff and turn onto SE 142nd. This will reduce congestion and noise levels at the intersection of SE 135th/SE Hubbard Road and Highway 212/224. Vehicles would still have access to Highway 212/224 a few blocks	The project evaluated at least one alternative that includes a partial at-grade section of the mainline in this area -- Design Option C-3. The C-3 proposal was grade-separated over Hubbard at 135th Avenue and grade-separated under 142nd Avenue before it climbed back up to cross over 152nd Avenue. This alternative was not selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. The suggested connection of Hubbard

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						farther east. Most importantly, this would make it possible to build the highway at ground level instead of elevated at the intersection of SE 135th/SE Hubbard Road and Highway 212/224 because it would not have to travel above SE Hubbard Road at this location.	Road to 142nd Avenue and then to OR 212/224 would require the construction of a new road section across a large area of wetlands which the selection of Preferred Alternative had previously avoided.
282	21	B	Walter	Michael	Hubbard Terrace Homeowners Association	Reduce the property taxes of the nineteen homes indefinitely in the HTHA using a percentage that reflects that impact the highway will have on the value of each home.	Because of the extremely high mitigation costs, no federal or state funds are available to financially mitigate properties along Bluff Drive and 135th Avenue that face noise and visual impacts if the Sunrise Project is constructed as proposed in the Sunrise Project SDEIS and FEIS, nor does the County have the resources to financially mitigate these properties. At this point, no source of such a large amount of mitigation funds is in sight.
290	21	B	Walter	Michael	Hubbard Terrace Homeowners Association	Provide cash compensation to the nineteen homeowners in the HTHA that could be used to install sound dampening windows to reduce interior noise levels.	Cash compensation is not allowed for noise impacts under FHWA or ODOT guidance. Structural mitigation, such as the installation of noise dampening windows, or insulation is only allowed for public buildings such as schools under the guidance.
283	21	B	Walter	Michael	Hubbard Terrace Homeowners Association	For locations 99, 100 and 101 provide monetary compensation to the homeowners for the significant reduction in property values that will result when the Sunrise Project is built. Another option would be to purchase the homes from the owners and resell the homes after the construction project is completed which would also absorb the reduction in property values.	Because of the extremely high mitigation costs, no federal or state funds are available to financially mitigate properties along Bluff Drive and 135th Avenue that face noise and visual impacts if the Sunrise Project is constructed as proposed in the Sunrise Project SDEIS and FEIS, nor does the County have the resources to financially mitigate these properties. At this point, no source of such a large amount of mitigation funds is in sight.
272	21	B	Walter	Michael	Hubbard Terrace Homeowners Association	HTHA would recommend Alternative 3 with no midpoint. It would have less visual impact than Alternative 2 which includes a midpoint. There would be less paved surface, a narrower roadway, a slightly lower elevation, less vegetation removal and terrain modification, fewer street lights and signs, fewer brake lights, signals and ramps associated with an interchange.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
273	21	B	Walter	Michael	Hubbard	Do not include lighting for the stretch of highway that	The Visual section of the SDEIS notes that residents'

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Terrace Homeowners Association	would pass through the intersection of SE 135th/SE Hubbard Road and Highway 212/224. These lights would shine through the homes along the bluff. Vehicles would still be able to travel safely through this area with headlights. This is another reason that selection of an option without a midpoint or the single point interchange at 122nd would be preferable because it would reduce the amount of lighting needed for an intersection.	views of the proposed highway from along the bluff would be screened somewhat by existing trees (p. 112) but less so towards the east end where there are fewer trees. Retaining as many trees as possible is a proposed mitigation measure to reduce the impact from headlights and street lights (p. 114-15). The single diamond interchange was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative, which would have less lighting impacts on neighborhood near SE 135th Ave/SE Hubbard Rd. and OR 212/224 than the split diamond interchange option. In final design, lighting structures (shielded lighting/dark sky lighting) will be considered to minimize adverse lighting impacts on the neighborhood.
276	21	B	Walter	Michael	Hubbard Terrace Homeowners Association	As mentioned above, HTHA would recommend selecting Design Option C-2 with alignment parallel to the existing 212/224 highway. This will have less visual impact on the homes along the bluff because it will be farther away.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
277	21	B	Walter	Michael	Hubbard Terrace Homeowners Association	As the study mentions, plant additional evergreen trees along the south and east side of the residences along the bluff that will grow tall enough to help block some of the view of the new highway and will not lose their leaves in the winter. Additional evergreen trees should also be planted along the south and east sides of the residences along the bluff to reduce views of the highway in those directions.	The proposed mitigation in the SDEIS for visual impacts (e.g., retaining vegetation, planting coniferous trees for screening) has been incorporated into the Preferred Alternative. See Chapter 3, Visual and Table 3.
303	21	B	Walter	Michael	Hubbard Terrace Homeowners Association	As the study mentions, use materials that provide a design aesthetic that is more visually appealing and complements the surrounding geology and vegetation.	In the midpoint area, vegetation will be planted to screen residential viewers from direct vehicle light and glare. The planting will be done in an appropriate manner consistent with ODOT's Roadside Development Design Manual (ODOT 2006). (See Chapter 3, Visual.)
281	21	B	Walter	Michael	Hubbard	Allow homes along the bluff to build their own fences	Fences taller than six feet in height may be

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Terrace Homeowners Association	above the standard 6-foot height.	constructed but require a building permit to confirm that they meet structural code requirements. The allowed height of fences on private property is regulated by local government (in this case, Clackamas County) and is not an issue that this project has jurisdiction.
306	22	B	Wilson	Ronnie	RK Wilson Corp	Our concerns are we are already having some tenants that do not want to enter into long term leases and are resisting rent increases because they think they are going to get kicked out of their space in a few years. As for our business we have already put expansion plans on hold due to relocation.	The Sunrise Project schedule anticipates a Record of Decision in late 2010. Your property located at 9160 SE Lawnfield Rd. would be acquired for right-of-way for the Preferred Alternative. Assuming there is a decision to build the project, no construction is likely for approximately 3 years.
307	22	B	Wilson	Ronnie	RK Wilson Corp	Basically this project is already costing us money and I want to make sure when the time comes all these costs and inconveniences are taken into account when it comes to ROW acquisition, relocation, and finding replacement properties.	The property acquisition process for purchasing road right-of-way is governed by specific Federal and State laws identified on page 105 of the Right-of-Way Technical Report. As stated in the Mitigation Measures on the same page, "just compensation is based on valuation of the needed property by an experienced and qualified right-of-way agent or by an independent fee appraiser." That valuation must be determined by comparison with recent sales of similar properties sold. These same laws govern the assistance that business owners, homeowners and business and residential tenants receive when they have to move. A summary is provided in the ODOT brochure entitled, "Moving Because of the Highway or Public Projects."
310	23	B	Hagen	Terry	International Wood Products	But for us to continue to grow and be viable, we need access to 205 from both directions with the Sunnybrook connector, and the Tolbert connection to 82nd.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
311	23	B	Hagen	Terry	International Wood	International Wood Products ships and receives up to 40 trucks per day; let alone what all the other businesses in	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Products	the Lawnfield area do. Without the Lawnfield connection due to the Sunrise project, we need good freeway access. And if the only connector is Sunnybrook, the bottleneck of trucks will be unbelievable. IWP and all the Lawnfield member businesses need a second access, and the Tolbert connection is the best one brought up to date. We know Camp Withycombe prefers both the Sunnybrook and Tolbert access, and it is imperative to our survival. We are also somewhat concerned about the grades for both Sunnybrook and Tolbert since most of that traffic will be semi-truck traffic and with Oregon Iron, some of it even bigger.	alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative. Both the connection to Sunnybrook and the Tolbert connection to 82nd Drive are part of the Preferred Alternative, and will be designed to accommodate WB67 trucks with regard to grade and curvature.
320	24	B	Hegar	Terry		I own the property at 130th Street that would be eliminated due to the two interchange system. I've worked my whole life to build my business and this building. I would hate to see it all destroyed for the sake of bizarre engineering and unnecessary spending.	The split interchange affecting 130th Avenue has not been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
322	24	B	Hegar	Terry		Clackamas industrial area could be served efficiently with its existing access or the addition of a single access if commuter traffic wasn't present.	A primary reason for creating a Sunrise Project is to move commuter and long distance travelers off of Hwy 212/224 and onto a higher capacity through route. When that shift occurs, the more locally-oriented traffic will not be mixing with as many commuters passing through the area.
317	24	B	Hegar	Terry		This project needs to be kept simple and cost effective.	The selection of the Preferred Alternative is based on meeting the Project's Purpose and Need and providing the best balance of operational effectiveness, protecting environmental and community resources, and cost.
318	24	B	Hegar	Terry		A single interchange or no interchange would be safer and move traffic more efficiently. I believe that is the purpose of this project.	Thank you for your comment. The single interchange at SE 122nd Ave. was selected in the Preferred Alternative. Design Option B-2 (split-diamond interchange) was not selected. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
319	24	B	Hegar	Terry		I would like to go on record in support of the single interchange at 122nd Street proposal.	Thank you for your comment. The single interchange at SE 122nd Ave. was selected in the Preferred Alternative. Design Option B-2 (split-diamond interchange) was not selected. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
324	25	B	Ahrend	Brent	Group Mackenzie for Fred Meyer Stores	The increase in traffic volumes along SE 82nd Drive, especially to the south at Evelyn, does not seem reasonable because all areas to the south of the Fred Meyer site are already built out or have access to the SE 82nd Drive interchange further to the south. The volume projections for SE 82nd Drive should be reconsidered. It may be the large increase in projected volumes that is causing the County to recommend a five-lane widening of SE 82nd Drive.	As I-205 reaches and exceeds capacity, travelers will attempt to find alternative routes to their destinations. The current design shows a direct connection between 82nd Drive and 82nd Avenue that is much improved over the current design. This increases the viability of 82nd Drive as an alternative to I-205 which is near or at capacity. Volume projections for the area were developed using the most current industry standards (NCHRP 255 methodology), and were revisited during the FEIS process. The volume projections are derived from the Metro maintained regional model.
323	25	B	Ahrend	Brent	Group Mackenzie for Fred Meyer Stores	With the current five-lane concept for SE 82nd Drive shown with the Sunrise project, the existing bank and gas station would be removed, and access to the restaurant would likely be limited to right turns. With widening to the west on SE 82nd Ave., Fred Meyer may lose some frontage and the short throat length at the signal would be lessened further. Such a plan would create queuing and circulation issues on the Fred Meyer site.	The ODOT preliminary design unit (tasked with the design of this project) has not worked on specific internal circulation plans for the project. As funding becomes available and Project Engineering refinement starts, internal circulation questions will be addressed.
334	25	B	Ahrend	Brent	Group Mackenzie for Fred Meyer Stores	Because the current proposal would result in traffic circulation issues at the existing Fred Meyer north access, we considered a number of ways to better manage the on-site Fred Meyer circulation and maintain access to SE 82nd Drive.	The design you are suggesting was reviewed as part of the SDEIS refinement process. Roadway improvements resulting from this process have been included in the Preferred Alternative, as described in the FEIS.
328	25	B	Ahrend	Brent	Group Mackenzie for Fred Meyer	The existing Fred Meyer driveway is located at the north end of the existing building and provides only 75 feet for queuing, which would be reduced to 25 feet with the	The design you are suggesting was reviewed as part of the SDEIS refinement process. Roadway improvements resulting from this process have been

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Stores	roadway widening. Moving the access and signal to the north approximately 75 to 100 feet would allow longer approaches of 100 to 150 feet for both Fred Meyer and the shopping center on the east side of SE 82nd Ave. An easement would be provided to Elmer's restaurant, which would have its access limited to right turns in from SE 82nd Drive. This option would also improve access for the shopping center across from Fred Meyer. The current shopping center driveway approach has curb cuts very near the intersection with SE 82nd Drive (30 feet). Internal Fred Meyer parking circulation could be revised to accommodate truck access to and from the back of the building. Spacing between the relocated access and exiting Highway 212/224 would be 600 feet between intersection centerlines, which meets the generally recommended spacing of 600 feet for traffic signals. The widening would taper back to a three-lane section south of the access, which would occur mostly outside the Fred Meyer frontage, resulting in less right of way needed from Fred Meyer. This option would result in little or no loss of parking for Fred Meyer, provide a longer driveway approach to the signal and move the internal intersection away from the building's busiest entrance. The attached Option 1 plan presents a concept for this access.	included in the Preferred Alternative, as described in the FEIS.
329	25	B	Ahrend	Brent	Group Mackenzie for Fred Meyer Stores	This option would keep the access at its current location, curve the Fred Meyer approach to the north to provide a longer queuing distance, and move the internal intersection away from the building. The on-site changes to the Fred Meyer parking lot, including curved drive aisles would reduce the number of parking spaces. In addition, the taper back to a 3-lane section would have an impact on some of the Fred Meyer frontage immediately south of the access. As with Option 1, an easement would be provided to the restaurant, which would have its access limited to right turns in from SE 82nd Drive. No changes would be made to the shopping center access across SE 82nd Drive. Intersection spacing	The design you are suggesting was reviewed as part of the SDEIS refinement process. Roadway improvements resulting from this process have been included in the Preferred Alternative, as described in the FEIS.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						would be 700 feet from the existing Highway 212/224. Option 2 is presented in the attached plan.	
330	25	B	Ahrend	Brent	Group Mackenzie for Fred Meyer Stores	A roundabout option at or near the existing north driveway for Fred Meyer could work instead of a traffic signal. It could reduce the need for widening on SE 82nd Drive, thus reducing the impact on Fred Meyer's frontage. Also, the existing short approach lengths for Fred Meyer and the shopping center across SE 82nd Drive would probably not need to be lengthened. Another benefit of a roundabout is it can be located further north than a traffic signal because no southbound left turn lane storage is needed. Parking impacts would depend on the ultimate location and radius of a roundabout. Truck access would necessitate a wider diameter for the roundabout, as trucks leaving Fred Meyer would need to circulate the roundabout to turn left to SE 82nd Drive. An easement would be provided to Elmer's restaurant, which would have its access limited to right turns in from SE 82nd Drive. The attached plan for Option 3 presents a roundabout solution located slightly north of the current intersection.	Roundabouts were in the IAMP for this area and were found to not meet jurisdictional standards for level of service or capacity. The Preferred Alternative incorporates traffic signals at both the northern Fred Meyer Access and at Clackamas Road to the north.
331	25	B	Ahrend	Brent	Group Mackenzie for Fred Meyer Stores	Considering all three options for maintaining access to Fred Meyer and traffic flow on SE 82nd Drive, we recommend Option 1 be pursued for the Sunrise project.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
325	25	B	Ahrend	Brent	Group Mackenzie for Fred Meyer Stores	In addition, we recommend Clackamas County reconsider the traffic volume projections along SE 82nd Drive to ensure they accurately reflect future conditions. An overestimation of traffic volume could result in unnecessary roadway widening, costs and encroachment on existing businesses.	Volume projections for the area have been developed using the most current industry standards (NCHRP 255 methodology), and have been reviewed by Clackamas County and ODOT staff. The phasing strategy of this project is intended to relieve today's congestion with available funding while maintaining acceptable operations on the existing system.
335	26	B	Satterlee	Ron	Milwaukie Tire and Automotive	He heard about the release of the SDEIS and that his leased property (82nd Dr and SE Herbert Ct) may be impacted by the project. He was soon to be signing a new	The Sunrise Project schedule anticipates a Record of Decision in late 2010. Your property located at 8921 SE Herbert Ct. would be acquired for right-of-way

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						10-year lease on property, and wondered whether he should consider looking elsewhere, if property was proposed to be taken for the project. He was informed that his property (#75 in Figure #30 and Table 9 in Ch. 3) would be impacted.	for either build alternative. Assuming there is a decision to build, no construction is likely for at least 3 to 5 years. The relocation process is governed by specific Federal and State laws identified on page 105 of the Right-of-Way Technical Report. A summary is provided in the ODOT brochure entitled, "Moving Because of the Highway or Public Projects." Benefits can include search expenses, moving expenses and some reestablishment expenses. A Relocation Agent works with the business to help with the relocation benefits.
338	27	B	Kim	Jin		Called to ask about potential impacts to this property from the project. (location: 15630 SE 82nd, vacant lot)	[Note: Specific information was provided directly to the commenter by ODOT in 2008.] Page 50 of the SDEIS indicates that a partial acquisition is anticipated for this property. The SDEIS build alternative had the same level of impacts to the site that occur with the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative has minor impacts on this property along 82nd Drive. Access to 82nd Drive will become a right-in / right-out access due to the raise median included in the Preferred Alternative.
340	28	B	Ray	Jared	McDonald's Restaurants	Our family owns two McDonald's Restaurants that will be affected by this project. We were very disappointed when we received the Draft EIS which indicated that our business was on the list for full right of way acquisition. Our Restaurant is situated on site #134 on Figure 30. It did not make sense to us when we saw that our site and the adjacent site #133 are listed for full acquisition, while the other side of the Highway 212, with sites #139 and #138 has only partial impact and therefore limited business impact. The businesses that occupy those two spaces are a motel the Clackamas Inn, and an adult video store, Fantasy Land Two. While we don't want to diminish the social and economical significance that these businesses bring to the community, we certainly feel as business owners that the community as a whole is much better off with a McDonald's restaurant than an aging	The north leg of the 82nd Drive / OR 212/224 intersection is the location of one of the major traffic problems that the project is attempting to address. This leg of the existing intersection has a high level traffic demand and a high level of conflicting turn movements. While a high level of demand exists for the year 2030 SDEIS Build Alternatives at this location, the build alternatives reduce the level of turn conflict in part by installing a raised median which restricts left turns along 82nd Drive between OR 212/224 and Clackamas Road. Also the 2030 SDEIS Build Alternatives have a third westbound lane which functions best with a dedicated right turn lane, which removes the access for the McDonalds and the 7-11 Store on the east side of 82nd Drive.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						<p>motel and an adult video store. Additionally, I am sure our economic impact is much greater to the community as our store employs approximately 50 people.</p>	<p>Due to poor performance of the intersection of 82nd Drive and OR 212/224 in 2030, refinement alternatives for 82nd Drive were developed with participation from the public and business communities. The refinements do not avoid the displacement of this property.</p> <p>The property acquisition process for purchasing road right-of-way is governed by specific Federal and State laws identified on page 105 of the Right-of-Way Technical Report. These same laws govern the assistance that a business receives when they have to move. A summary is provided in the ODOT brochure entitled, "Moving Because of the Highway or Public Project." Benefits can include search expenses, moving expenses and some reestablishment expenses. A Relocation Agent works with the business to help with the relocation benefits. The laws do not cover the loss of business value.</p>
341	28	B	Ray	Jared	McDonald's Restaurants	<p>The Draft EIS talks about displaced businesses being relocated. This again is problematic for us. We are a franchisee of McDonald's, meaning we own the local restaurant on 82nd Dr. as discussed, however, we do not have the authority to relocate this restaurant to another site we deem appropriate. McDonald's corporation has the final say on where restaurants are built and who they are sold to. While it is possible McDonald's may find another suitable piece of real estate to locate this restaurant to in this area, there are certainly no guarantees that they will do this nor is there any guarantee we would have the opportunity to purchase this franchise. Keep in mind, the closing of this restaurant affects local business owners and local employees far more than it affects McDonald's corporation.</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The proposed alignment for the Preferred Alternative would affect this property in relation to potential right-of-way needs.</p> <p>The property acquisition process for purchasing road right-of-way is governed by specific Federal and State laws identified on page 105 of the Right-of-Way Technical Report and in the FEIS. These same laws govern the assistance that a business receives when they have to move. A summary is provided in the ODOT brochure entitled, "Moving Because of the Highway or Public Project."</p> <p>Assistance is available if a business is displaced as a result of project actions. Assistance can include search expenses, moving expenses and some reestablishment expenses. A Relocation Agent would work with affected business owners to help</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							with relocation assistance.
342	28	B	Ray	Jared	McDonald's Restaurants	From an economic sense, we have significant debt outstanding on this investment. We purchased this restaurant and the building in 2004 and are still carrying much of this debt on our books. We do not however own any of the real estate, McDonald's corporation leases the real estate, and we in turn lease it from McDonald's. Therefore in the acquisition process, we would get the "replacement" value of the building and that is it. It is doubtful that the amount of funds we would receive on the "replacement" value would be enough for us to pay off our debt and it certainly does nothing to replace our lost future cash flows from this investment we made. This economic hardship pales in comparison to our 50 employees that would be out of work.	See response to Entry # 341.
339	28	B	Ray	Jared	McDonald's Restaurants	Our second restaurant affected is the McDonald's restaurant located at 13740 SE Highway 212, at the intersection of Highway 212 and 135th Ave. This restaurant is only affected by the proposed new roadway. While we wish that the interchange had been located at 135th Ave. this seems like a more logical choice to use with respect to traffic flows, of the alternatives presented we would like to throw our support behind Alt 2, without the Design B option.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
352	29	B	Bishop	Brian	Lawnfield PAC representative	The quality and vitality of this industrial area was originally established because of its immediate, high capacity and direct access to the local highway systems and it continues to completely rely upon these highway access attributes. The Lawnfield Industrial Area is in great peril as the Sunrise Project moves forward if serious efforts are not made to maintain its present level of highway access for which it is dependent.	Two alternative accesses were part of the SDEIS and were included in the Preferred Alternative to mitigate for the closure of access at Lawnfield and 82nd Drive: Lawnfield North (to SE 97th Avenue) and the Tolbert Crossing, which would include a bridge over the railroad tracks from the Lawnfield industrial area to 82nd Drive. Both of these options would provide another access for the industrial area as well as alternative access to I-205. - Lawnfield North provides better access to I-205 via the Sunnybrook Interchange.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							- The Tolbert Crossing provides better access to local business and service providers.
350	29	B	Bishop	Brian	Lawnfield PAC representative	The only option that has been presented to date which preserves the Lawnfield Industrial Area's viability has been the North Lawnfield Extension. It is my concern as the Lawnfield PAC member and the universal concern of all Lawnfield Industrial Area businesses I have met with believe that insufficient attention has been given to assuring the preservation of this vibrant industrial area.	Both the Tolbert overcrossing and the north Lawnfield extension are components of the Preferred Alternative and are included in the FEIS.
348	29	B	Bishop	Brian	Lawnfield PAC representative	A particular example of this problem is the constant presentation by the Sunrise project designers of design option A-2 as an alternative to the North Lawnfield Extension. In no way is the circuitous design option A-2 an "alternative" that will allow the Lawnfield Industrial Area to continue to function at anywhere near the level it presently does. It does not provide immediate, high capacity or even direct access to the highway system which were the foundation for the establishment of the present Lawnfield Industrial Area businesses.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
349	29	B	Bishop	Brian	Lawnfield PAC representative	At every PAC meeting the Lawnfield businesses and I have made the point that the so-called "design option A-2" is not an option for proper highway access for the Lawnfield Industrial Area, but it is a vital business-to-business connection that preserves the current business-to-business interactions between the 82nd Drive Commercial/Retail area with the Lawnfield Industrial Area. The Sunrise Project's planned closing of the Lawnfield at-grade crossing of the railroad tracks should be replaced by this connection to preserve these important business interactions. It has never been considered by the Lawnfield Industrial Area businesses to be a functional replacement for the present highway access or the proposed North Lawnfield Extension.	Both the Tolbert overcrossing and the north Lawnfield extension are components of the Preferred Alternative and are included in the FEIS.
351	29	B	Bishop	Brian	Lawnfield PAC representative	The economic viability of the Lawnfield Industrial Area will be substantially degraded if the North Lawnfield Extension or something very similar is not a mandatory piece of the Sunrise Project.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
355	29	B	Bishop	Brian	Lawnfield PAC representative	Another point that has not yet been given sufficient consideration is Metro's goal to preserve, maintain and if possible enhance current industrial lands within the present Urban Growth Boundary. Removing the highway access that was the foundation for the establishment of the Lawnfield Industrial Area will naturally create demand for additional industrial land outside of the current Urban Growth Boundary that provides the access that could be provided instead with the North Lawnfield Extension or something very similar as a mandatory piece of the Sunrise project.	The Sunrise Project's purpose is consistent with Metro's overall goal to "preserve, maintain and if possible enhance current industrial" land by solving a variety of transportation problems in one of the region's largest employment areas and by facilitating freight movement from one of the region's largest freight distribution centers. Impacts to existing businesses have been kept to a minimum. It is anticipated that the Sunrise Project will displace a small number of industrial businesses and will cause about 120 acres (more or less depending on the alternative selected) of industrial land to be converted to right-of-way. There should be adequate capacity within the existing urban growth boundary to accommodate this displacement without a major addition to the urban growth boundary.
347	29	B	Bishop	Brian	Lawnfield PAC representativethe road alignment selection of the North Lawnfield Extension may be in conflict with recent findings regarding a Section 4(f) Historical Site designation of the KEX Transmitter Facility. Certainly the economic viability of the Lawnfield Industrial Area can be properly weighed as mitigation measures are determined for this issue. This is a brand new issue requiring serious and urgent attention of all parties to assure a proper and balanced outcome. If the originally planned alignment of the North Lawnfield Extension is in jeopardy, the Sunrise planning staff, the PAC and the PRC need to quickly work with the Lawnfield area businesses by scheduling additional meeting amongst the parties to achieve the best possible outcome for all involved. Any change of the North Lawnfield Extension alignment should include the active participation of the Lawnfield Business Group.	ODOT and Clackamas County worked to develop avoidance and mitigation measures for the KEX facility. Designers were able to reroute the Lawnfield alignment to avoid impacts to the copper ground mats while resulting in property impacts to one business east of the new proposed roadway. The project team continued to communicate with the Lawnfield Business group, KEX, and other affected property owners as design refinements were made. The design is shown in the FEIS.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
368	31	B	Bishop	Brian	Lawnfield Business Group/PAC Member	This area developed at the interchange of 224 and 205 is a vital industrial area for the county, Clackamas County with--and it's developed there because of the highway access, and it has some of your largest employers with enormous payrolls, and they're all there for highway access. Their business and their employees are there for the highway access.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
360	31	B	Bishop	Brian	Lawnfield Business Group/PAC Member	The current design takes away that access that it has, and the alternatives that are being presented mitigate that--those changes. And we're trying to make sure it's clear to everyone in the chain of approving the access understands that this industrial area will go from being vital, large employment area center for Clackamas County--it will not be that without highway access. And so these aren't optional. Sometimes they're called optional, and I guess that's why we're here and concerned. They're really not optional. You might take-- I'm sure Metro doesn't want to see vital industrial lands become unused or low-used wasteland because it's been cut off from the highway. They want to keep everything denser and being used rather than pushing out, because if you cut us off, then you'll have to rebuild replacement industrial land further out in the rural land to make up for it. So it is critical to choose both alternatives to connect into the 205 system.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
361	31	B	Bishop	Brian	Lawnfield Business Group/PAC Member	They call it option one and option two. We don't. We've been trying to communicate to everyone at the meetings that it's not an option one and two. There is these two need to be put together, both connect to the north to 205 and connect south or into the 82nd, the Tolbert connection right there.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
362	31	B	Bishop	Brian	Lawnfield Business Group/PAC Member	Because we actually have a lot of business to business connections with 82nd drive, whether it's restaurant or small suppliers or banks, post office, whatever. There is a lot of interaction between the Lawnfield and the 82nd	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						area. And that's why it's not a choice of if it's A1 or A2, they both are vital to keeping the area a vital business area.	Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
379	32	B	La Noue	Mark	Clackamas Commerce Center	I can assure you that if we do not have proper ingress and egress for all of our businesses down there, that we will become a third rate industrial location.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
380	32	B	La Noue	Mark	Clackamas Commerce Center	And it is our sole commitment, I say our, the Lawnfield basin people, it's our sole commitment to make sure that we get proper ingress and egress in both directions out here. And this isn't an idle threat or anything, it's just a statement saying that we will do everything we have to do make sure that happens, because that's how critical it is to all of us.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
373	32	B	La Noue	Mark	Clackamas Commerce Center	We're good with Lawnfield Road. The day you close Lawnfield Road and our access down, you better have...	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
374	32	B	La Noue	Mark	Clackamas Commerce Center	We can live as long as Lawnfield Road is open, if you guys come in and you build this and you build all this and the major money isn't available and Lawnfield Rd, wherever it is, Lawnfield Road is still open and we have access, we can live with all of that. That's a plus for us.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
375	32	B	La Noue	Mark	Clackamas Commerce Center	...super money comes in and says, all right, let's make this interchange happen. We will support anything you would do in addition to our Lawnfield current access.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
382	33	B	Doane	Mick	RS Davis Recycling	My concern is trucks getting in and out of here.	Clackamas County Hwy 212 – Lawnfield Rd. project will provide enhanced access with completion of the construction/connection of SE 98th Ct. between Mather Rd. and Lawnfield Rd.
387	34	B	Mayer	Mindy and Jared Ray	McDonald's	And so our questions are just, what was the process that was developed to, how did they come about picking that side, and the other side is not.	The process of creating a preliminary design was focused on the need to address the following problem: The north leg of the 82nd Drive / OR 212/224 intersection is the location of one of the major traffic problems that the SDEIS is attempting to address. This leg of the existing intersection has a high level traffic demand and a high level of conflicting turn movements. While a high level of demand exists for the year 2030 SDEIS Build Alternative at this location, the build alternative reduces the level of turn conflict in part by installing a raised median which restricts left turns along 82nd Drive between OR 212/224 and Clackamas Road. Also the 2030 SDEIS Build Alternative has a third westbound lane that functions best with a dedicated right turn lane, which removes the access for the McDonalds and the 7-11 Store on the eastside of 82nd Drive.
385	34	B	Mayer	Mindy and Jared Ray	McDonald's	The hope would be that they would take some of that land and maybe take some from the other side or whatever, and we'll be happy to get rid of the land up front, and we could potentially relocate the business towards the back of that lot in the big, deep parking lot that we have.	The SDEIS has identified this property for full acquisition even though not all of the property is needed for the project, because of anticipated access restrictions. The intersection widening will not leave room for a safe entrance into the property. Without access the property would not be of economic value to the owner so a full acquisition is anticipated.
386	34	B	Mayer	Mindy and Jared Ray	McDonald's	Just talking to ODOT about this and the acquisitions are they pay you for your real estate value and not much of the business value, and that is a lot.	The property acquisition process for purchasing road right-of-way is governed by specific Federal and State laws identified on page 105 of the Right-of-Way Technical Report. These same laws govern

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							the assistance that a business receives when they have to move. A summary is provided in the ODOT brochure entitled, "Moving Because of the Highway or Public Project." Benefits can include search expenses, moving expenses and some reestablishment expenses. A Relocation Agent works with the business to help with the relocation benefits. The laws do not cover the loss of business value.
388	34	B	Mayer	Mindy and Jared Ray	McDonald's	Well certainly we would rather have seen the on and off at 135th, but the way they've done it is...	The spacing between the midpoint interchange and the Rock Creek interchange would violate ODOT design standards if the midpoint were to be located at 135th Avenue. There would not be enough space between the Midpoint Interchange and Rock Creek Interchange for the Expressway to operate efficiently and not cause safety concerns due to traffic weaving. An interchange at 135th would also create a larger constraint on the wildlife corridor that runs east/west to the north of the Build Alternative compared to the proposed interchange at 122nd.
383	34	B	Mayer	Mindy and Jared Ray	McDonald's	We would rather have the midpoint	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
384	34	B	Mayer	Mindy and Jared Ray	McDonald's	Yeah, we would want the midpoint because our business would be strangled, not as bad as 82nd would wipe out, but it wouldn't be good.	Thank you for your comment. The single interchange at SE 122nd Ave. was selected in the Preferred Alternative. Design Option B-2 (split-diamond interchange) was not selected. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
396	35	B	Porter	Cliff	Cascade Phillips	My concern on the project is the midpoint. I am-my property is right at the midpoint. I have 5 parcels on the northeast corner of the 122nd midpoint, used to be	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						known as Cascade Phillips.	to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
394	35	B	Porter	Cliff	Cascade Phillips	I have several comments. The first, in the Environmental Impact Study, the build, the midpoint, or to build the midpoint, or don't build the midpoint shows a net loss of three additional jobs. The reality is, there is approximately, in that location alone, about 35 jobs, Most of those jobs start out at from \$16 to \$17 an hour on up, with benefits, with pensions, with vacations. Most of them are long term employees.	The data utilized in the analysis was the Oregon Employment Division ES 202 data set (2004) with information filed by employers linked to a specific location. If the business address was listed as a PO box, as is indicated by the commenter, it would not have shown up in this data set. The details of the information in this data set are covered by a non-disclosure agreement that restricts the release of information on a specific employer or establishment.
390	35	B	Porter	Cliff	Cascade Phillips	Second of all, that particular location has an industrial waste water discharge facility. It is one of the only ones in the Northwest, so figuring out a right-of-way and the cost of right-of-way, I think it's well, the estimate is very low in what it's going to cost to move this facility to somewhere else. And they're going to look at a broad range. They may not stay in the county. So it's a growing business. It's been growing for years.	This business has an industrial wastewater discharge permit, issued by WES. It essentially allows pre-treatment of waste from that business, which is then discharged into the sewer system. Staff from WES indicated that as long as there is a sewer connection where the business moves, the same system could be set up. Business owners will work with ODOT or the county on a specific relocation plan.
389	35	B	Porter	Cliff	Cascade Phillips	So the dollar impact of moving those people will be significant in terms of displacement. The other thing is the cost to relocate that business and help them, because they're going to lose this industrial waste water discharge facility. That facility, just in disposal cost, not the time savings, it estimated between \$120 and \$150,000 a year versus taking it directly to treatment plants. It was a unique program that was worked out with WES, and it allows us to bring all our waste there, dispose of it there into the sewer, and for a fraction of the cost. SO there is a hidden cost. There is a bit of a cost there.	See response above (Entry # 390). Relocation costs for this business are reflected in the cost estimate for the project.
395	35	B	Porter	Cliff	Cascade Phillips	I'm not a big proponent of the interchange. I've been involved in this project for years and years and years, tracking it. I question the benefits of it.	Thank you for your comment. The project team has worked to analyze how the different alternatives and design options compare to the project's stated goals and objectives (see Chapter 2 of the SDEIS). The analysis was used as an input in the selection of

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							the Preferred Alternative.
401	35	B	Porter	Cliff	Cascade Phillips	That said there are these other costs, because this business, when they pick up and move, you need to consider the loss because they may move several counties away.	The property acquisition process for purchasing road right-of-way is governed by specific Federal and State laws identified on page 105 of the Right-of-Way Technical Report. These same laws govern the assistance that a business receives when they have to move. A summary is provided in the ODOT brochure entitled, "Moving Because of the Highway or Public Project." Benefits can include search expenses, moving expenses and some reestablishment expenses. A Relocation Agent works with the business to help with the relocation benefits. The laws do not cover the loss of business value.
404	35	B	Porter	Cliff	Cascade Phillips	There is no reason to build that split because the reality is, in 2008 dollars to have that split feature will cost you 112 million more dollars. You would never get the benefit for that design. It won't improve flow that much. And it's 137 million, to have that adjustment in 2012 or 13 dollars.	Thank you for your comment. The single interchange at SE 122nd Ave. was selected in the Preferred Alternative. Design Option B-2 (split-diamond interchange) was not selected. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
391	35	B	Porter	Cliff	Cascade Phillips	So it pretty well narrows it back to just one design that makes any economic sense. So you're basically looking at a 70 million estimate, 62 million estimate in today's dollars to put a split in there, that single split, or 76 million. So that's--you have to measure the benefit of, and that's the right-of-way construction and everything.	Thank you for your comment. The project team is working to analyze how the different alternatives and design options compare to the project's stated goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria. The cost-efficiency of the project is an objective under Goal 1: Transportation/Operations (see Chapter 2 of the SDEIS).
392	35	B	Porter	Cliff	Cascade Phillips	And I think at this point the right-of-way and the displacement, that portion of it, and the acquiring--the relocating business there is probably low. That's my opinion. But-- and I don't know what the number-- I know it's low if it doesn't include Emmertt's property, which is on the other side. They're in the northwest corner. So I don't know which number they're using in this study, but	Both the Right-of-Way Technical Report and the Executive Summary list the estimated cost of the right-of-way anticipated for the project. The information is most easily found in the Executive Summary, Table 1. The total estimated cost for right-of-way for the Preferred Alternative is \$216 million.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						Emmertt had a deal with Clackamas County to have the community development that was announced for 14 to 16 million for his facility, so I don't know what number is here, if that includes his and the other properties right around there. So it just seems low that the cost of the right-of-way and moving people is only ten million dollars. That's to put it there or not put it there, so I think there is an underestimation there that should be looked at again.	
393	35	B	Porter	Cliff	Cascade Phillips	That said, I have mixed feelings of whether the current estimate of 76 million, in 2013 dollars would be justified. I've been operating out of that particular spot for ten, twelve years, and so I see the flow is there. Of course, if they phase it in and they have to stop the first phase funding-wise right there, then maybe it will make sense. But it's a lot of--potentially five percent of the overall cost of the project, so how much benefit do you get out of it? I question it.	Thank you for your comment. The project team is working to analyze how the different alternatives and design options compare to the project's stated goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria. The cost-efficiency of the project is an objective under Goal 1: Transportation/Operations (see Chapter 2 of the SDEIS). In addition, a phasing strategy has been developed for the Preferred Alternative that addresses short- and long-term project implementation and responds to funding limitations.
410	35	B	Porter	Cliff	Cascade Phillips	I also question the assumptions of noise for the hill.	Please see the additional response to comment No. 35. We assume this comment refers to predicted noise levels for the "Bluff" houses. The general approach to predicting noise levels is to measure existing noise levels, model existing conditions using a standardized FHWA computer model (TNM), and compare the results to see if the model results agree with the measured results. If the model results are reasonable, then the model is used, with design information and predicted future traffic information, to predict future sound levels with the proposed project alternatives. These standard methods were used to predict the impacts expected for the Sunrise alternatives and design options. More detail on the specific methods and on the results for locations along the proposed project alignments are discussed in the Noise Report and

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
411	35	B	Porter	Cliff	Cascade Phillips	The noise, I have been dealing with trucks for many, many years. There is difference if you drive through, maintaining pace, or you are going to slow down and you are going to use your jake brakes to get off--- you are going to crawl up onto a ramp to get off, you have acceleration and jake brakes. I talked to the people about the sound and they said there is some federal formula. My comment comes down to, there will be a significant difference in noise to the people on the hillside.	the SDEIS. The noise study uses a computer model (TNM) developed by FHWA. The model uses noise data for vehicles based on a large database of actual measurements of vehicle noise levels under different conditions to predict noise levels for a specific project alternative at a given location. The model can account for the differences in noise levels due to acceleration and deceleration at signals and stop signs, and for the increased sound levels of trucks going up-grade. We included all of these effects in our analysis for the project alternatives. The use of Jake Brakes that do not comply with EPA standards is not legal. If this type of noise is an ongoing problem in the project area, the local enforcement agencies should be contacted. You are correct that there will be a substantial increase in sound levels for some houses on the hillside north of the proposed alignment. Your statement is consistent with the results of the noise study reported in the SDEIS.
405	35	B	Porter	Cliff	Cascade Phillips	There is significant wildlife habitat that will break it up more, but I don't know enough about it, that's a pro and a con.	The Lawnfield alignment would convert areas used for wildlife refuge to roadway use (see p.143-146 and p. 151 of the SDEIS). ODOT, Clackamas County, and ODFW are working together to try to avoid impacts when possible and minimize or mitigate impacts when they are unavoidable. The FEIS presents an updated analysis for the Preferred Alternative and proposes mitigation measures for unavoidable impacts (See Chapter 3, Biology).
397	35	B	Porter	Cliff	Cascade Phillips	...if it comes down to doing that single midpoint, there might be at that point an opportunity to sit down with the County and decide whether we want to leave it broken up into separate parcels or consolidate what's left over and actually reduce the take necessary, thus I might benefit and the County benefits, because they have to take less land as a result of design, given the current	The Midpoint Interchange has been selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Impacts associated with the Preferred Alternative are analyzed in the FEIS. ODOT is willing to work with the property owners to consolidate the parcels and to take less land. This

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						design.	coordination work is normally done as part of the Preliminary Engineering (PE) for the Preferred Alternative.
398	35	B	Porter	Cliff	Cascade Phillips	I was talking to one of the transportation designers earlier and they said the midpoint, that final little design, and they drew a little loop off of 142nd [<i>did commenter mean 124th?</i>] to provide access to some of those properties to reduce the take, they said, we didn't put a ton of time into that. If it's decided that the midpoint is going to go in, which is a bigger picture decision, then I was hoping to get on record that at that point I want to be involved in the designing of that intersection.	Access would be via public street extending west from SE 124th Ave. Construction of a "hammerhead" cul-de-sac at west end of this street, instead of standard circular cul-de-sac will minimize property needed for street/emergency service provider purposes. The County will work with the property owner in developing the new access road and cul-de-sac.
416	36	B	Arnold	Lewis	Real Estate Broker	But I feel that because the freeway access was so terribly important and the original instance to get people to come into the Lawnfield area, that it's terribly important to maintain that freeway access as best you can.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
417	36	B	Arnold	Lewis	Real Estate Broker	Now, there are two alternative ways of getting to the freeway. And in talking with these gentleman and others, it's very important to maintain those access points. One is to go up the hill to the north and make a connection to 97th and Miller Drive, whatever it is, and then it goes up to Sunnybrook where they can get on the freeway going north or south, or they continue down Sunnybrook to 82nd drive and sneak around and get back on the new freeway, and also to get onto the Milwaukie Expressway	Thank you for your comment. The Preferred Alternative has been chosen and incorporates both the northern Lawnfield connection and the Tolbert connection. These connections were chosen as they are reasonable alternative access points when the existing single access point is removed by construction of the Sunrise Project.
418	36	B	Arnold	Lewis	Real Estate Broker	If neither one of these alternatives is built, then there will only be one--one way out of the area and it will be to go down through a rather circuitous route to Highway 224, Industrial Way. There are plans for improving Industrial Way, but it will isolate the Lawnfield area.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
415	36	B	Arnold	Lewis	Real Estate Broker	If the connection is from Industrial Way across on the railroad tracks and then onto Tolbert and then on 82nd Drive, that will improve freeway access in a southbound	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						direction, but it's a long, long route to get down there, and it is not as easy to get onto the new expressway and the Milwaukie Expressway as it is to go up the hill to get to Sunnybrook and also to I-205.	Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
419	36	B	Arnold	Lewis	Real Estate Broker	If both of those connections are made, then that area will remain viable and vital and the values will be maintained in the properties. It will be easy to get the employees in and out and it will be easy to get products in and out. Oregon Iron Works relies heavily, very heavily on the freeway to get its products in and out. They've been trying to get rail access. It's very, very difficult to get it. And the only way is to go across the Super Fund site that adjoins the property, and that's not been able to be done. So I hope that the powers that be will decide that the very best thing to do is to fund both of these accesses to 205 and keep the area vital.	Two alternative accesses were part of the SDEIS and were include in the Preferred Alternative to mitigate for the closure of access at Lawnfield and 82nd Drive: Lawnfield North (to SE 97th Avenue) and the Tolbert Crossing, which would include a bridge over the railroad tracks from the Lawnfield industrial area to 82nd Drive. Both of these options would provide another access for the industrial area as well as alternative access to I-205. - Lawnfield North provides better access to I-205 via the Sunnybrook Interchange. - The Tolbert Crossing provides better access to local business and service providers
420	37	B	Ahrend	Brent	Group Mackenzie for Fred Meyer Stores	With the current five-lane concept for SE 82nd Drive, widening would occur mostly on the west side, impacting the Fred Meyer frontage. A loss of 24 feet from the site frontage would eliminate an entire row of parking in the most heavily used area. The two existing driveways to 82nd Drive only have a throat length of 75, which would be shortened by one vehicle length. This would result in additional impacts to on-site queuing and potentially impact traffic on 82nd Drive.	The SDEIS Build Alternative for 82nd Drive had a problem with traffic operations at its intersection with OR 212/224. Due to poor performance at this intersection in 2030, additional refinement alternatives for 82nd Drive were developed with participation from the public and business communities. One of the refinement alternatives was selected as the Preferred Alternative based in large part on improved traffic operations at this intersection. The Preferred Alternative will impact this property in a manner that is similar to the one mentioned in the comment.
421	37	B	Ahrend	Brent	Group Mackenzie for Fred Meyer Stores	The Mid-point interchange is important for truck access to and from the Fred Meyer Warehouse Facility. Either the single or split interchange options would be acceptable. Without an interchange, trucks would not be able to take advantage of the new Sunrise highway	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						project, and travel to and from the east would have a circuitous route as trucks would need to use the Rock Creek interchange.	
422	37	B	Ahrend	Brent	Group Mackenzie for Fred Meyer Stores	Only options with Mid-Point interchange should be considered. Either the single or split options are acceptable.	Thank you for your comment. The single interchange at SE 122nd Ave. was selected in the Preferred Alternative. Design Option B-2 (split-diamond interchange) was not selected. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1274	38	B	Bricker	Scott	Bicycle Transportation Alliance	. . . We hope the county will take the opportunity presented by this project to emphasize and prioritize additions to the non-motorized transportation network in this part of the region	Sidewalks and bike paths are provided within the study area. Additionally, a multi-use path connecting the I-205 path on the west and Rock Creek on the east is included in the Preferred Alternative.
1275	38	B	Bricker	Scott	Bicycle Transportation Alliance	1 of 2 changes recommended: ... it appears that the otherwise excellent continuation of the I-205 path through the project area is broken by gaps and crossings at Hwy 212, McKinley and Roots Rd. If the path is in fact continuously separated here, we would appreciate seeing a more detailed map that confirms this. Otherwise, this should be remedied.	There are no gaps, within the project area, of the I-205 multi-use path. The only crossing at a signalized intersection occurs at the crossing of Oregon 212 and is due to the lack of right-of-way to provide a grade separated crossing for the path.
1276	38	B	Bricker	Scott	Bicycle Transportation Alliance	2 of 2 changes recommended: the multi-use path stops at 122nd Avenue, rather than continuing to connect Rock Creek and Damascus. Residents of these areas would value today, and will certainly value in our uncertain economic and energy future, safe and direct access to our region's active transportation network alongside the safe and direct access a new Sunrise Highway would provide to our region's auto network.	In addition to the bicycle and pedestrian facilities studied in the SDEIS, the Preferred Alternative adds bicycle and pedestrian facilities east of 122nd to the Rock Creek Junction.
991	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Further, there are many in the environmental community of the region who are concerned about the corridor impacts to fish and wildlife habitat, open space corridors, wetlands, upland forests, surface water management and not least neighborhood sustainability and protection (not to mention the aspects of growth inducing impacts)	Thank you for this comment. The designers, traffic analysis, and environmental team worked together to recommend a Preferred Alternative that avoids or minimizes impacts to natural and cultural resources.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
993	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Salmon species are currently blocked from access to the Kellogg-Mt. Scott Watershed due to the McLoughlin Blvd (US 99E) Crossing (Dam) in the estuary downtown Milwaukie. The Sunrise Corridor is a major growth-inducing capital impact on the north Clackamas Urban area and will exacerbate the lack of fish access into the 4(d), ESA-listed streams, watershed and needs to be resolved as part of any first phase of freeway or interchange construction.	The dam at the mouth of Kellogg Creek creates a partial barrier to fish movement and is located outside of the Sunrise Corridor project area. It is not addressed as part of the project. The City of Milwaukie has initiated a separate program to address fish passage at the dam. New and replacement stream crossings in the Sunrise Corridor will comply with state and federal regulations, which require maintenance of fish passage. Therefore, the project is not expected to create new fish migration barriers, and will improve passage at retrofitted culverts.
995	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	...the loss of hydric lands and wetlands will adversely impact the ability of the watershed to capture and replenish the water table and feed our Kellogg-Mt. Scott stream network during the dry months.	These water courses should continue to receive groundwater recharge, via surface infiltration and recharge from flowing streams, beyond the limits of the proposed Corridor. Most recharge to these streams in the primary groundwater recharge areas is anticipated to be unaffected by construction of the Corridor. Clearly, groundwater recharge capacity will be impacted in those areas where existing drainage courses are located, however, there are bioengineered controls that can be implemented to reduce the impacts to groundwater recharge and flow of these streams, as well as establishing artificial recharge areas to maintain recharge to the existing hydrologic pattern, and in some cases, greatly improve conditions by allowing controlled infiltration at key points where recharge is anticipated to be most beneficial. With the exception of localized dewatering during construction of Corridor segments where shallow groundwater could be encountered, groundwater extraction is not planned.
994	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	The loss of forest canopy over the years, along with urbanization, compaction and expansive hardscape has had a serious impact on the historic fish habitat. As some of the old-timers know, Clackamas used to be called	The existing culvert under I-205 was retrofitted for fish passage, but not wildlife. The existing east-west wildlife corridor, between Rock Creek, Mt. Talbert, and the Kellogg Creek drainage area, currently

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						Marshfield for a good reason! Further, the construction of I-205 and its various upgrades (such as the braided interchange of Sunnyside/Sunnybrook Blvds) has blocked the historical east-west wildlife corridor between North Clackamas Park/3 Creeks Natural Areas and the Mt. Talbert and bluff areas above the proposed Sunrise Corridor. The wildlife corridor needs to be better defined (to include the dynamics of the Oatfield Ridge and Johnson City-Hearthwood wetlands corridors) and the current, narrow and tunnel-like "box culvert" under I-205 cannot be justified as a proper wildlife crossing and fish habitat.	successfully accommodates wildlife movement through this area. The Dean Creek undercrossing under I-205 provides continuation of wildlife corridor to the west (Kellogg Creek).
1010	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Further, as I have been involved in the neighborhood planning activity of our CPO since 2001, its been the opinion of many neighbors that neither the county, ODOT nor Metro have really take time to clearly understand the impacts and opportunities on our local street network and how it will be affected by lack of connectivity, street closures and increased traffic impacts, etc.	As it relates to the Sunrise Project, the project process has provided many opportunities for input from affected communities, including having the benefit of Mr. Russell being an appointed member of the Public Advisory Committee (PAC). All neighborhood impacts brought to the attention of this project were considered in development of the Preferred Alternative.
1016	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Specific detailed street circulation concepts and options have not been fully vetted, including ideas presented by neighbors, such as myself, a former public land use planner for cities and counties and involved in regional transportation planning.	The project team has considered and analyzed specific concepts introduced by project stakeholders. Concepts that have shown potential to meet the Purpose and Need of the project have been analyzed and studied for feasibility. Some of these stakeholder concepts have been added to the Preferred Alternative.
1017	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Of interest to many is what will happen along the Milwaukie Expressway and the local surface intersections (Lake/Johnson, Lake/Webster, Rusk), and the interchange circulation around Roots/McKinley/Clackamas/Hood and 82nd Drive	The design in the I-205 area (along the Milwaukie Expressway and 82nd Drive) has been modified in the Preferred Alternative in response to concerns about traffic performance and impacts in this area. See Chapter 2 for a description of the Preferred Alternative.
1005	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	The NCCA has been told by county staff that Lake Road will be dead-ended on the west side of Johnson Road, thereby creating an approx. one mile dead end arterial. This is totally absurd and a mockery of the planning	The design you are suggesting was reviewed as part of the SDEIS refinement process. Roadway improvements resulting from this process have been included in the Preferred Alternative, as described in

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						process.	the FEIS.
997	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	The intersection along the Expressway noted are also very congested and exacerbated by the North Clackamas School District bus program. This is causing inconveniences on the neighborhood streets during many hours of the day. The region and state and county should be working with the district to relocate the bus transportation yard to a more industrial area that does not impact residential streets.	The School district is looking at moving its bus facility. However, the timing of this move will be based on availability of school district funding. As part of the upgrading of Johnson and Lake Roads, the project team is working with the School District on access to Webster Road. The Preferred Alternative for this area that would relieve the congestion by adding through lanes to OR 224, removing the northbound approach from Johnson Road to Highway 224 and moving this approach to Pheasant Court and Highway 224.
1012	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	The intersection along the Expressway noted are also very congested and exacerbated by the North Clackamas School District bus program. This is causing inconveniences on the neighborhood streets during many hours of the day. The region and state and county should be working with the district to relocate the bus transportation yard to a more industrial area that does not impact residential streets.	See response to Entry # 997.
992	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	For example, rather than filling wetlands and hydric soil areas or needs to gain elevation by filling, many of these acres could be considered for joint use (such as parking school buses under bridge ramps). Many of these acres near the Milwaukie Expressway/I-205 interchange (and now the Sunrise) would be ideal for waste water treatment facilities and surface water runoff treatment areas (prior to release of urban storm runoff into the creeks).	Project designers will seek to minimize wetland impacts through efficient use of development area within the constraints of engineering standards and regulations. State and federal regulations limit the placement of water treatment and detention facilities within the wetlands. Some water detention facilities have been located within interchange areas, and under structures. See Entry #435.
1013	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	As far as interchange designs, the Roots/McKinley/Clackamas Road local link needs to the Business Corridor of 82nd Drive have not been well thought out. The plans call for yet another time delay signal and mega intersection with 82nd Drive and the freeway ramps and local traffic. The roadway leading from the freeway is now 8 lanes wide at the intersection	The design you are suggesting was reviewed as part of the SDEIS refinement process. Roadway improvements resulting from this process have been included in the Preferred Alternative, as described in the FEIS.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						with 82nd Drive and still creates congestion and a pedestrian no man's land. It is not safe and having more lanes (as many as 7 lanes nb/sb) only makes the intersection worse. It will be worse than the Sunnyside/82nd Ave intersection everyone belly-aches about being too much.	
1015	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	We should not be mixing local traffic with traffic designed for the Clackamas Industrial Sanctuary or Damascus. If ODOT, Metro and County wish to retain freeway access in this area from I 205 to points east of 82nd Drive and the r/r (industrials, Damascus, Mt. Hood destinations), they should decouple it with 82nd Drive signals and create new local streets on Clackamas and Roots Road to cross over I-205 independently of the interchange. The interchange traffic should go over 82nd Drive and have mini loops just east of 82nd Drive (east of McD's and through the dirty book store in the back of the shopping center--creating a new frontage/retail exposures) to provide access to the business/shopping corridor of 82nd Drive by local streets to the north and south. This might entail some r/w acquisition through the shopping centers south of the highway (the Fred Meyer Center and the neighborhood center east of Fred Meyer). Such a semi-flyover 82nd Drive and elimination of the present access to McKinley/Roots-Clackamas, would eliminate ALL SIGNALS and return 82nd Drive as a local shopping street which would not need to be more than 3 lanes wide (with perhaps some additional left turn capacity at the existing signal at Fred Meyer and at Hood Street, the post office). There would be a new signal at Clackamas Rd.	From a roadway design standpoint, it is not feasible to cross Roots Road or Clackamas Road over I-205. The vertical alignments are not possible without lowering the elevation of I-205. Even if the elevation of I-205 were lowered, the north/south roadways between I-205 and 82nd Drive would have to be severed as they could not become intersections due to access spacing requirements.
1006	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	I have tried to point out this option a number of times to county road designers--the last time being last January at the first IAMP meeting sponsored by the county.	Thank you for your comments and input.
998	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens	Our neighborhood needs more exacting plans and a serious attempt to look at deviations and alternatives just as much as Metro, the County and ODOT want to study	The specific purpose of the proposed Sunrise Project is to effectively address the existing congestion and safety problems in the OR 212/224 corridor

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Association	how many interchanges to permit along I-205 and the Sunrise (such as the midpoint interchange vs. no midpoint interchange, etc.)	<p>between its interchange with I-205 and Rock Creek Junction, and to serve the growing demand for regional travel and access to the state highway system. The midpoint interchange is located in a place that would not cause weaving/merging problems to occur on the Sunrise Project.</p> <p>Many people in and around the project area have other transportation issues relating to their neighborhoods. The local city and county jurisdictions have better opportunity to directly address these issues through their transportation system planning processes - which also have a public involvement component.</p>
1007	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	I think the message of the council to the county administration and the County's Board of Commissioners is that the project alternatives are not yet ready to move forward because they need more refinement before scoping of alternatives is complete. Therefore, the preparation of the DEIS should be held in abeyance until more details are worked out satisfactory to the city, neighborhood and environmental community.	One of the purposes of the public hearing process is to obtain input from affected citizens and agencies to assist in appropriate refinements to the selected alternative. Any impacts resulting from these refinements are covered in the Final EIS for this project. As a part of the refinement process, focused contacts with directly affected communities have occurred.
1018	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	The Sunrise Corridor discussion has talked about a new access road to 82nd Ave (Deer place, north of the K Mart complex) but nothing west of Johnson Rd. Now is the time to address the problems of mixing through traffic needs with circulation.	The design of the Preferred Alternative incorporates improvements over that of the alternatives studied in the SDEIS that will minimize right-of-way impacts while maintaining a functioning interchange at I-205.
1014	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	There is plenty of opportunity for access from the east (of I205) through the 92nd/97th corridor if planned properly. Unfortunately, the ODOT and county and Metro did not plan for a proper north-south corridor from Johnson Creek Blvd. to the Clackamas Highway on the east side of I205 and allowed it to be blocked by commercial development and medical complexes. However, many west of the freeway don't think that blockage should be their problem and become their accessibility burden on the 82nd corridor.	Thank you for your comment and input.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
1000	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	There is serious noise and dirty air impacts and I-205 noise will increase particularly along homes on the west side of I-205 from Strawberry Lane north to the Expressway. Some homes have no protection or noise attenuation presently as the freeway construction of the 70's did not require as much mitigation. Where there are soundwalls, most of the residential properties have experienced higher property values and maintenance upkeep.	Please refer to the Noise Report on pages 45 and 46 for noise prediction sites 16 through 52, and page 50 for a description of future sound levels in this area. Please refer to the Noise Report on page 65 for the description of recommended noise walls for inclusion in the project (Walls 1, 2 and 4), and Figures F1 and F2. In summary, the Build alternatives move the mainline of I-205 to the east slightly and noise levels on the west side of I-205 are projected to decrease relative to the No Build conditions. Noise walls, including replacement of the existing 6-foot noise wall near Hwy 212 and I-205 are recommended for inclusion in the project. Strawberry Lane is somewhat south of the anticipated project limits. Please refer to the portions of the noise report cited to determine the limits of the sound walls recommended.
1008	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	The major project will impact our community for the next 50 to 100 years and we want it done right. We want to actively participate in the road connectivity planning and interchange details, watershed improvements to give NOAA/NMFS listed salmon species proper access to its watershed, and succinct physical concepts to protect the sustainability and integrity of our neighborhoods.	Active participation by all affected citizen and agency stakeholders has been encouraged to ensure appropriate measures are taken to protect the natural and built environments. A citizen advisory committee, public informational mailings, neighborhood meetings, local council and commission briefings, public open houses, a public hearing, and coordination with affected regulatory and resource agencies are among the techniques used to achieve this participation. The project website: www.sunrise-project.org contains up-to-date information on the project and lists opportunities to participate in the process.
1009	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Please give us more opportunity for much more involvement at the neighborhood level. I recommend at least 6 neighborhood meetings for our neighborhood, alone, and those along the 82nd Drive corridor. A six week review window and comment period for Draft SEIS is not adequate and the lead and responsible agencies are not doing enough detailed planning to the satisfaction of	See response to Entry # 1008.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						neighborhoods, businesses and property owners.	
1002	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	However, no one is bothering to discuss the funding strategy with our neighborhoods so that we all have an idea of how phasing might work, which might mean "phasing" over a 20 year period or more!	A phasing strategy has been developed for the Preferred Alternative that addresses short- and long-term project implementation and responds to funding limitations.
1003	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	The County's Comprehensive plan needs some reshaping in transportation and infusion of TOD planning for an extension of the light rail along I-205 to Oregon City. The intercity McLoughlin Corridor and Milwaukie Expressway Corridors need more attention right now than a new freeway corridor. Fix what we have before we start impacting our hinterlands. Damascus also needs serious help to fund a complete community and all community funds and assets should be sunk into another new freeway. Many wonder why we are pursuing the freeway in the first place since the region abandoned the Mt. Hood Freeway in the 70's in favor of alternative transportation solutions.	As with all comprehensive planning efforts, there are differences of opinion as to which policy direction should be taken to realize the goals of the local community. But following is true concerning the local comprehensive plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan has been acknowledged as being in compliance with the State Goals and is consistent with the Metro Functional Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan. • The City of Damascus is in the process of creating a new Comprehensive Plan and Transportation System Plan, which will be evaluated under the same standards. • The Sunrise Project, from I-205 to Rock Creek Junction, a limited-access expressway, has been identified in the regional transportation plan (RTP) for decades as a regional transportation facility need. It has been determined to have independent utility, and is strongly anticipated by the communities of Happy Valley and Damascus to achieve implementation of the planned growth identified in their respective comprehensive plans. This planned growth will be constrained if transportation improvements, including the Sunrise Project, are not constructed. This facility will likely be constructed in phases to respond to the pace of development in the corridor and not create that development.
1004	39	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens	Over the years, the Sunrise Corridor has only had a reluctant support from Metro as Metro, nor ODOT wanted to take on a lead agency status. ODOT has	Both ODOT and Metro commissioners serve on the Sunrise Corridor Policy Review Committee.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Association	already made a statement about freeways by abandoning the Westside Bypass through Washington County. Its quite one thing for our Board of Commissioners to focus on better truck access into and out of our Industrial Sanctuary through better road connectivity and more direct road access to I 205 (perhaps the Milwaukie Expressway) and reduction of freeway impacts on our local 82nd Drive shopping/business corridor (and providing neighborhood routes OVER the I-205 that do not mix with interstate traffic). Its quite another thing to think a 6 to 8 lane freeway to Mt. Hood.	In providing a 6-lane or 6-plus auxiliary lane facility between I-205 and the Rock Creek area, the congestion along Hwy 212/224, Jennifer, Sunnyside, Sunnybrook and other parallel routes decreases improving the functionality of these corridors.
1037	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	It was felt that the neighborhood was never actively solicited in the decision-making process and that the engineering seems to be ODOT-centric without our consideration given to the neighborhood.	The project team has designed the project to include multiple means of public participation. The Project Advisory Committee is composed of 18 citizens representing neighborhoods, business and civic advocacy groups, emergency services, and other stakeholder agencies in the project area, is the central focus of the public involvement effort. The PAC reviews the work completed by the Project Management Team and provides input on key decision milestones -- including reviewing and commenting on the SDEIS. Project presentations at over 20 community meetings have occurred, including at the North Clackamas, Sunnyside United Neighbors and other Clackamas Citizens' Participation Organizations. Hundreds of citizens have also participated in project open houses and a two-day design workshop. Focus meetings with area stakeholders have also been held around each of the potential interchange areas.
1066	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Such alternatives might include: extending Lake Road further south to align with the easterly leg at the 7-11 store, thereby creating a four-way intersection and possible signal warrants.	The project staff has refined the design for this area to include through lanes to OR 224, removing the northbound approach from Johnson Road to Highway 224 and moving this approach to Pheasant Court. This refinement will relieve the congestion in the area.
1067	40	B	Russell	Pat	North	Consideration of Johnson Rd area to be grade separated	The project staff has refined the design for this area

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Clackamas Citizens Association	from the Expressway, providing alternative access to 82nd Ave or the interchange plans.	to include through lanes to OR 224, removing the northbound approach from Johnson Road to Highway 224 and moving this approach to Pheasant Court. This refinement will relieve the congestion in the area. The above mentioned approach is much more cost-effective than the grade separation of Johnson Road at Milwaukie Expressway, and results in similar congestion relief.
1068	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Leaving Johnson Rd/Lake Rd intersection as is and modify the Expressway intersection design with Johnson Rd	The project staff has refined the design for this area to include through lanes to OR 224, removing the northbound approach from Johnson Road to Highway 224 and moving this approach to Pheasant Court. Simply modifying the Expressway approaches is not enough to relieve congestion in this area.
1069	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Eliminating all surface street intersection with the Expressway from Lake Road interchange west of Rusk Road all the way to the 82nd Ave interchange area. The alternative is to create a frontage road concept that would link into 82nd Ave. Johnson would go over the expressway; Pheasant Court access would be altered by a parallel access road between the Lowe's site to the Lake Road Intersection with Webster. Webster would be grade separated, keeping the Lake Road intersection (south of the expressway_ and have a second intersection at the new frontage road (on north side of the expressway). Webster would go OVER the expressway (the expressway would be partially depressed at this location to reduce noise and visual disruption and the overpass would not appear as large scale in comparison to surrounding buildings. Rusk Road would go under the Expressway (the expressway would be partially elevated where today it is at grade-the controlling factor being the floodplain level of Kellogg-Mt. Scott Creek providing positive drainage) noise impacts from the expressway would also have to be addressed if elevated.	The project staff has refined the design for this area to include through lanes to OR 224, removing the northbound approach from Johnson Road to Highway 224 and moving this approach to Pheasant Court. This refinement will relieve the congestion in the area and is more cost effective than the concept coupling a frontage road and a grade-separated interchange in this area.
1070	40	B	Russell	Pat	North	Assisting the school district in relocating its bus	The school district is currently considering relocation

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Clackamas Citizens Association	transportation yard into a more light industrial/industrial location so that it doesn't have to rely on neighborhood streets for its access as it does today (Webster Road and Rusk Rd); this reduction in street use might reduce the Webster/Lake/Expressway intersection to more tolerable levels that might persuade businesses and residents to accept the Lake Road closure at Johnson Rd	of its bus transportation yard. However, the timing of this move will be based on availability of funding. As part of the upgrading of Johnson and Lake Roads, the project team is working with the School district on access to Webster Road. The busses comprise a relatively small portion of the vehicular volume within this area, and their times of travel do not influence the most crucial time period (the evening peak hour of travel).
1038	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	President Russle suggested that ODOT and the county were avoiding the entire Milwaukie Expressway issue by not undertaking a comprehensive analysis of the corridor for the next 30 to 40 years. Planning and building the Sunrise Freeway before planning the Milwaukie Expressway/McLoughlin to PDX corridor was like "putting the horse before the cart". There really needs to be a corridor plan as part of a Region Transportation Plan. Sooner or later, it seems that the county and city of Milwaukie need to decide whether the expressway should be a major arterial or a limited access expressway.	Metro's Regional Transportation Plan is responsible for comprehensively evaluating the future transportation needs for the region and setting priorities for improvements to the regional transportation systems. The Sunrise project is an outcome of this planning process. The Build Alternatives for the Sunrise Project are designed to accommodate the Milwaukie Expressway as a fully grade-separated highway if future planning decisions so direct.
1022	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	A number of members were concerned about the loss of canopy trees and wetlands	Thank you for your comment. The project team has worked to analyze how the different alternatives and design options compare to the project's stated goals and objectives (see Chapter 2 of the SDEIS). The analysis was used as an input in the selection of the Preferred Alternative.
1021	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	With the interchanges and fill construction, the Sunrise Corridor would become a serious barrier in the area. There should be more effort to create viaducts, especially where wetlands are involved-rather than fill sections. This would open up more traffic circulation alternatives and sense of visual openness.	The Sunrise facility should not be a barrier to the existing roadway network, as all existing public roadway crossing of the Sunrise facility will be maintained with a grade separated crossing of the Sunrise facility. Existing north and south travel patterns and access points to Highway 212/224 will be also be maintained.
1071	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	With the interchanges and fill construction, the Sunrise Corridor would become a serious barrier in the area. There should be more effort to create viaducts, especially where wetlands are involved-rather than fill sections. This	The Sunrise facility should not be a barrier to the existing roadway network, as all existing public roadway crossing of the Sunrise facility will be maintained with a grade separated crossing of the

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						would open up more traffic circulation alternatives and sense of visual openness.	Sunrise facility. After the selection of the Preferred Alternative, ODOT developed a wetland mitigation plan commensurate with impacts associated with the Preferred Alternative, described in the FEIS.
1041	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Freeway traffic would NOT be able to use the Sunnybrook/Sunnyside couplet interchange ramping system because it was too close to the Sunrise. Therefore ALL the traffic is being pushed to 82nd Drive.	This change in the system is planned with the Sunrise project. The existing weaving maneuvers between the Hwy 212/224 and the Sunnyside/Sunnybrook interchange causes a large reduction in capacity of I-205 in this area. That weaving maneuver was eliminated with the Sunrise Corridor project, allowing I-205 to operate more efficiently.
1072	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Why not direct an equal amount of the traffic to the 97th Ave corridor? If ODOT and the county elevated the 92nd/97th/Stevens Road corridor from Sunnybrook all the way north to Johnson Creek Blvd, they would realize that they have allowed the blocking of this corridor due to the Kaiser Hospital, medical complex and the retail center to the north.	Thank you for your comment. However, the 97th Avenue corridor between Sunnybrook Boulevard and Johnson Creek Boulevard is not within the transportation study area of this project.
1020	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	The neighborhoods to the west of I205 should not be burdened by the poor north-south "connectivity planning" east of I205 on the part of cities, the county, region and ODOT. The only other east-west "connectivity" to service the entire area west of I 205 in the Happy Valley area was Sunnyside Rd.	The Sunrise Project is intended to "address the existing congestion and safety problems in the Highway 212/224 corridor between its interchange with I-205 and Rock Creek Junction, and to serve the growing demand for regional travel and access to the state highway system." North-south connectivity is not one of the major issues the needs to be addressed as part of the SDEIS.
1085	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	With regard to the revisions to the Clackamas Highway interchange with I 205 the group expressed concern that 82nd Drive would become a heavily traveled truck route between Milwaukie and the Industrial Sanctuary, especially if the midpoint interchange was deleted. That's because there is no other proposed access to the Milwaukie Expressway from the Sanctuary. This generally means that many of the trucks trying to get to the regional center area for deliveries will have to use 82nd Drive to 82nd Ave.	The trucks accessing the industrial area are expected to continue to use the local system. The intent of the Sunrise Project is to get the regional trips off of the local network.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
1042	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	The intersection of 82nd Drive with Clackamas Highway would become a nightmare. Today it is too wide and busy for local shopping traffic. In the meantime, 82nd Drive has only one lane in each direction to get past the Clackamas highway. This causes unacceptable delays. Sometimes local traffic must wait through 2 and 3 signal rotations to wait their turn. Also, access to the post office provides little protected left hand turn movement along 82nd Ave and from the side streets. Much of this congestion is N994 because of the Clackamas Highway creating a choke point. Building the Sunrise Freeway will not change this choke point.	The design in the I-205 area (along the Milwaukie Expressway and 82nd Drive) has been modified in the Preferred Alternative in response to concerns about traffic performance and impacts in this area. See Chapter 2 for a description of the changes. The Preferred Alternative addresses the congestion issues around the intersection of 82nd Drive and Clackamas highway by removal of the left-turn phases and the addition of signalized u-turns to the north and south on 82nd Drive. 82nd Drive is also planned to be widened to have two lanes in each direction in the future. The northbound left-turn access into the post office will no longer be possible as there will be a raised median between the northern Fred Meyer intersection and Clackamas Road. Additional improvements to circulation within the local roads are also planned.
1084	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	If the mid point interchange is provided, only some of the truck traffic would be intercepted. Other than Jennifer/Evelyn Overpass to 82nd Drive, there is no other way to get to the I205 for 90% of commuters and trucks using the Clackamas Highway. There is no convenient alternative from Damascus such as a direct parkway from the area of Lawnfield and 82nd Drive.	The majority of the trucks originating/destined for the Clackamas Industrial Area are traveling via I-205 to either the north or south. The project provides for access to both north and southbound I-205 to/from the industrial areas. Direct access to/from the industrial area to the expressway would not meet ODOT access spacing standards. With the midpoint interchange, we are still pushing the limits regarding access spacing.
1043	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	I-205 and the Sunrise Corridor will create serious blockage to already poor connectivity.	When accesses are changed, replacement access will be provided. Several parts of the project serve to improve existing access and connectivity, from the Tolbert overcrossing to the improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the corridor.
1073	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	There should be no access to the west side of the freeway into the neighborhood directly from a ramp. Local traffic should be directed to 82nd Drive and then to one or two local streets north and south of Clackamas Highway that would be extended over the freeway. One could be	From a roadway design standpoint, it is not feasible to cross Roots Road or Clackamas Road over I-205. The vertical alignments are not possible without lowering the elevation of I-205. Even if the elevation of I-205 were lowered, the north/south

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						Clackamas Rd, another might be an easterly extension of Roots Road to the Fred Meyer Shopping Center signal at 82nd Ave.	roadways between I-205 and 82nd Drive would have to be severed as they could not become intersections due to access spacing requirements.
1074	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	By providing separate local bridges over the freeway, the ODOT and county could provide flyover ramps to service I 205 which could also run OVER 82nd Drive and then create mini interchange loops to get back to 82nd Drive behind McDonalds/7-11 and the Clackamas Motel. There could be a signal at Hood Street to service post office traffic and local services. The service stations would then not have to be demolished and other corner businesses cut-off as proposed by the IAMP. 82nd Drive could likely remain a two lane arterial with generous sidewalks and street trees within the existing right of way. Additional parking could be provided under the Clackamas Highway passing over 82nd drive. This area could also be a future Transit Oriented District, should Light Rail be extended from Clackamas Town Center. This sort of highway "overpass" of 82nd Drive would eliminate any need for traffic signals along the Clackamas Highway ramps to I-205 rather than the 4 signals proposed and extremely wide intersection.	<p>From a roadway design standpoint, the mini-interchange loop ramps do not meet current roadway design standards as they do not provide safe or efficient traffic operations. In order to construct a loop that would satisfy current standards, there would be more right-of-way and access impacts than the currently proposed design.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative incorporates turning movement restrictions at the intersection of Hwy 212/224 with 82nd Drive. These turn restrictions minimize congestion within the corridor.</p> <p>Current traffic models used by Metro show the demand for a five-lane 82nd Drive. By leaving 82nd Drive at two lanes, there would not be enough capacity to serve the projected demand on this corridor.</p>
1059	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	One other side-effect of the proposed interchange improvements is that the Comfort Suites on the west side of I-205 along McKinley between Hood Street and Jefferson will be forced to use Hood Street, a residential street in the R-10 zone, in violation of the Conditional Rezone approval, establishing the use of the property, which was previously R-10.	Any access that is eliminated as part of the project must be replaced. For the Comfort Suites, the best place to provide this access is from adjacent Hood Street. Normally this change would be allowed because it is the result of a proposed project that eliminates the existing access point.
1027	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	One other side-effect of the proposed interchange improvements is that the Comfort Suites on the west side of I-205 along McKinley between Hood Street and Jefferson will be forced to use Hood Street, a residential street in the R-10 zone, in violation of the Conditional Rezone approval, establishing the use of the property, which was previously R-10.	The access change to the Comfort Suites site is needed to improve traffic operations on the west side of the Clackamas Interchange.
1075	40	B	Russell	Pat	North	One other alternative is to buy the land use and convert it	While some changes to the access of the Comfort

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Clackamas Citizens Association	into some sort of more compatible neighborhood use, such as a senior housing project. However, this could easily be served by Clackamas Rd.	Suites to McKinley Avenue will be necessary, the purchase of this property is not required in order to build the Sunrise Project.
1039	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	During the approximate one-hour informal discussions, there were a number of other detailed questions/concerns that were brought up, but not fully recorded. The group generally felt that there were many outstanding issues that could really use more detailed planning, before ODOT is granted its freeway concepts and the final certification of the SDEIS and the subsequent IAMP.	During the course of the project over 20 community meetings have occurred, including at the North Clackamas, Sunnyside United Neighbors and other Clackamas Citizens' Participation Organizations. The project team has had many discussions about transportation issues in and around the project area. These comments and conversations may not be part of the formal comment record. The public comment period for the SDEIS ran from October 13 - November 26, 2008. Nearly 200 comments were received from individuals, agencies and businesses and are responded to specifically in the FEIS.
1044	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Change to Lake Road (being terminated w/o of Johnson)? Will anything be done about Webster Road/Lake Road/Milwaukie Intersection. Where will all the office traffic on Lake Road go? We don't want people driving through streets like Tiara/Topaz to Thiessen to Johnson to get eastbound. Webster is bad enough now, it will get worse if all the traffic has to go to and from Webster. ODOT is just passing the problems into the neighborhood.	The design you are suggesting was reviewed as part of the SDEIS refinement process. Roadway improvements resulting from this process have been included in the Preferred Alternative, as described in the FEIS.
1045	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Some curiosity about 83rd/84th and the Sunrise WB to NB 82nd Ave and why "flies" past the Johnson/Deer Lane/82nd intersection.	This ramp is intended to connect westbound Sunrise traffic with northbound 82nd Avenue. Travelers destined for the commercial/industrial area north of Milwaukie Expressway and west of 82nd Drive will remain on the Sunrise Project and turn north onto either Johnson, Webster or Pheasant.
1046	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Why I-205 is widened and moved eastward, affecting Clackamas Elementary.	The primary reason for widening/moving I-205 to the east was to avoid displacement of approximately 30-35 single-family residences on the west side of I-205, including some Section 8 low-moderate income housing. Widening I-205 symmetrically (on both east and west sides) would have adversely impacted both sides of highway.
1047	40	B	Russell	Pat	North	How does the spaghetti bowl work, with signals and then	Traffic signals on the Sunrise Project/Milwaukie

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Clackamas Citizens Association	without signals. When signals go away, what happens to Milwaukie Expressway?	Expressway ramps would be removed when the Milwaukie Expressway becomes a future grade-separated facility.
1076	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Eliminate surface street intersections with SR 224 Expressway. Were there are other design concepts if all the signals along the express way go away new frontage roads, especially between Lake Road/Expressway interchange to the Johnson Road links that would get people to 82nd Ave. Other option is to use Lake Road as the connector from International Way to Johnson road and Johnson Road would go over the expressway, only access to expressway would be from 82nd Ave. Would have to provide a small frontage road to Pheasant Court traffic to tie into Webster? If so, how would local traffic worth of expressway get on to the expressway and over to 82nd Ave and onto I205 and also onto the Sunrise?	The project staff has refined the design for this area to include additional through lanes on OR 224, removing the southern approach to Johnson Road at OR 224 and rerouting this approach to Pheasant Court. This refinement will relieve the congestion in the area. The above mentioned approach is much more cost effective than the frontage road coupled with grade separated interchange concept and is expected to relieve the predicted congestion in this area.
1048	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	What's going on with Harmony Rd and the r/r crossing? What issues are being raised?	The Harmony Road project, including the railroad crossing, is on hold. The project will likely be on hold until funding is available to construct the Preferred Alternative. Meanwhile, the County is working with Clackamas Community College and the N. Clackamas Park District in developing a master plan for this site. The Harmony Road master plan looks at the design of the Sunnybrook extension.
1049	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Is Sunnybrook going west of 82nd Ave south of the Aquatic Center?	The County is working with Clackamas Community College and the N. Clackamas Park District in developing a master plan for this site. This project looks at the design of the Sunnybrook extension. The extension is proposed to be constructed south of the Aquatic Center.
1060	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Will there be another way to get to the mall without using 82nd, especially north of the expressway?	Sunnyside Road will remain as a viable alternative to the Sunrise Project for those originating/destined to the east of its intersection with Hwy 212. For those originating/destined west of the Sunnyside/Hwy 212 intersection, Clackamas Hwy to 82nd Drive and 82nd Avenue will remain as a viable alternative to the Sunrise for access to/from the Clackamas Town

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							Center.
1050	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Will Strawberry Lane be built to the normal county standards? Currently the state opted NOT to build sidewalks and bike lanes when they raised the bridge over the freeway 2 years ago, also will there be a signal at 82nd drive and Strawberry Lane?	Strawberry Lane is not within the study area of this project. Please contact Clackamas County's transportation department for additional information in this area.
1051	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	How will ODOT prevent cut through traffic in the neighborhood during rush hour. People use Johnson Rd, Roots Rd, and Webster to get to Gladstone and Oregon City.	A side effect of creating a faster route between Milwaukie and the Clackamas Industrial area is that it shifts cut through traffic back onto the major roads and off of the local roadway network.
1052	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Why isn't Milwaukie Expressway being upgraded with interchanges first (before Sunrise)	Milwaukie Expressway between 99E and Rusk Road operates much better than Milwaukie Expressway within the limits of this project area. In improving the interchange at I-205, Milwaukie Expressway will also benefit.
1053	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	The interchange seems confusing, what kind of signage will there be?	Signage will be compliant with the most current Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).
1036	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Will all the improvements around the interchange be done at once?	It is likely the Sunrise Project will be built in phases over time as increments of funding become available. Some funding is already programmed to begin a first phase of the project.
1061	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Or if not, what plans are there to provide better access into the Clackamas Industrial Park, west of the r/r? There is too much choking of traffic to 82nd Dr/Clackamas Highway (SR212/224). We have to wait too long just to get across the freeway to get to the gas station or Fred Meyer. Or get to businesses between Lawnfield and Clackamas Highway.	The design you are suggesting was reviewed as part of the SDEIS refinement process. Roadway improvements resulting from this process have been included in the Preferred Alternative, as described in the FEIS.
1054	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Why does Damascus traffic have to use 82nd Ave? Rather than use 97th Ave around its intersection with Mather Rd. The road is already there as collector street and it just needs some widening and sidewalks.	Route choice for vehicles is based on state of the art Traffic Demand Modeling software maintained by Metro. This model is widely accepted as the most accurate way of determining route choice.
1086	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas	Are hairpin turns as desirable as diamond interchanges for trucks?	Hairpin turns are not desirable for trucks. The design of this project is based off of the most

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Citizens Association		current "AASHTO - A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets" standards concurrently with ODOT Design Standards.
1087	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	If trucks are coming from the north to make a delivery on 82nd Dr (between Lawnfield and the Clackamas Hwy), how do they get there? The same 82nd Dr/Clackamas Hwy intersection.	There are four (4) ways for trucks from the north to access 82nd Dr. : 1) 82nd Ave. turns directly into 82nd Dr. 2) I-205 to Sunnybrook Blvd. interchange >> new North Lawnfield Rd. Extension >> Tolbert Rd. >> 82nd Dr. >> OR 212/224; or, from new North Lawnfield Rd. Extension >> Industrial Way/Clackamas Rd., SE 102nd Ave. >> OR 212/224 3) I-205 to Milwaukie Expressway >> Johnson Rd. >> Deer Creek Ln >> 82nd Ave. >> 82nd Dr. 4) I-205 to Clackamas Hwy interchange (OR 212/224) >> 82nd Dr.
1088	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	If all the trucks are being directed to the western Clackamas Industrial Sanctuary via the Clackamas Highway interchange, is there a way to get them over or under 82nd Drive so the intersection can be used more by locals? Such as right turn loops on the north and south sides of the highway. That way fewer businesses would be impacted.	Right turn loops in this location are not feasible for trucks as it would cause greater business impacts than the current design.
1077	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	We could put a signal on Hood street for local traffic and left turns. The street would be reserved for "locals". We wouldn't need 10 wide intersections. The highway could return to 6 lanes, 2 through and one exclusive right turn.	Signalizing Hood street would not only fail to meet jurisdictional standards for minimum signal spacing, but it would also create a safety issue with northbound traffic on 82nd Drive being stopped by the new signal at Hood Street and queuing back into and through the Hwy 212/224 intersection.
1062	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Is the Comfort Suites going to have their driveway closed and all traffic forced to the residential side of the street? How will the hotel behind the Chevron gain access, along with Denny's?	The Comfort Suites access to McKinley Road is proposed to be closed. The only access available would be Hood St. that is adjacent to the site. Access to Denny's and the hotel will have right-in and right-out only access. In addition, local streets can be used to access 82nd Drive via Tolbert Road, which will be signalized.
1089	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas	If trucks are coming from Milwaukie Expressway, how will they access 82nd Drive and then the area east of the r/r?	This trip could be made in multiple ways: 1) Make an eastbound left at Johnson, then a right

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Citizens Association		at Deer Creek Lane then a right onto 82nd Ave which will turn into 82nd Drive, then a left onto the Tolbert Road extension to get to the east side of the railroad tracks. 2) Make the eastbound right turn onto a loop ramp from Milwaukie Expressway to northbound 82nd Ave, then a right onto Sunnybrook boulevard and then another right at 97th Avenue onto the new Lawnfield north extension being built as a part of this project.
1055	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	What are the speed for the flyovers?	The ramps are designed for a maximum speed of 45-50 mph, although ramp speeds are normally not posted.
1090	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	If the trucks are coming from the south on I205 into the Industrial Sanctuary, why is it all directed to the Clackamas Highway Interchange? With Evelyn/Jennifer improvements, cant these trucks be intercepted?	If trucks coming from the south are destined for the Lawnfield Industrial area, they could take the exit following the Hwy 212/224 exit and gain access directly onto 82nd Drive. This would allow them to bypass the 82nd Drive/Hwy 212/224 intersection. If they are destined for areas along Hwy 212/224 between I-205 and 122nd avenue they would have to exit I-205 onto Hwy 212/224. If they are destined for areas along Hwy 212/224 east of 122nd Avenue and a midpoint interchange is provided, they could exit I-205 onto the Sunrise Project eastbound and exit the Sunrise Project at the midpoint.
1078	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Why not connect Roots Road directly to 82nd Drive over I-205 to the midblock signal, and eliminate Roots Rd access to the interchange at McKinley? Same for Clackamas Rd. We don't want these roads being used for direct access to the interchange. McKinley would be vacated between Roots Rd and Hood Street. Jefferson would only have access from Johnson Rd and dead ended at McKinley. The Comfort Suites would have a driveway access to the interchange signal at the off-on ramps, better yet, it could be converted to other use such as senior housing. It doesn't belong in the neighborhood.	From a roadway design standpoint, it is not feasible to cross Roots Road or Clackamas Road over I-205. The vertical alignments are not possible without lowering the elevation of I-205. Even if the elevation of I-205 were lowered, the north/south roadways between I-205 and 82nd Drive would have to be severed as they could not become intersections due to access spacing requirements.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						The goal is to protect the single family homes and R10 zoning from speculation.	
1079	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Jannsen could also be extended over the freeway	From an engineering standpoint, Jannsen cannot be extended over I-205 due to grade and access limitations.
1080	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Should 82nd Ave remain a 45mph "highway" or convert it into a tree lined urban street-with raised median planters in the center. If Lake Road is being cut off, maybe there should be a road from Johnson through the Schellenberg campus to connect with 82nd Drive/Ave. 82nd Drive/Ave needs to be a more pedestrian friendly street. Since it is no longer going to be a "freeway" linking into the I 205, it cant be tamed into a local collector street rather than a 7 lane freeway. Not all our local traffic has to be directed behind Kmart to get to and from the Mall. Give the neighborhood more options.	The design you are suggesting was reviewed as part of ODOT's Interchange Area Management Planning process. Roadway improvements resulting from this process have been included in the Preferred Alternative, as described in the FEIS. 82nd Ave and 82nd Drive within the study area will be designed with pedestrian friendly side walks and bicycle friendly lanes/shoulders.
1063	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Is McDonald's and 7-11 going to have access to 82nd Drive directly?	The intersection of OR 212/224 and 82nd Drive will need to be widened to accommodate additional lanes. In addition, the existing accesses for McDonald's and 7-11 are too close to the 82nd Drive / OR-212/224 intersection. Therefore, both McDonalds' and 7-11 are expected to be acquired and relocated as part of ROW purchases associated with this project.
1064	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	What happens to the gas station at the corner? Will the hotel at the SE corner of the highway and 82nd Drive and the adult book store have direct access to 82nd Drive? It appears to have access to US Bank, Elmer's, the hotel, Adult store will have to get access from the mid-block signal leading in the Fred Meyer Center?	The intersection of OR 212/224 and 82nd Drive will need to be widened to accommodate additional lanes. In addition, the existing access for the gas station is too close to the 82nd Drive / OR 212/224 intersection. Therefore, the gas station is expected to be acquired and relocated as part of ROW purchases associated with this project. US Bank is located within the proposed ROW and is expected to be relocated as part of ROW purchases associated with this project. Access changes are expected to occur for Elmer's as part of ROW purchases associated with this project.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							The hotel and the adult store are expected to experience minimal ROW impacts as part of this project.
1056	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Why is the link between the Clackamas Highway and Lawnfield jogging and jiggig? Can't there be a more direct route for trucks and commerce? Since Lawnfield isn't going to cross over the r/r and directly access I-205, the Sunrise or Milwaukie Expressway, it should be part of the north south link from Sunnybrook to the Clackamas highway going under the freeway.	Roadway improvements in the Lawnfield Business Area are a combination of new roadways and improvements to existing local roadways. Existing local roads (SE 102nd Ave., Clackamas Road, and Industrial Way) are being improved to make them more truck-friendly. These improvements, in conjunction with a connection under the Sunrise Project to a realigned Lawnfield Rd. and new North Lawnfield Rd. extension to Sunnybrook Blvd./I-205, will provide for convenient access through the area and access to OR 212/224 and I-205. A proposed overcrossing of the UPRR tracks via Tolbert Rd., connecting Lawnfield Rd./Industrial Way and 82nd Dr., and OR 212/224/I-205, will provide further access and connectivity opportunities.
1081	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Use the existing 97th alignment toward Mather and then drop down to the Clackamas hwy east of 102nd. Intercept WB Damascus traffic before Camp Wythecombe and move it to Sunnybrook rather than forcing it all down 82nd aver.	This would increase cut through traffic on a local industrial roadway. The intent is not to create cut through traffic, but to place trips on the appropriate facilities (local trips on local roadways, and regional trips on regional roadways).
1091	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Would it be better to extend Oak Bluff Ave (east side of Costco) through Precision Parts campus, continue south and then turn west to directly key into the Johnson/Deer Creek intersection, going over the r/r at right angle- instead of extending 83rd south over the r/r as a dead-end street? Then trucks could get directly to Johnson from Precision Castparts and other businesses around Costco without using 82nd Ave. Also this route would get traffic into the Promenade and 93rd aver, thereby splitting the traffic around the south side of the mall. The issue here is that the Damascus accessibility flyovers are pushing too much traffic onto 82nd Ave and they are extremely expensive bridge structures.	The roadway through Precision Cast Parts (PCP) campus is a private road. It is unlikely PCP will be receptive to designation of this road for public use. Regardless, provision for a full access intersection at Deer Creek Ln. and 82nd Ave. will cause that intersection to fail. Extension of Deer Creek Ln. through 82nd Ave. will conflict with the on-ramp to 82nd Ave. from Sunrise Project. (See Entry # 891.)
1057	40	B	Russell	Pat	North	Also this route would get traffic into the Promenade and	The proposed design responds to travel patterns as

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Clackamas Citizens Association	93rd Ave, thereby splitting the traffic around the south side of the mall. The issue here is that the Damascus accessibility flyovers are pushing too much traffic onto 82nd Ave and they are extremely expensive bridge structures.	understood from the Metro travel demand model. While Damascus traffic will be using the Sunrise Facility, there is also a large demand for freight travel through this corridor.
1028	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	There is too much noise from the Expressway spilling noise south into the Westwood neighborhood (south of the Alder Creek Middle School and homes between Johnson Road and Webster Road). Same as the Rusk Rd neighborhood.	Noise walls are proposed on the south side of the Milwaukie Expressway as it approaches the I-205 interchange. However, they are not intended to protect the referenced neighborhoods from noise related to this Expressway because these receptors are beyond the limits of the Sunrise Project.
1029	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Noise from Johnson Rd intersection with the Expressway Existing noise along I-205 from the Expressway south to past Strawberry Lane. The increase of congestion and traffic loads with the Sunrise/Damascus traffic and the interchange will exacerbate ineffective sound walls, where they exist. Noise from the Clackamas Highway interchange along the Clackamas Elementary neighborhood. Noise from the Sunrise interchange with I-205 west of the I-205 between Schellenberg campus to the Clackamas highway interchange. A third signal at the Clackamas Highway interchange with I-205 will generate more noise to neighbors on Jefferson and Hood, and homes along McKinley, idling, big rigs, brakes, etc.	Please refer to the Noise Report on pages 45 and 46 for noise prediction sites in the area, and page 50 for a description of future sound levels. Please refer to the Noise Report on page 65 for the description of recommended noise walls for inclusion in the project (Walls 1, 2 and 4), and Figures F1 and F2. In summary, the Build alternatives move the mainline of I-205 to the east slightly and noise levels on the west side of I-205 are projected to decrease relative to the No Build conditions. Noise walls, including replacement of the existing 6-foot noise wall near Hwy 212 and I-205 are recommended for inclusion in the project. Strawberry Lane is somewhat south of the anticipated project limits. Please refer to the portions of the noise report cited to determine the limits of the sound walls recommended.
1034	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Identify noise shadow on the west side of the I-205 corridor (homes immediately next to sound walls are insulated pretty good, but homes further west get the full brunt of the noise-noise waves). How far away from I-205 travel lanes does it take to be 65db and 55db during night (for residential areas). Possible mitigation, lower I-205 if its going to be reconstructed. Need typical cross sections.	See response to Entry #1029.
1023	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens	ODOT will need fill dirt for Sunrise fills on hydric soils.	See response to Entry #s 955 and 995.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Association		
1035	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	Jake brake a problem (sb trucks)	The use of Jake Brakes that do not comply with EPA standards is not legal. If this type of noise is an ongoing problem in the project area, the local enforcement agencies should be contacted.
1024	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	If some from our environmental community attend, I think many may be concerned about the hydric soils and the network of drainage patterns (small streams) into the Mt. Scott Creek Corridor.	Thank you for your comment. The project team has worked to analyze how the different alternatives and design options compare to the project's stated goals and objectives (see Chapter 2 of the SDEIS). The analysis was used as an input in the selection of the Preferred Alternative.
1058	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	It is not clear how much of 82nd Ave is being reconstructed but it appears that the bridge over the r/r might be reconstructed.	The structure over the UPRR tracks will be reconstructed.
1082	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	As a mitigation measure, some of the fill could be removed and the bridge elongated to a more open public visual corridor.	Aesthetics and accessibility will be considered in the final design.
1040	40	B	Russell	Pat	North Clackamas Citizens Association	It would be helpful if some of the maps identify some key businesses across from the fire station on Lake Road, Sabin-Schellenberg Campus, etc.	This area along Lake Road north of OR 224 is outside of the Sunrise Project Land Use Study Area as depicted on Figure 41 of the SDEIS. Employment locations in general, with in the Land Use Study Area, have been identified on Figure 42 of the SDEIS. Other descriptions of the land uses and business within the study area are contained in pages 47 to 94 of the SDEIS.
427	2	I	Russell	Pat		There is too much mixing of local neighborhood/shopping traffic from the neighborhoods and those wanting to get to/from I-205 (trucks and employees to/from the industrial area and Damascus commuters).	Thank you for your comment. The Preferred Alternative improves travel experiences for all modes of traffic. The Preferred Alternative also helps to shift commuters onto a regional facility (the Sunrise Project) while maintaining OR 212 as the local/neighborhood route.
424	2	I	Russell	Pat		Widening SE 82nd Ave to an un-godly five lanes is not a solution to a local business/shopping corridor.	Thank you for your comment. The project team has worked to analyze how the different alternatives and design options compare to the project's stated

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							goals and objectives (see Chapter 2 of the SDEIS). The analysis was used as an input in the selection of the Preferred Alternative.
426	2	I	Russell	Pat	I've advocated for a Clackamas Road crossing of the freeway and then a separate Roots Road Crossing that would land near the Fred Meyer Shopping Center complex and mid-block signals. Then the ramps could go over 82nd Drive and just service the freeway (and could be narrowed roadway) and we'd eliminate all three signals and takings and access restrictions. The fallout would be some r/w acquisition and bridging, comparable to the costs of condemning property and restricting access at the 82nd Drive intersections.	It would be difficult for the Roots Rd. overcrossing proposal to touch down on the east side of I-205, with acceptable grades, in time to match up with 82nd Dr. The Clackamas Rd. overcrossing proposal is more appropriately studied under the upcoming Clackamas County TSP update. More modest improvements to the I-205 SB ramp terminal are proposed in the SDEIS to provide improvements to access and operations on the west side of interchange and McKinley Ave.
425	2	I	Russell	Pat		We are forcing traffic to use 82nd Drive to get to the Milwaukie Expressway and the regional center, when much of this traffic should be intercepted east of the r/r and directed northward toward Lawnfield and 97th (up to Sunnybrook intersection). The freeway proposal will be adding 10,000 new vehicles on 82nd Ave at about Deer Creek or Sunnybrook intersection and it's all due to Damascus traffic and growth in the industrial area. People at the Clackamas interchange area shouldn't be burdened by this eastern trip Origin/Destination.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
423	2	I	Russell	Pat		I'd like to see some honest scaled staff drawings illustrating this concept for discussion. Or give me a set of 1: = 100' scale aerials (with property lines) and I'll provide a sketch of my own. And we are talking about 35 mph ramp speeds (with "mini-interchanges just west of the r/r tracks) -- not 70 mph flyovers.	Thank you for your interest in this project, participation on the PAC, and your request to be involved. Any potential designs that you have provided were analyzed for feasibility. All designs are compliant with national standard practices as contained in the manual "AASHTO A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets" in conjunction with ODOT specific design standards. None of the flyovers will have a speed of 70mph.
431	3	I	Bollam	Douglas		The EIS number for the impervious surface area of the Rock Creek basin is grossly understated in table 19, labeled "Impervious surface summary" on page 149,	See response to Entry # 429.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						chapter three, biology.	
429	3	I	Bollam	Douglas		The table shows 280 existing impervious acres, translating into five percent of the impervious surface area for the Rock Creek basin. It further states that post-construction adds 42 acres, resulting in a total of the 322 impervious acres, for a total change to six percent. Contrarily, Clackamas County Water Environment Services, WES, 2004 published the figure of eight percent impervious surface area, as presented to the Rock Creek Watershed Action Plan stakeholder group meeting of October 21st, 2008, is more than 50 percent higher than the impact statement's use of five percent of impervious surface area for the Rock Creek Basin. Using WES's eight percent figure and adding the Sunrise post-construction 42 acres, and further adding, since 2004, triple digit impervious development acres, brings the Rock Creek basin's impervious surface area to well beyond ten percent.	The "existing impervious area by basin" data for the SDEIS analysis was obtained directly from the current Metro GIS database. In addition, SDEIS basins were calculated only upstream from the point at which the area of potential impact intersects the drainage, and would therefore be somewhat smaller than data for the overall basin. (See the <i>Water Quality Technical Report</i> for more information.)
432	3	I	Bollam	Douglas		WES defines above ten percent basin impervious surface area as the tipping point that results in unstable channels, stream bank damage, downstream sediment disposition, severe degradation of overall water quality and, sadly, causing more prime aquatic habitat and ecosystem damage. This severely impacts large numbers of threatened lower Columbia River Chinook salmon, Coho, and steelhead in the lower reach of Rock Creek.	See response to Entry # 429.
433	3	I	Bollam	Douglas		The lower reach of Rock Creek is designated as critical habitat for steelhead, Coho, and Chinook salmon under the ESA, and is also listed on ODEQ's Oregon Department of Environmental Qualities 303(d), list 303(d) of the clean water - Federal Clean Water Act, of water bodies that do not meet water quality standards for bacteria.	Comment noted. This is consistent with information on page 149 of the SDEIS.
434	3	I	Bollam	Douglas		Unfortunately the EIS's extreme understatement of basin impervious surface area will result in the Sunrise's compounding detrimental impact on the lower reach of Rock Creek's natural sustaining Andromorphs, Salmonid, population.	See response to Entry # 429.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
435	3	I	Bollam	Douglas		<p>.....I made a suggestion that as much impervious surface as possible that could potentially or possibly or will flow into Rock Creek, the lower reaches, because that's where the Sunrise Corridor is passing through, the lower reach of Rock Creek, take this impervious area and channel the liquid, i.e. rain, oil droppings from vehicles, and other toxic material, and instead of having it diverted directly into the lower reach of Rock Creek, have it piped, via gravity, because the elevation differential's quite high between the Clackamas River and Rock Creek, and take this potential degrading and accumulative adverse impact of liquids and solids, and instead of having them flow to Rock Creek, the lower reach, have them go to the Clackamas River directly where they will be infused with a much larger body of water and diluted in a much quicker manner versus being in a concentrated form having been diverted to the lower reach of Rock Creek.</p>	<p>All new impervious surface stormwater runoff in this area will be collected, detained, and treated before outfall to the Clackamas River. See Chapter 3 for additional detail on plans to treat stormwater.</p>
428	3	I	Bollam	Douglas		<p>I hope the federal government takes my comments at heart and will do whatever they can....to come up with the necessary funding to not only expedite the construction of the first phase of unit one, but have subsequent phases follow as soon as possible, which will be concluded at the end of the unit one at the Rock Creek Junction interchange, and then the next segment of unit two will hopefully be constructed shortly thereafter to alleviate a very serious problem with the city of Damascus lying just to the east of the Rock Creek Junction and having very limited infrastructure to handle all the people and commerce that pass through this area in their accessing Highway 26 through the Rock Creek area via the Sunrise Boulevard of expressway and the Sunrise Corridor to get to I-205.</p>	<p>The sequence and timing for the construction of project phases will be guided by the availability of project funding and the rate of travel demand growth in the project area. The Sunrise Project must compete with other major projects in the Metro area for funding.</p>
430	3	I	Bollam	Douglas		<p>The federal government hopefully will give as much funds as humanly possible to get the Sunrise Corridor kicked off as soon as possible to help the populous of the area, but also keeping in mind to have at the forefront the health of the Rock Creek watershed, and more specifically,</p>	<p>See funding response for comment 428. The project's design for crossing Rock Creek takes into consideration the protection of the creek's water quality and functional habitat for salmonids and other aquatic species as well as the adjacent</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						because of the design and construction aspects of the Sunrise Corridor, do whatever they possible can, and again within reason, to help protect or mitigate any adverse activity occurring within the lower reach of the Rock Creek watershed area that presently has large populations of threatened lower Columbia steelhead, lower Columbia Coho, and lower Columbia Chinook salmon populations, and has a great deal of natural sustaining Andromorphs Salmonid populations.	riparian habitat.
467	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		NEPA requires a Supplemental EIS when there are "new circumstances" relevant to a project's development. If the end of cheap oil and the start of climate change are not relevant circumstances, then nothing is....Projections for transportation increases need to be adjusted to reflect the reality of finite fuel supplies.	The FEIS includes a section on greenhouse gases and Appendix D includes additional information on state and federal efforts related to climate change.
450	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		The concept of peak oil is not mentioned once in the Sunrise SDEIS.	<p>Peak oil is the concept that humans have reached the point at which half the world's petroleum reserves have been utilized and, therefore, oil production will begin to decline. Impacts of the peak oil concept would include the need to conserve oil supplies, including derivatives such as gasoline and other vehicle fuel by-products. Government agencies at all levels (federal, state, and local) are working to understand the impacts of declining oil supplies on society, including future transportation needs.</p> <p>As such, FHWA has been actively engaged in preparing for transportation changes that may result from larger-scale issues such as peak oil, climate change, and other externally caused actions. Although formal policies are still emerging for many of these issues, planning for such changes is occurring. This planning takes many forms including alternative fuels, new modes of travel (mass transit, bicycle/pedestrian), sustainable design, and other measures. Many new infrastructure projects are</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							<p>allowing for increased use of transit (buses, light rail, trains) and bicycle/pedestrian travel to reduce oil and gas consumption and maintain the public's mobility.</p> <p>Thus many elements of new projects do reflect future oil supply and demand considerations. It is important to note that, while fuel types and supplies may change, transportation agencies are preparing to continue to provide needed infrastructure and improvements to assure that the future movement of goods and people will continue. The proposed project would contribute to these efforts.</p> <p>Although the document may not explicitly mention peak oil and other agents of change, government agencies are considering future conditions in planning for public infrastructure projects.</p>
454	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		<p>The original Sunrise study examined a facility between I-205 and US 26. The SDEIS states the logical termini for Sunrise have been truncated, but no analysis was included in the SDEIS to justify this decision. NEPA prohibits an EIS from basing information on material that is not generally publicly available. The SDEIS did not provide documentation on the FHWA decision to truncate the project and determine that each segment of the Sunrise highway supposedly has independent utility.</p>	<p>In the 1993 Draft EIS for the Sunrise Corridor, the project extended from I-205 to Highway 26. At that time, planning for then-rural lands east of Rock Creek was uncertain, making it difficult to determine the appropriate design and location for a major transportation facility. Through agreement between ODOT and Metro, the rural portion of the project was deferred until eventual completion of a master plan for the now-urban lands around Damascus (this planning is still underway). FHWA agreed that a Sunrise project between Rock Creek and I-205 had independent utility and does not preclude future options for connecting to Hwy 26 or serving the Damascus area. FHWA issued a Notice of Intent to prepare a Supplemental DEIS to address the more immediate transportation needs west of Rock Creek.</p>
455	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		<p>NEPA and FHWA regulations prohibit segmentation of a project to avoid full analysis of the impacts. Since the</p>	<p>See related response for Entry # 454. One of the primary reasons for modifying the east end of the</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						1996 DEIS, the area east of the study area for the current SDEIS has been included in the UGB and the City of Damascus has been incorporated. The Purpose and Need in the SDEIS does not address these changes, and a new SDEIS is needed to fully examine the cumulative impacts of the UGB expansion and the City of Damascus.	Sunrise Project to the logical termini of the Rock Creek Junction was to allow time for these new urban lands around Damascus to undergo master planning. The Sunrise Project is fully coordinated with this effort and has been designed to not preclude future transportation options east of Rock Creek. A discussion of the UGB expansion in the Damascus area occurs in the Cumulative Impacts section of the SDEIS on Page 207 (and in the FEIS in Chapter 4).
456	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		NEPA states that an EIS cannot be based on material that is not generally available (40 CFR 1502.21). The SDEIS does not provide any documentation for the decision to truncate the project to half its previous length (in the original DEIS). The information for this is not readily available in the SDEIS or the accompanying technical reports. One of the maps in the SDEIS does show the future extension of the Sunrise highway on the south side of the town of Damascus, but this is not indicated clearly and no information is available as to why the logical (eastern) terminus was moved from US 26 to a point west of the new bedroom community of Damascus.	See responses for Entry #s 454 and 455.
461	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		Figures 22 through 24 show that even with the Sunrise sprawlway, there would still be Level of Service F on 212/224 and Milwaukie Expressway, therefore the project does not meet the purpose and need. A new SDEIS is needed to examine the impacts to these intersections in the design year, assuming that ODOT and FHWA do not want to include the obvious finite nature of fossil fuels and the fact that "alternatives" to oil generally have a much lower "Energy Return on Energy Invested" ratio.	In response to SDEIS findings and public comments, these intersections have been analyzed in greater detail through the IAMP process. The SDEIS alternative has been modified and is now expected to operate at LOS E or better during peak periods along Milwaukie Expressway. Your concerns about peak oil are addressed in the response to Entry # 450 (above).
462	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		The SDEIS does not have any mention of transit as a means toward accomplishing the ostensible purpose and need. If the P & N is solely to build a six to eight lane freeway to facilitate sprawl development in the new edge city of Damascus, then transit as a serious part of a	TriMet was consulted in the early stages of this project and maintains that Sunnyside Road will be the main transit route for busses after the Sunrise Project is constructed.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						transportation policy would not be something to consider except as a means to transport poor people in and out of the area.	There are a few express bus service routes from the Damascus area that will potentially use the Sunrise Project, but final details will be determined by the City of Damascus.
474	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		Transit is going to be of critical importance as oil prices increase and availability decreases. An SDEIS is needed to consider the feasibility of extending the planned transportation systems are going to be more and more needed as oil supplies become less and less. The cost of the Sunrise sprawlway could probably cover the cost of a first class transit system into the supposed "smart growth" edge city of Damascus.	See response to Entry # 462.
442	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		If this project was not affordable when the price was about a quarter billion, it is even less likely to be affordable with the low price at five times the previous amount.	The Sunrise project has the advantage of being able to be constructed in strategic phases to match funding availability and travel demand growth.
457	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		The table starting here (p 18) only looks at direct land use conversion of highway construction, not cumulative impact of the project.	The SDEIS discusses cumulative effects in Chapter 4, which includes a historic overview of the major impacts and additional assessment by topic area. Also please refer to the response to Entry # 113.
463	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		Existing damaged bridges should be repaired or replaced before new or wider bridges are contemplated.	Thank you for your comment. But at this time repairs to existing structures not impacted by this project are outside of the scope of this project.
475	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		"Since the I-205 interchange area is already quite developed, residents and other viewers are already accustomed to views that are of moderate visual quality." P. 167 - In other words, the area is already ugly so making it uglier is acceptable.	The Visual technical report explains the FHWA methodology used to assess view quality and impacts. Four categories of visual resources are identified, one consisting of man-made features and the others consisting of different types of natural landscape features. Ratings are based on a variety of factors. Man-made features without being balanced by or integrating natural features are considered of lower quality. Another factor is the degree to which a project would change existing views. In the area of I-205, the addition of more pavement and concrete structures to an area already consisting largely of such features would result in less change for the average viewer. The SDEIS section does not make a

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							value judgment regarding the change, but does note that the difference between existing and proposed conditions would be less in this area compared to areas further east that are currently less developed.
476	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		"Removing the knoll in the Rock Creek Junction area would open up views for motorists" p 170 - It would also reduce understanding of the region's natural topography that took eons to develop, mountaintop removal creates tragic ugliness.	The statement on page 170 is intended to disclose the fact that more distant views would be opened if the knoll is removed. It is not intended to diminish the benefits of the knoll for others in the area, as evidenced by the notes on View #18, Figure 47 of the SDEIS: view quality to the northwest across the knoll would be reduced.
446	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		"VMT increases by nearly 20 percent for Alternatives 2 and 3 over Alternative 1, No Build...Alternatives 2 and 3 would result in more emissions compared to Alternative 1, No Build" p 189 - Therefore, the only prudent and feasible decision is to select Alternative 1, No Build because of the threat to public health.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
459	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		"Land use patters have a much greater effect on all emissions than do highway expansions" p 194 - If true, this means that the land use changes that will be induced by the Sunrise sprawlway must be factored into the cumulative analysis of the NEPA process.	The Sunrise project is a planned project included in adopted local and regional plans. The Sunrise project will serve existing and planned land uses in Clackamas County and is not anticipated to change planned land use patterns. The SDEIS discusses cumulative effects in Chapter 4, which includes a historic overview of the major impacts and additional assessment by topic area. Also please refer to the response to Entry # 113.
451	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		NEPA does state that when there are "new circumstances" relevant to a project they must be considered. The reality of climate change and peak oil are of critical importance to any project dependent on vast amount of fossil fuels combustions (for construction and operation). If climate change is not something to factor in for this project, then nothing is relevant to this project. This is not a speculative concern (such as the timing of the next large eruption from Mt Hood or the next Cascadian Subduction Zone Earthquake, which might or	See response to Entry # 467 for a general response. At the direction of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions are not being evaluated in any Oregon NEPA documents, or similar project evaluations, until an acceptable statewide strategy and methodology is adopted to address HB 3543.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						might not occur during our lifetimes). Climate change and peak oil are here now and are likely to have major disruptions to this project before the projected construction date.	
452	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		The "Energy" section (p 141) does not mention at all price impacts of petroleum on driving. The "potential mitigation measures" have no analysis to determine the scale and effectiveness of these initiatives, and need to be fully examined in a new SDEIS.	The Energy section of the FEIS provides a relative comparison of how much energy would be consumed by the different project alternatives. The energy analysis uses the regional Metro travel demand forecast model, which incorporates factors for user costs and price escalation. The Metro model is regionally approved and is based on 2030 projections for growth. All projects in the region use this model to ensure consistency in growth assumptions and modeling results within the Metro area.
448	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		P 178 Cuts and fills could be 40 to 50 feet high and deep. This could pose serious landslide risks for nearby properties.	Cuts of 40 to 50 feet could present a risk to slope stability. Potential mitigation measures could include adjusting the elevation of the roadway to minimize cutting the slope and use of retaining structures such as soldier pile and tieback and secant pile retaining walls. The impact of site grading on the stability of existing slopes has been identified and appropriate mitigation measures will be further addressed in final design and construction.
449	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		P 179. The "earthquakes" section should include an analysis of the impact of building new structures (the Sunrise ramps, bridges and other components) while existing structures on nearby highways are not seismically safe.	New structures, including ramps, bridges, and other infrastructure will be designed to meet the current seismic requirement in the governing building and bridge codes. Additionally, site grading and construction will be evaluated with respect to the impacts to existing structures and facilities.
443	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		The 4(f) analysis for avoiding Camp Withycombe and other properties is invalid because it does to address the issues of Peak Traffic as oil escalates in price and decreases in availability between now and the design year of 2030....The criteria for a "prudent and feasible" alternative must include analysis of peak traffic as	The Sunrise project is designed to address expected travel demand based on growth assumptions in Metro's travel forecasting model. The model is based on assumptions of future population and employment growth, planned modal distribution of trips, future land use development patterns, and the

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						gasoline costs increase and the potentials for meeting travel demand through expanded transit (extending the Milwaukie and I-205 light rail lines, rapid bus and other services) and modes, affordable fixes to existing roads. By 2030, gasoline rationing is likely going to make the Sunrise sprawlway moot.	growth in intrastate travel involving the region. These are the same assumptions used in all projects being developed in the Metro region. The model projects growth over a long period and can thus account for fluctuations in growth through 2030. It is expected that the project will be implemented in phases over time based, in part, on actual rates of future development and economic conditions.
444	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		Figure 16 in the 4(f) analysis implies that the only alternative to "use" of Camp Withycombe would be a completely impractical reroute of the Sunrise sprawlway through even more properties with sharp curves that are clearly not "prudent and feasible." However, a better alternative would be to model a LUTRAQ type study for the Sunrise sprawlway area.	LUTRAQ-type principles are being considered in the master planning for the Damascus area (east of the project) and have been considered in the broader regional planning context for the project's corridor and purpose. Optimizing land use patterns and multi-modal transportation networks do not completely address regional and intrastate freight and travel mobility, which is a main focus of this project's purpose.
445	4	I	Robinowitz	Mark		Figure 18 shows that Clackamas elementary school would lose most of the trees that screen the view of the I-205 freeway. Young lungs are more vulnerable to auto exhaust than those of healthy adults.	There are a number of studies under way investigating the "micro-effects" of barriers to air pollutant dispersion along freeways. To the best of our knowledge, there is not conclusive information at this time as to whether or not the removal of screening trees would be likely to affect air pollutant concentrations. Please note that a sound wall is recommended for inclusion in the project along this portion of I-205 and would screen the view of the freeway from the school yard. Children are considered a sensitive population for air pollutant effects and the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) are set to protect the health of sensitive populations, including children. At this time, the Portland area has air quality that meets the NAAQS. In the future, regulation of fuels and vehicle technologies will help to decrease emissions of fine particulates (PM2.5), VOCs, and nitrogen oxides. However, area-wide emissions of very fine particulates (PM10) and carbon monoxide are

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							expected to increase.
478	5	I	Gorr	Raymond		No one really listens	An important element of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is the opportunity for citizens and other agencies to review and comment on proposals. Public involvement on the project began in 2004. In addition to Project Advisory Committee meetings, many public forums have been held for determining the scope of the SDEIS, developing alternatives and reviewing the range of alternatives. The public comment period for the SDEIS ran from October 13, 2008 - November 26, 2008. Nearly 300 comments were received from individuals, agencies, and businesses. The comments will be shared with the project's advisory committees and the decision-makers, and will become part of the public record.
480	5	I	Gorr	Raymond		People do not want Goose Hollow closed	Access to/from Goosehollow Dr. at this location would be closed under the Preferred Alternative due to: 1) insufficient approach throat distance to intersection from Goosehollow Dr.; 2) addition of signal phase to accommodate access to/from this local street leg of intersection will cause intersection to fail; and, 3) availability of alternative access north (Orchard View Lane right-out access), south (Eckert Ln.), and east (Goosehollow Dr. x proposed new SE 162nd Ave. to OR 212).
479	5	I	Gorr	Raymond		Emergency vehicles will be hampered - a longer drive - to exist off Eckert if hundreds of families are forced to one light. Please get real.	As currently designed, the access will be closed to vehicular traffic, but will remain open to emergency services via bollards and mountable curbs.
481	6	I	Gilb	Merele		Don't you realize that the world will run out of oil soon? Ask any geologist. There will be far less vehicles on the road in the future. We will have alternative energy, but it won't be enough to keep all the vehicles we would like on the roads.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
482	6	I	Gilb	Merele		Please cancel the project.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
483	7	I	Paulken	John		I think it is a possibility that if the max did run into downtown Oregon City, that it would help with the congestion we have now.	The models used to develop traffic volumes for the future 2030 alternatives assumes all projects that are included in Metro's Regional Transportation Plan. Projects are included in the Regional Transportation Plan because they are the projects that state and local officials feel are the most pertinent. The Light Rail extension to Oregon City is not one of the projects assumed in the Regional Transportation Plan or in our modeling work.
484	8	I	Stanfill	Robert		Please keep us informed.	Thank you. You have been added to the project's mailing list. To keep interested parties informed, the project team continually adds new contacts to the postal mailing list and email distribution list. Stakeholders are added to the list if they provide contact information at a meeting or when they call/email staff asking to be added to the list. Mailings serve to provide new project information and invite stakeholders to meetings. A project website is updated periodically to reflect new information and announce public meetings. Public meetings are also held to inform stakeholders and gather public input. Special meetings have occurred in specific design or issue focus areas, and presentations are scheduled at the are community planning organization meetings.
485	8	I	Stanfill	Robert		The sooner the better, 2013 is 4 1/2 years away.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
488	9	I	Silaev	Leah		It would be nice if semi trucks were either able to turn left from I-205 SB OR the exit was better marked. There are two or more a day that have no option but to come down McKinley Ave. due to the median on Hwy 212/224.	With improvements to I-205 within the project study area, the signage will be revised and improved to minimize driver confusion. Signage will be compliant with the most current Manual on Uniform

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
486	9	I	Silaev	Leah		Also, my concern is I house disabled adults. The home I live in would be impossible to replace if I had to relocate. The reason is the layout which I have remodeled to accomplish. At this time it does not look like I am affected by this but do have concern of future plans.	Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). The ODOT Right of Way Manual states that "In no event, however, shall the displaced person be required to move into a dwelling that is not functionally equivalent in accordance with the definition of a comparable replacement dwelling, found in the glossary." The glossary states, "The term 'functionally equivalent' means that it performs the same function and provides the same utility. While a comparable replacement dwelling need not possess every feature of the displacement dwelling, the principal features must be present..." The Relocation Agent works closely with the residential owner to meet this requirement.
487	9	I	Silaev	Leah		Please contact me if my home becomes in the affected area.	This property is three parcels north of the affected properties on McKinley Ave. If the project area of impact were to expand such that this property would be affected, the owner would be notified immediately.
490	10	I	Swanson	Andrew		Please add a section of multi-use path from SE 135th Ave. to the easterly end of the project (at least to SE 172nd). This section of land, along the existing Hwy 212/224 has no sidewalk or bike lanes, except on the bridge over Rock Creek. Right now, bicycling and walking east to west in these 37 blocks is very dangerous. Too dangerous to attempt to do in my opinion. If a multi-use path can't be built between SE 135th and 172nd, no less than a wide sidewalk needs to be built.	The Preferred Alternative includes plans to extend the multi-use path from the midpoint interchange to the Rock Creek junction. Additionally, sidewalks are currently provided on the existing Rock Creek Bridge, with adequate roadway shoulder width on existing OR 212/224 for bikes.
493	10	I	Swanson	Andrew		I don't support the project at all if there are to be tolls due for travel on the Sunrise.	The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) has stated its intention not to initiate project-specific tolling analyses until the OTC has had an opportunity to address wider policy issues associated with tolling (anticipated at a later date). Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							selection of a Preferred Alternative.
491	10	I	Swanson	Andrew		My homeowners Association, Addington Place, owns 2 acres of land along Graham Creek. This land is roughly between SE Stanhope Rd. and SE Pinegrove Loop. There is a corrugated steel culvert (40 feet long) on this land which carries Graham Creek. Please remove this culvert if any mitigation of this type is needed as a result of the Sunrise project.	Thank you for your suggestion. The ravine downstream of OR 212/224 forms an impassable fish barrier, greatly reducing the benefit of removing the culvert between SE Stanhope Rd. and SE Pinegrove Loop.
492	10	I	Swanson	Andrew		For wetland mitigation and Creek removal/fill mitigation work under this project, please perform the mitigation work in or within 1/3 miles of the project area boundaries if possible.	Recent direction from the US Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of State Lands encourage the use of wetland mitigation banks as the first preference in compensatory wetland mitigation. The project is within the service area of the Foster Creek Wetland Mitigation Bank. This bank is several miles from the project site. ODOT is currently evaluating the use of this bank or mitigating impacts on parcels much closer to the project; some within 1/3 mile and some further out. See Chapter 3, Wetlands for more information regarding wetlands and proposed mitigation.
496	11	I	Zuckerman	Debbie		We would like to see the Lawnfield railroad crossing eliminated as soon as possible. 1) Noise Pollution 2) traffic impediment	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
498	12	I	Gorr	Kathleen		At every meeting we plead with you to not close the entrance at Goose Hollow off 224. We need a right turn and most important emergency vehicles ability to quickly access the area. Lots of seniors.	As currently designed the access will be closed to vehicular traffic, but will remain open to emergency services via bollards and mountable curbs. The design you are suggesting was reviewed as part of the SDEIS refinement process. Roadway improvements resulting from this process have been included in the Preferred Alternative, as described in the FEIS.
497	12	I	Gorr	Kathleen		You are causing a longer drive and one street Eckert to service hundreds of families.	The design you are suggesting was reviewed as part of the SDEIS refinement process. Roadway improvements resulting from this process have been included in the Preferred Alternative, as described in

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
500	13	I	Shannon	Randy		The project alternatives do not mitigate for the impact to Damascus. As has been requested for the last two years. This project as proposed blocks off access to the Goose Hollow neighborhood.	the FEIS. Access to/from Goosehollow Dr. at this location would be closed under the Preferred Alternative due to: 1) insufficient approach throat distance to intersection from Goosehollow Dr.; 2) addition of signal phase to accommodate access to/from this local street leg of intersection will cause intersection to fail; and, 3) availability of alternative access north (Orchard View Lane right-out access), south (Eckert Ln), and east (Goosehollow Dr. x proposed new SE 162nd Ave. to OR 212). See also responses to entries # 518 and 875.
505	14	I	Phillips	Sheryl		There needs to be some accommodations for the homes on the Clackamas Bluff. The noise level at our home will triple (per your study), yet because our location a wall cannot provide relief - there is nothing planned.	The project team acknowledges that the noise is a significant problem for residents on the bluff and that under federal and state rules, allowable mitigation was not found to be cost effective nor feasible. Because of the extremely high mitigation costs, no federal or state funds are available to financially mitigate properties along Bluff Drive and 135th Avenue that face noise and visual impacts if the Sunrise Project is constructed as proposed in the Sunrise Project SDEIS and FEIS, nor does the County have the resources to financially mitigate these properties. At this point, no source of such a large amount of mitigation funds is in sight.
504	14	I	Phillips	Sheryl		I feel they should buy all our homes at current market value, then the county can resell them at their reduced value to folks that understand and accept the new noise level.	Because of the extremely high mitigation costs, no federal or state funds are available to financially mitigate properties along Bluff Drive and 135th Avenue that face noise and visual impacts if the Sunrise Project is constructed as proposed in the Sunrise Project SDEIS and FEIS, nor does the County have the resources to financially mitigate these properties. At this point, no source of such a large amount of mitigation funds is in sight.
502	14	I	Phillips	Sheryl		In addition, the construction at the bottom of the bluff puts land stability at risk. The county needs to have provisions for settling and stress cracks/fractures that	Cuts of 40 to 50 feet could present a risk to slope stability. Potential mitigation measures could include adjusting the elevation of the roadway to

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						happen as the ground resettles.	minimize cutting the slope and use of retaining structures such as soldier pile and tieback and secant pile retaining walls. The impact of site grading on the stability of existing slopes has been identified and appropriate mitigation measures will be further addressed in final design and construction.
501	14	I	Phillips	Sheryl		There will also be less access to our home. Today we take Milwaukie expressway to Lawnfield - that won't be available and will need to go to mid-point exchange then Hwy 212 then 135 then Hubbard to Bluff. This will increase my travel time and cost of which I am also not receiving any compensation.	Another potential route would be to use Johnson Rd to Deer Creek Lane to 82nd Ave to Sunnybrook Boulevard to 97th Avenue. The above mentioned route would be 0.8 mile longer and would take approximately three additional minutes to travel.
508	14	I	Phillips	Sheryl		Lastly there will be a visual impact. Today from our backyard and deck we see trees, some of those may be impacted making our view less enjoyable.	The proposed mitigation in the SDEIS for visual impacts (retaining vegetation, planting coniferous trees for screening (p. 114-15) has been incorporated into the Preferred Alternative. See Table 3 and Chapter 3, Visual, for more information.
506	14	I	Phillips	Sheryl		When we purchased our home in 1993 no one disclosed that there might be a 6 lane freeway behind our home. We have a considerable investment in our home and we feel it is being greatly diminished.	Property owners who are selling property and the realtors representing them have a legal obligation to disclose any conditions that exist or other pertinent information concerning the property that is for sale. Buyers of property are responsible for their own due diligence. We recognize that the problem that was mentioned may well have occurred, but it is beyond the purview of the SDEIS process to address this problem.
509	15	I	Allen	Tarah		I just want to confirm that you will not be closing an entrance into the Orchard Lake Development.	The design you are commenting on was recently reviewed through the Interchange Area Management Planning process and the design was modified. The intersection of Goosehollow Drive at Hwy 224 will be a three leg intersection with no access to/from the neighborhood to the east. There will be an additional right-out ONLY access point at the north western terminus of Orchard View Lane for residents to gain access onto northbound Hwy 224. Another addition in the Preferred Alternative is

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							the extension of 162nd Avenue South of Hwy 212 to connect to the northeast terminus of SE Goosehollow Drive.
510	16	I	Doak	Mike		My concern would be Anderegg Pkwy. It is the only street into the Trillium neighborhood. Also 172nd is a major road out of the neighborhood. I just want someone to take that info consideration when it comes to road closures.	This is a local circulation issue that can best be handled by the City of Damascus. Additional local connectivity to/from the Trillium neighborhood is being considered in the City of Damascus Transportation System Plan currently under development.
514	17	I	Russell	Joanna		I live on the hill directly above new project. It is already noisy from 212.	The noise study report for the Sunrise project analyzed both existing sound levels and predicted future sound levels with the proposed project alternatives. In general, the existing sound levels on the bluff north of the proposed project alignment would be considered moderate and typical of suburban neighborhoods. Many areas along the bluff are predicted to experience substantial increases in noise levels as a result of the project.
513	17	I	Russell	Joanna		Project will bring down home values and increase noise levels in neighborhood.	Noise levels will increase at your residence (See the Noise section of the FEIS in Chapter 3). In developing the Preferred Alternative, the project team, advisory and decision-making committees worked to understand how the different alternatives and design options compare to the project's stated goals and objectives (see Chapter 2 of the SDEIS).
512	17	I	Russell	Joanna		This is a bad idea or horrible waste of taxpayers/or whoever else is paying/money.	Thank you for your comment. The project team is working to analyze how the different alternatives and design options compare to the project's stated goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria. The cost-efficiency of the project is an objective under Goal 1: Transportation/Operations (see Chapter 2 of the SDEIS).
517	18	I	Weber	Dick		I would like to see bike lanes on both sides of the Sunrise corridor because cyclists will take the most direct route to their destinations. Many of the cycling community will use this route for their commute. When completed, this route would be a connector for those cycling to	It is against ODOT design standards to include a bike lane on a limited access expressway with a 55 mph posted speed limit. There is, however, a spur from the I-205 multi-use

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						Damascus, Sandy, Mt. Hood areas and be safer than taking back roads.	path that runs near the Sunrise alignment out to 122nd Avenue and the Preferred Alternative includes an extension of the multi-use path to the Rock Creek junction.
519	19	I	Comfort	Eugene		I can certainly appreciate the need for this project. The implementation is long overdue since development is well beyond the present capacity of the transportation system. I was impressed with thoroughness of the planning and the presentation provided.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
518	19	I	Comfort	Eugene		My specific interest and concerns are directed at the intersection of Hwy 224 and Goosehollow Dr. I fail to see the justification for closure of Goosehollow Dr. Especially since a traffic light is already planned at that point. Assuming that the decisions are irreversible, I was heartened to receive assurances that a major signalized intersection is planned for Eckert Lane and Hwy 224. There will be major traffic flow at that point for access and egress to and from Highway 224.	The design you are commenting on was recently reviewed through the Interchange Area Management Planning process and the design was modified. The intersection of Goosehollow Drive at Hwy 224 will be a three leg intersection with no access to/from the neighborhood to the east. There will be an additional right-out ONLY access point at the north western terminus of Orchard View Lane for residents to gain access onto northbound Hwy 224. Another addition in the Preferred Alternative is the extension of 162nd Avenue South of Hwy 212 to connect to the northeast terminus of SE Goosehollow Drive.
521	19	I	Comfort	Eugene		There will be a signalized intersection at Eckert Lane and Hwy 224. . . While representatives were eager to point this out, the displays were not supporting the solution.	The improvements to the south of Goosehollow Drive are on a list of Regional Transportation Projects (Metro's RTP) to be completed by 2030. This is a local improvement that is not a part of this project, but is assumed to be built and in place when this project is constructed. This signal is not shown on the FEIS maps as it is not part of the proposed project.
522	19	I	Comfort	Eugene		Please make those points clear on the official documents and make it clear that 224 will be widened and improved to accommodate this additional traffic flow.	The information that you are requesting is contained in the Transportation Technical Appendix on the CD that accompanies the SDEIS document. The FEIS contains a map (Figure PA-8) that shows the extent of these improvements.
524	20	I	Clayton	Ashley		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						Written in: No Lawnfield interchange	team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
525	20	I	Clayton	Ashley		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Single 122nd interchange	Thank you for your comment. The single interchange at SE 122nd Ave. was selected in the Preferred Alternative. Design Option B-2 (split-diamond interchange) was not selected. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
526	20	I	Clayton	Ashley		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
527	20	I	Clayton	Ashley		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
528	20	I	Clayton	Ashley		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
529	21	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Do not build at Lawnfield	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
530	21	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						preference.	project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
531	21	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
532	21	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
533	22	I	Clayton	Jerry		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: I would like to see no Lawnfield Interchange	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
534	22	I	Clayton	Jerry		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
535	22	I	Clayton	Jerry		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
536	22	I	Clayton	Jerry		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
537	22	I	Clayton	Jerry		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
538	23	I	Pridmore	Carissa		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: I don't believe we should build a Lawnfield extension. I believe it is unnecessary.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
539	23	I	Pridmore	Carissa		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: I believe the single middle point interchange at 122nd would allow more options to surrounding businesses and business owners.	Thank you for your comment. The single interchange at SE 122nd Ave. was selected in the Preferred Alternative. Design Option B-2 (split-diamond interchange) was not selected. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
540	23	I	Pridmore	Carissa		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
541	23	I	Pridmore	Carissa		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
542	24	I	Boyd	Renee		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						preference. Written in: Build Lawnfield	over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
545	24	I	Boyd	Renee		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Make sure the land is available for this to actually go through.	The Oregon Department of Transportation and Clackamas County must follow very specific Federal and State laws identified on page 105 of the Right-of-Way Technical Report to ensure that the property owner receives the fair market value, also referred to as just compensation, for the property. They have the right to use Eminent Domain to insure that the land required for the project can be purchased.
543	24	I	Boyd	Renee		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
544	24	I	Boyd	Renee		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
546	25	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Yes, Lawnfield build.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
547	25	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
548	25	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
549	25	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
550	25	I	Lesh	Karen		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
551	26	I	Lesh	Karen		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Do the extension of Lawnfield road.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
552	26	I	Lesh	Karen		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
553	26	I	Lesh	Karen		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
554	27	I	Trimm	Debi		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Build the Lawnfield extension	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
555	27	I	Trimm	Debi		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
556	27	I	Trimm	Debi		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
557	27	I	Trimm	Debi		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
558	28	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Don't build in Lawnfield	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							of a Preferred Alternative.
559	28	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
560	28	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
561	28	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
562	29	I	Shufelt	Joe		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Do not build at Lawnfield	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
563	29	I	Shufelt	Joe		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
564	29	I	Shufelt	Joe		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
565	29	I	Shufelt	Joe		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
566	30	I	Dougherty	Shawn		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: No build Lawnfield.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
567	30	I	Dougherty	Shawn		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
568	30	I	Dougherty	Shawn		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
569	30	I	Dougherty	Shawn		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
570	30	I	Dougherty	Shawn		It would be a good idea to purchase all the land necessary for the Sunrise corridor before more businesses and subdivisions go in and the County would have to pay extra condemnation fees and relocation fees to the owners.	One of the key outcomes of the Sunrise Project EIS process is to formally select a project design so that the project's right-of-way can be protected through planning measures or acquisition. Purchase of right-of-way following the FHWA Record of Decision will help to preserve the project's affordability in the future.
572	31	I	Halloway	Danielle		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in:	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						No build Lawnfield.	selection of a Preferred Alternative.
573	31	I	Halloway	Danielle		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
574	31	I	Halloway	Danielle		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
575	31	I	Halloway	Danielle		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
576	31	I	Halloway	Danielle		Do you have all the land that would be necessary for this project?	Some of the needed land for the project is already owned by ODOT or the County. Additional property may be acquired from adjacent parcels. The acquisition of new right-of-way is expected to occur in 2011 and 2012. The property acquisition process for purchasing road right-of-way is governed by specific Federal and State laws identified on page 105 of the Right-of-Way Technical Report. Property acquisition would not begin until ODOT and the County have identified property needs for the proposed project.
577	32	I	Olson	Tammy Jo		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: No I don't believe they should build a Lawnfield extension because I'm happy the way it is.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
578	32	I	Olson	Tammy Jo		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. The single interchange at SE 122nd Ave. was selected in the

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						Written in: I do believe it's a good idea to build the single middle point interchange on 122nd for more access roads.	Preferred Alternative. Design Option B-2 (split-diamond interchange) was not selected. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
579	32	I	Olson	Tammy Jo		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
580	32	I	Olson	Tammy Jo		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
584	33	I					Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
583	33	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
581	33	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						Written in: No build Lawnfield.	team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
582	33	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
585	34	I	Ankrom	Tina		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Not build Lawnfield.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
586	34	I	Ankrom	Tina		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
587	34	I	Ankrom	Tina		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
588	34	I	Ankrom	Tina		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
589	35	I	Miller	Tammy		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: No build Lawnfield.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
590	35	I	Miller	Tammy		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
591	35	I	Miller	Tammy		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
592	35	I	Miller	Tammy		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
593	36	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: No build Lawnfield.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
594	36	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
595	36	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
596	36	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
597	37	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						preference. Written in: No build Lawnfield.	project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
598	37	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
599	37	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
600	37	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
601	38	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: No build Lawnfield.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
602	38	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
603	38	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
604	38	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
605	39	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: No build Lawnfield.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
606	39	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
607	39	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
608	39	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
609	40	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: No build Lawnfield.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
610	40	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
611	40	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
612	40	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
613	41	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: No build Lawnfield.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
614	41	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
615	41	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
616	41	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
617	42	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						preference. Written in: No build Lawnfield.	project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
618	42	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
619	42	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
620	42	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
621	43	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: No build Lawnfield.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
622	43	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
623	43	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
624	43	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
625	44	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: No build Lawnfield.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
626	44	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
627	44	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
628	44	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
629	45	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: No build Lawnfield.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
630	45	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
631	45	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
632	45	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
633	46	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: No build Lawnfield.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
634	46	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
635	46	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
636	46	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
637	47	I	Davis	George	12345 SE	Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					Fuller Road	preference. Written in: I do not believe Lawnfield extension should be built.	project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
638	47	I	Davis	George	12345 SE Fuller Road	Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: This would be helpful to alleviate traffic jams.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
639	47	I	Davis	George	12345 SE Fuller Road	Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
640	47	I	Davis	George	12345 SE Fuller Road	Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
641	48	I	Zapata	Jenn		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: I do not believe they should build a Lawnfield extension.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
642	48	I	Zapata	Jenn		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: It would be much easier for me to get to work quicker and save time	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
643	48	I	Zapata	Jenn		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
644	48	I	Zapata	Jenn		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
645	49	I	Tidwell	Catrice		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Don't build the Lawnfield extension.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
647	49	I	Tidwell	Catrice		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
648	49	I	Tidwell	Catrice		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
646	49	I	Tidwell	Catrice		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
649	50	I	Tidwell	Andriar		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: No build Lawnfield.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
650	50	I	Tidwell	Andriar		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
651	50	I	Tidwell	Andriar		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
652	50	I	Tidwell	Andriar		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
653	51	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: "Build at Lawnfield A-2"	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
654	51	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
655	51	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
656	51	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
657	52	I	Obrisi	Dave		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						preference.	project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
659	52	I	Obrisi	Dave		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Improve Hwy 212 only and live with the change and from Evelyn St. hook up a new north bound and south bound onto I-205.	This proposal would not satisfy the Purpose and Need or Goal 1 of the Goals and Objectives for this project. Additionally, a full access interchange from Evelyn Street to I-205 would not meet ODOT access spacing criteria for interchanges along the Interstate system.
658	52	I	Obrisi	Dave		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Alt 2 if we have to choose.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
660	53	I	Troup	Bobby		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: I am always one to advocate express routes especially if it is bettering an existing transportation system.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
662	54	I	Tate	Sue		Noise impact will double - already hear too much noise. Property value (what little is left) will be impacted further. Very concerned about noise levels. Our house site on top of bluff. We will have to move.	Noise levels are expected to double for some houses along the bluff. These are substantial noise impacts. The project team looked extensively at ways to abate noise impacts and were successful in many locations. However, for the residents along the bluff, abatement measures were found to be ineffective or not to meet ODOT's reasonableness criteria.
663	55	I	Murphy	Maureen		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: It offers much better traffic flow options and uses both Sunrise corridor and Hwy 212 allowing ingress and egress at key locations. Traffic will continue to increase on both these routes as the years go by.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
664	55	I	Murphy	Maureen		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
665	55	I	Murphy	Maureen		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
668	56	I	Wilson	Eric and Wendy		When the design options were first released to the public, it was confusing to us why a large curve would be thrown in the middle of the highway as proposed by option C-3. The EIS confirmed many of our thoughts about the negative impacts the C-3 design option would have on the area and construction.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
673	56	I	Wilson	Eric and Wendy		It is clearly visible when looking at this design option [C-3] on the maps and confirmed by the report that it converts the most acres of land into highway.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
670	56	I	Wilson	Eric and Wendy		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Curving the highway towards the hillside would require the removal of a lot more forest area resulting in a greater displacement of wildlife due to less habitat.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
675	56	I	Wilson	Eric and Wendy		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: This would also result in a visually less appealing character to this area.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
672	56	I	Wilson	Eric and Wendy		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: This option would also increase the fuel annually as a future energy expense.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
671	56	I	Wilson	Eric and Wendy		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Running the highway towards the hillside would also require deeper cuts during construction. That earth movement will be a tremendous burden on costs.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
667	56	I	Wilson	Eric and Wendy		In general, it's clear that the C-3 design option at the midpoint section has the most negative impacts in most areas of the environmental study. The cost estimates also verify that construction of the C-3 option would cost millions of dollars more than the other options. . .	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
674	56	I	Wilson	Eric and Wendy		As indicated by the EIS, the C-3 design option is the least desirable when the objectives are to preserve natural resources and to be cost effective.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
676	57	I	Frith	Amanda		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
677	57	I	Frith	Amanda		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
679	57	I	Frith	Amanda		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
678	57	I	Frith	Amanda		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							selection of a Preferred Alternative.
680	57	I	Frith	Amanda		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
681	58	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
682	58	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
683	58	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
684	58	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
685	59	I	Marcerfish	Joseph		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
686	59	I	Marcerfish	Joseph		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
687	59	I	Marcerfish	Joseph		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
688	59	I	Marcerfish	Joseph		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
689	59	I	Marcerfish	Joseph		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
690	60	I	Sparkman	Donna		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Yes Lawnfield, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
691	60	I	Sparkman	Donna		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
692	60	I	Sparkman	Donna		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
693	60	I	Sparkman	Donna		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
695	61	I	Hester	Thomas		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
694	61	I	Hester	Thomas		<p>Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.</p> <p>Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
696	61	I	Hester	Thomas		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
697	61	I	Hester	Thomas		<p>Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.</p> <p>Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							selection of a Preferred Alternative.
698	61	I	Hester	Thomas		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
699	62	I	Medwid	Dave		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
700	62	I	Medwid	Dave		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
701	62	I	Medwid	Dave		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
702	62	I	Medwid	Dave		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
703	62	I	Medwid	Dave		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
705	63	I	McNamara	Mark		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
704	63	I	McNamara	Mark		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
706	63	I	McNamara	Mark		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
707	63	I	McNamara	Mark		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
708	63	I	McNamara	Mark		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
710	64	I	McNeil	Mike		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
709	64	I	McNeil	Mike		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
711	64	I	McNeil	Mike		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
712	64	I	McNeil	Mike		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
713	64	I	McNeil	Mike		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
715	65	I	Peterson	Ken		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
714	65	I	Peterson	Ken		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
716	65	I	Peterson	Ken		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
717	65	I	Peterson	Ken		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
718	65	I	Peterson	Ken		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
720	66	I	Mather	Linda		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
719	66	I	Mather	Linda		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
721	66	I	Mather	Linda		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							selection of a Preferred Alternative.
722	66	I	Mather	Linda		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
723	66	I	Mather	Linda		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
724	67	I	Hoyle	Nancy		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
725	67	I	Hoyle	Nancy		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
726	67	I	Hoyle	Nancy		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
727	67	I	Hoyle	Nancy		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
728	67	I	Hoyle	Nancy		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
730	68	I	Graham	Billy		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
729	68	I	Graham	Billy		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
731	68	I	Graham	Billy		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
732	68	I	Graham	Billy		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
733	68	I	Graham	Billy		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							issues a Record of Decision on the project.
735	69	I	Varga	Stefan		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
734	69	I	Varga	Stefan		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
736	69	I	Varga	Stefan		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
737	69	I	Varga	Stefan		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
738	69	I	Varga	Stefan		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
740	70	I	Murk	Lucas		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
739	70	I	Murk	Lucas		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
741	70	I	Murk	Lucas		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
742	70	I	Murk	Lucas		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
743	70	I	Murk	Lucas		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed Row NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
744	71	I	Doberenz	Mark		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
745	71	I	Doberenz	Mark		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
748	71	I	Doberenz	Mark		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
746	71	I	Doberenz	Mark		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
747	71	I	Doberenz	Mark		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
749	71	I	Doberenz	Mark		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
750	71	I	Doberenz	Mark		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
752	72	I	Hieb	Daniel		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
751	72	I	Hieb	Daniel		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in:	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
753	72	I	Hieb	Daniel		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
754	72	I	Hieb	Daniel		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
755	72	I	Hieb	Daniel		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
757	73	I	Matsouka	Ian		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
756	73	I	Matsouka	Ian		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
758	73	I	Matsouka	Ian		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						preference.	was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
759	73	I	Matsouka	Ian		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
760	73	I	Matsouka	Ian		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
762	74	I	Tribe	Pam		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
761	74	I	Tribe	Pam		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
763	74	I	Tribe	Pam		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
764	74	I	Tribe	Pam		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
765	74	I	Tribe	Pam		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
767	75	I	Eggers	Tom		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
766	75	I	Eggers	Tom		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
768	75	I	Eggers	Tom		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
769	75	I	Eggers	Tom		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							selection of a Preferred Alternative.
770	75	I	Eggers	Tom		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
772	76	I	Lipscombe	Barg		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
771	76	I	Lipscombe	Barg		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
773	76	I	Lipscombe	Barg		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
774	76	I	Lipscombe	Barg		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
775	76	I	Lipscombe	Barg		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
777	77	I	Hickman	Kasandra		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
776	77	I	Hickman	Kasandra		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
778	77	I	Hickman	Kasandra		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
779	77	I	Hickman	Kasandra		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
780	77	I	Hickman	Kasandra		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
782	78	I	Fitzgerald	Marilyn		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
781	78	I	Fitzgerald	Marilyn		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
783	78	I	Fitzgerald	Marilyn		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
784	78	I	Fitzgerald	Marilyn		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
785	78	I	Fitzgerald	Marilyn		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
787	79	I	Codleti	Francise		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
786	79	I	Codleti	Francise		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
788	79	I	Codleti	Francise		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
789	79	I	Codleti	Francise		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
790	79	I	Codleti	Francise		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
792	80	I	Varga	Daniel		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
791	80	I	Varga	Daniel		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
793	80	I	Varga	Daniel		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
794	80	I	Varga	Daniel		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	selection of a Preferred Alternative. Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
795	80	I	Varga	Daniel		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
797	81	I	Graham	Sara Lee		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
796	81	I	Graham	Sara Lee		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
798	81	I	Graham	Sara Lee		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
799	81	I	Graham	Sara Lee		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
800	81	I	Graham	Sara Lee		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
802	82	I	Alerdoff	Dirk		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
801	82	I	Alerdoff	Dirk		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
803	82	I	Alerdoff	Dirk		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
804	82	I	Alerdoff	Dirk		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
805	82	I	Alerdoff	Dirk		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							issues a Record of Decision on the project.
807	83	I	Segrin	Joan		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
806	83	I	Segrin	Joan		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield interchange, no A-2	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
808	83	I	Segrin	Joan		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
809	83	I	Segrin	Joan		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Reduce interchange footprint move south	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
810	83	I	Segrin	Joan		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Purchase needed ROW NOW to save \$	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition would take at least two years. No right-of-way purchase will be allowed until the FHWA issues a Record of Decision on the project.
811	84	I	Boyd	Kayla		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: ...the Lawnfield extension is a good idea because it would give direct access to Lawnfield garden.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
812	84	I	Boyd	Kayla		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: It will allow less traffic jams.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
813	84	I	Boyd	Kayla		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
814	84	I	Boyd	Kayla		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
815	85	I	Diephaose	Tim		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Building the Lawnfield extension is good idea because lower traffic volumes on other roads	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
816	85	I	Diephaose	Tim		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
817	85	I	Diephaose	Tim		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
818	85	I	Diephaose	Tim		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
819	86	I	Gutierrez	Juan Antonio Amado		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Good idea to build the Lawnfield extension.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
820	86	I	Gutierrez	Juan Antonio Amado		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
821	86	I	Gutierrez	Juan Antonio Amado		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
822	86	I	Gutierrez	Juan Antonio Amado		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
823	87	I	Sinnott	Martin		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						preference. Written in: The Lawnfield extension would improve traffic controls.	over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
824	87	I	Sinnott	Martin		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Would help free up traffic, making pedestrian and bike traffic safe.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
825	87	I	Sinnott	Martin		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
826	87	I	Sinnott	Martin		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
827	88	I	Chaney	Antonio		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
828	88	I	Chaney	Antonio		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							selection of a Preferred Alternative.
829	88	I	Chaney	Antonio		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
830	88	I	Chaney	Antonio		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
831	89	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
832	89	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
833	89	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
834	89	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
835	90	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
837	90	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
836	90	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
838	90	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
840	91	I	Nelson	Sterling		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
839	91	I	Nelson	Sterling		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
841	91	I	Nelson	Sterling		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
842	91	I	Nelson	Sterling		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
844	92	I	Voss	Mark		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
843	92	I	Voss	Mark		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
845	92	I	Voss	Mark		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							selection of a Preferred Alternative.
846	92	I	Voss	Mark		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
848	93	I	Stravens	Mike		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
847	93	I	Stravens	Mike		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
849	93	I	Stravens	Mike		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
850	93	I	Stravens	Mike		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
853	94	I	Larsen	Kevin and Heather		We live in Wenzel Park estates subdivision which is accessed from SE 142nd. Although our property is not directly affected by any of the alternatives, we have some	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						major concerns with respect to the C-3 design options for the midpoint.	Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
854	94	I	Larsen	Kevin and Heather		Based on the EIS, the C-3 design option has the most damaging impacts when it comes to altering this beautiful area. Compared to the other design options, C-3 converts the most acres of land into highway.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
851	94	I	Larsen	Kevin and Heather		It seems to us, that keeping the highway as straight as possible and not throwing a big curve in it, would not only be more energy efficient but also more cost effective.	Thank you for your comment. The project team is working to analyze how the different alternatives and design options compare to the project's stated goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria. The cost-efficiency of the project is an objective under Goal 1: Transportation/Operations (see Chapter 2 of the SDEIS).
856	94	I	Larsen	Kevin and Heather		With the C-3 option curving the highway to the hillside, it would also be required to remove a lot more forested area. This would no doubt be a strain on all the wildlife we see here in our neighborhood.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
855	94	I	Larsen	Kevin and Heather		The environmental impact study supports the claim that the C-3 design option is not the best option when the goals are to be cost effective and to preserve natural resources.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
861	95	I	Sauer	Rod	Sun Ridge Construction	I own the single family residential community Wenzel Park estates. Seems like Alternative 3 with all options except C-3 would be best.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
863	95	I	Sauer	Rod	Sun Ridge Construction	Option C-3 is one of the most costly and converts most land to highway use.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
864	95	I	Sauer	Rod	Sun Ridge Construction	C-3 option is least environmentally friendly.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
866	95	I	Sauer	Rod	Sun Ridge Construction	Under Alternative 3, only option C-3 would increase fuel use.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
868	96	I	Smith	CM		I realize there will be various impacts, but all in all, the project will be a boon.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
869	96	I	Smith	CM		I'd be interested in knowing when and how our property will be bought and for how much.	<p>The acquisition of right-of-way will begin toward the end of the 2010 to 2012 range stated in the SDEIS. The property acquisition process for purchasing roadway right-of-way is governed by specific Federal and State laws identified on page 105 of the Right-of-Way Technical Report. Acquisition will not happen until ODOT and the County know exactly what is needed for the project. When that is known, the value is determined by comparison with recent sales of similar properties sold, knowledge and consideration of costs and depreciation for any improvements to be acquired, and the property's income potential (where applicable).</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
870	97	I	Bostwick	James		My concerns revolve around the closure of Goosehollow Drive. This will redirect traffic for over 100 homes through other parts of the neighborhood to allow exit/entrance to their homes. The current roadway is not designed to handle that great of increase in traffic.	<p>The streets within this neighborhood have been designed to Happy Valley standards and will accommodate the proposed increase in traffic volumes.</p> <p>The design you are commenting on was recently reviewed through the Interchange Area Management Planning process and the design was modified. The intersection of Goosehollow Drive at Hwy 224 will be a three leg intersection with no access to/from the neighborhood to the east. There will be an additional right-out access point at the northwestern terminus of Orchard View Lane for residents to gain access onto northbound Hwy 224. Another element of the Preferred Alternative is the extension of 162nd Avenue South of Hwy 212 to connect to the northeast terminus of SE Goosehollow Drive.</p>
872	97	I	Bostwick	James		I am also concerned about the delay of emergency vehicles into our neighborhood.	As currently designed the access will be closed to vehicular traffic, but will remain open to emergency services via bollards and mountable curbs.
871	97	I	Bostwick	James		We have voiced our concerns about this at previous meetings, but it does not appear to have made any difference.	Many meetings have been held at the east end of the project area, since there were significant changes proposed, including an interchange and a tapered transition back into existing Highway 212 and closure of Goosehollow Drive. Public concerns and issues were collected and documented at the meetings. Given that input, the project teams studied the potential for design refinements. As a result, modifications in this area have been made to allow access to the neighborhood and are shown in the FEIS.
877	98	I	Bostwick	Teri		I live in the Orchard Lake development. I have been to every meeting and at every meeting they have discussed closing/opening Goosehollow. At every meeting with a new map it is closed. Many have voiced keeping Goosehollow open but it goes unheard.	<p>The design you are commenting on was recently reviewed and modified through the Interchange Area Management Planning process.</p> <p>The intersection of Goosehollow Dr. at Hwy 224 will be a three leg intersection with no access to/from</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							the neighborhood to the east. There will be an additional right-out ONLY access point at the north western terminus of Orchard View lane for residents to gain access onto northbound Hwy 224. Another addition in the Preferred Alternative is the extension of 162nd Avenue South of Hwy 212 to connect to the northeast terminus of SE Goosehollow Dr. We hope that the addition of these two elements in the Preferred Alternative will satisfy the removal of a single access point.
879	98	I	Bostwick	Teri		On Nov 7th a house in our development had a fire. Several fire trucks responded. We have the best firemen. The fire was put out quickly because of the easy access up Goosehollow. Had the firemen needed to take Eckert and come through the development it would have taken longer winding through neighborhood streets and young kids.	As currently designed the access will be closed to vehicular traffic, but will remain open to emergency services via bollards and mountable curbs. Emergency response times are not expected to change with the project.
875	98	I	Bostwick	Teri		Closing Goosehollow makes no sense when school buses pick up/drop off kids. It will add many extra minutes to each driver because of the limited access in and out.	The design you are commenting on was recently reviewed and modified through the Interchange Area Management Planning process. The intersection of Goosehollow Dr. at Hwy 224 will be a three leg intersection with no access to/from the neighborhood to the east. Assuming you would be traveling at a conservative 15 mph, the detour would take roughly 2 additional minutes.
882	98	I	Bostwick	Teri		Goosehollow needs to have a right turn ability at the very least. Creating cul de sac neighborhoods is not a good idea.	See Entry # 877.
881	98	I	Bostwick	Teri		There must be more access in and out.	See Entry # 877.
878	98	I	Bostwick	Teri		Don't let another meeting go by without listening to people who live in the areas you are impacting.	See Entry # 877.
891	99	I	Shook	Dick		Could Deer Creek Lane be extended across 82nd Ave. (Hwy 213) to connect with Ambler since it will be extended across the RR? This would give people a back way into Costco and access to Sunnybrook.	Provision for a full access intersection at Deer Creek Ln. and 82nd Ave. will cause the intersection to fail. Extension of Deer Creek Ln. through 82nd Ave. would also conflict with the on-ramp to 82nd Ave. from Sunrise Project.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
883	99	I	Shook	Dick		Due to the critical wildlife corridor at the base of the bluff the mid point access should not be constructed.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
890	99	I	Shook	Dick		Another argument against the midpoint interchange is noise. Trucks and cars will be accelerating and decelerating when they get on and off the expressway creating a lot of noise for the residents at the top of the Bluff.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
888	99	I	Shook	Dick		Great care must be taken to protect the streams and wetlands in and adjacent to the right of way. Streams should be opened up wherever possible.	Methods to minimize the project impacts have been incorporated into the project design. New culverted stream crossings will meet ODFW Fish Passage guidelines.
886	99	I	Shook	Dick		The tree canopy also needs to be spared and additional trees planted to absorb co2 and noise.	The project team has narrowed the project footprint as much as possible, by incorporating tight turn radii and steepening fill slopes as much as possible. The project will replant large fill slopes and disturbed areas with native species prior to completing the project.
884	99	I	Shook	Dick		The new ramps on I-205 should be bridged where they cross Mt. Scott Creek. If possible, the I-205 Mt. Scott Creek culvert should be replaced with a bridge to provide better wildlife passage.	The new ramps on I-205 will be bridges where they cross Mt. Scott Creek. After the selection of the Preferred Alternative, ODOT developed a wildlife mitigation plan commensurate with impacts associated with the Preferred Alternative. Replacing the existing Mt. Scott Creek culvert with a bridge is currently under consideration, but is likely to be prohibitively expensive. The proposed mitigation is as follows: modify the interior of the existing culvert to design a bench (concrete or metal grate) that allows passage of medium-sized wildlife through the culvert above the 2-year flood elevation. Ensure a sufficient 'ramp' for access onto the bench or into the dry culvert is included in the design. (See Table 3 for all proposed mitigation.)
887	99	I	Shook	Dick		A land bridge for wildlife should be built across Mather Rd into Mt. Talbert Nature Park.	The wildlife mitigation plan is outlined in the FEIS (See Chapter 3, Biology and Table 3 in the Executive

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							Summary). Mather Road at Mt. Talbert is outside the current project boundaries.
892	100	I	Hoffman	David		Our Republic, economy, and infrastructure is collapsing. We do not have the money to maintain our existing roads and bridges. People have less money to drive. To build new roads is irrational. No new roads. Maintain what we have.	Thank you for your comment. The project team is working to analyze how the different alternatives and design options compare to the project's stated goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria. The cost-efficiency of the project is an objective under Goal 1: Transportation/Operations (see Chapter 2 of the SDEIS).
893	101	I	Obrist	Linda		No road improvement is necessary.	Thank you for your comment. The project team is working to analyze how the different alternatives and design options compare to the project's stated goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria. The cost-efficiency of the project is an objective under Goal 1: Transportation/Operations (see Chapter 2 of the SDEIS).
895	101	I	Obrist	Linda		Widening 212 from Rock Creek east would be more beneficial.	In considering current operational, safety, and congestion conditions between I-205 and Hwy 26, the greatest need for improvements is in the I-205 Interchange area. Transportation master planning must be completed in the Damascus/Boring area (east of Rock Creek) to determine what transportation improvements are needed, where they should be located, and the character of the land uses they will serve.
894	101	I	Obrist	Linda		If a build is coming, Alt 2 would be the option that would work for our property.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
901	102	I	Jacobsen	Curtis		I believe it has been determined that there is a great need for this project.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
898	102	I	Jacobsen	Curtis		The three phases to 172nd will definitely help traffic congestion. For those living in this area and south on 224. The bottleneck to it all will be past 172nd when all the	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						traffic is funneled back onto 212 and backed up by light at Damascus.	selection of a Preferred Alternative.
900	102	I	Jacobsen	Curtis		To my belief there should be another phase included that would push the corridor on past Damascus before stopping.	Clackamas County and the City of Damascus are currently studying the Hwy 212 corridor from Rock Creek to Hwy 26 as a separate project. See also the response to Entry # 895.
897	102	I	Jacobsen	Curtis		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
904	102	I	Jacobsen	Curtis		How about an off ramp running directly onto 224 south without any stopping in traffic?	This proposal was previously evaluated but not advanced, due to the safety and operational concerns created by conflicts with bike/pedestrians at the interchange, if forecast heavy traffic movements at this ramp were allowed as free-flowing and uncontrolled. Furthermore, the short distance between ramp terminal and first signal at Goosehollow Dr. creates an unsafe weaving section.
902	102	I	Jacobsen	Curtis		The sooner this whole project gets started the better, and hopefully in 15-20 years there will be the sunrise corridor all the way to 26.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
896	102	I	Jacobsen	Curtis		I believe that the impact on these historical resources is indeed minimal and shouldn't affect the time frame of the project. Go for it. Get it done.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
905	103	I	Measelle	Michelle		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: No extension at Lawnfield.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
906	103	I	Measelle	Michelle		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
907	103	I	Measelle	Michelle		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						preference.	<p>was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
908	103	I	Measelle	Michelle		Undecided.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
910	104	I	Glantz	Don		I have heard for nearly 2 decades that ODOT was planning to build a new road or "bypass" or "corridor" through Damascus. I'm very disappointed that your plans presented show no progress on this vital project.	<p>In the 1993 Draft EIS for the Sunrise Corridor, the project extended from I-205 to Highway 26. At that time, planning for then-rural lands east of Rock Creek was uncertain, making it difficult to determine the appropriate design and location for a major transportation facility. Through agreement between ODOT and Metro, the rural portion of the project was deferred until eventual completion of a master plan for the now-urban lands around Damascus (this planning is still underway). One of the primary reasons for modifying the east end of the Sunrise Project to the logical termini of the Rock Creek Junction was to allow time for these new urban lands around Damascus to undergo master planning. The Sunrise Project is fully coordinated with this effort and has been designed to not preclude future transportation options east of Rock Creek. A discussion of the UGB expansion in the Damascus area occurs in the Cumulative Impacts section of the SDEIS on Page 207.</p>
909	104	I	Glantz	Don		It would seem rather important that while Damascus is doing its planning, ODOT would be taking the lead ahead of Damascus to provide this vital access and egress and bypass for the future growth of this targeted expansion	<p>Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						area for Portland.	
911	104	I	Glantz	Don		The need is critically needed NOW. What will the advantage be to wait another 10 years if there no consideration for planning ahead instead of waiting for the crisis to get worse?	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
912	105	I	Decker	Teri		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: No build Lawnfield.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
913	105	I	Decker	Teri		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
914	105	I	Decker	Teri		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
915	105	I	Decker	Teri		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
916	106	I	Holloway	Ariane		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: No build Lawnfield.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
917	106	I	Holloway	Ariane		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
918	106	I	Holloway	Ariane		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						preference.	<p>was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
919	106	I	Holloway	Ariane		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
920	107	I				<p>Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.</p> <p>Written in: Build Lawnfield.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
921	107	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
922	107	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
923	107	I				Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
924	108	I	Stark	Chase		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Lawnfield extension should be built	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
925	108	I	Stark	Chase		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Would free up the flow of traffic and make it safer for drivers.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
926	108	I	Stark	Chase		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
927	108	I	Stark	Chase		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
928	108	I	Stark	Chase		I think it is smart to plan ahead in the development of these extension/interchanges before more businesses built blocking these options.	One of the key outcomes of the Sunrise Project EIS process is to formally select a project design so that the project's right-of-way can be protected through planning measures or acquisition. Purchase of right-of-way following the FHWA Record of Decision will help to preserve the project's affordability in the future.
929	109	I	Adams	Terri		I think that by building the Lawnfield extension will help	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						to free up traffic flows during rush hour.	over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
930	109	I	Adams	Terri		Will give drivers a better route than traveling down 142nd.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
931	109	I	Adams	Terri		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
932	109	I	Adams	Terri		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
933	110	I	Greges	Sherine		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Please do not build the Lawnfield extension	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
934	110	I	Greges	Sherine		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
936	110	I	Greges	Sherine		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
935	110	I	Greges	Sherine		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
937	111	I	Rosin	Erika		<p>Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.</p> <p>Written in: Please build Lawnfield extension.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
938	111	I	Rosin	Erika		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
939	111	I	Rosin	Erika		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
940	111	I	Rosin	Erika		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
941	112	I	Blue	Trisha		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Build Lawnfield extension.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
942	112	I	Blue	Trisha		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
943	112	I	Blue	Trisha		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
944	112	I	Blue	Trisha		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
945	113	I	Briggs	Jeffrey		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: I believe building the Lawnfield Road ext. would benefit everyone and help with traffic.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
946	113	I	Briggs	Jeffrey		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in:	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						It would benefit people living up here.	to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
947	113	I	Briggs	Jeffrey		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
948	113	I	Briggs	Jeffrey		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
949	114	I	Ovalle	Lorena		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Build Lawnfield extension.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
950	114	I	Ovalle	Lorena		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
951	114	I	Ovalle	Lorena		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
952	114	I	Ovalle	Lorena		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
953	115	I	Stephnes	Racaela		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
954	115	I	Stephnes	Racaela		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
955	115	I	Stephnes	Racaela		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
956	116	I	Zanotti	Nikki		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference. Written in: Build Lawnfield extension.	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
957	116	I	Zanotti	Nikki		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
958	116	I	Zanotti	Nikki		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
959	116	I	Zanotti	Nikki		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
960	117	I	Weaver	Andrew		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
961	117	I	Weaver	Andrew		Comment form shows Alternative/Design Option preference.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
963	117	I	Weaver	Andrew		I feel it is important that the building begin as soon as possible so that the displace additional housing or nearby businesses.	One of the key outcomes of the Sunrise Project EIS process is to formally select a project design so that the project's right-of-way can be protected through planning measures or acquisition. Purchase of right-of-way following the FHWA Record of Decision will help to preserve the project's affordability in the future.
964	118	I	Chaney	Brandi		Upon reviewing the numerous maps and various information presented I noticed that by creating the Lawnfield Extension as well as the Single Middle Point interchange on 122nd will do a number of things to help	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						businesses create better access to their locations for one and two could possibly cut down on speeders for the road may possibly be more regulated.	Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
966	118	I	Chaney	Brandi		I think design option C3 and D2 would be the best possible solution.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
968	118	I	Chaney	Brandi		I think planning ahead is imperative before other development occurs such as more commercial and residential property is built.	One of the key outcomes of the Sunrise Project EIS process is to formally select a project design so that the project's right-of-way can be protected through planning measures or acquisition. Purchase of right-of-way following the FHWA Record of Decision will help to preserve the project's affordability in the future.
970	119	I	Ghores	Edwar	PRC	Our Bluff Drive neighborhood has regrettably resigned to the fact that we all are losing a precious, quiet, green space behind our backyards. We are losing our residential neighborhood buffer to a noisy polluting expressway, and there is "NOTHING WE CAN DO ABOUT IT".	The project team acknowledges that the noise is a significant problem for residents on the bluff and that under federal and state rules, allowable mitigation was not found to be cost effective nor feasible. Because of the extremely high mitigation costs, no federal or state funds are available to financially mitigate properties along Bluff Drive and 135th Avenue that face noise and visual impacts if the Sunrise Project is constructed as proposed in the Sunrise Project SDEIS and FEIS, nor does the County have the resources to financially mitigate these properties. At this point, no source of such a large amount of mitigation funds is in sight.
971	119	I	Ghores	Edwar	PRC	After all the studies and calculations we were told that we will have to live with noise levels which exceeds federal acceptable levels. The reason given was the cost to mitigate the noise levels to acceptable levels would be cost prohibitive, and the topography of the Bluff renders conventional means useless. Our neighbors and friends are passing the buck just like the county, selling their homes on the Bluff to unsuspecting buyers "and why not,	See response above regarding noise (Entry #970).

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						I'm being screwed, let them screw someone else, I'll get out of here". Metro and County are looking to push this project through, the did not give serious consideration for options that could mitigate noise and pollution predominantly for cost reasons. Bluff Drive residents think "WE ARE GETTING SCREWED".	
976	120	I	Smith	Pat & Jeff		How is the Sunrise Corridor going to help those of us who live in our area (east of 172nd Ave)?	The Sunrise Project is intended to complement and be consistent with Damascus area transportation system planning.
974	120	I	Smith	Pat & Jeff		Traffic is already a nightmare at peak hours going past our exit/entry and further east through downtown Damascus. As a matter of fact, sometimes the traffic slow down/back up starts as far west as Hwy 224 where it merges into Hwy 212. I thought the idea for this project was to circumvent the heavy (through) car/truck traffic off Hwy 212 and bypassing Damascus at least to 232nd/Hogan Rd. Apparently, that is what should be done, but isn't.	This is a problem to be addressed by Damascus transportation system planning currently in progress.
984	121	I	Hebrard	Kim		Over the years, we have noticed the noise level rise from Highway 212. We cannot imagine the noise level when the proposed 6, and possibly more, lanes of highway are built.	Noise levels generally rise with time in urbanizing areas. Noise levels at properties along much of the new alignment are predicted to increase.
986	121	I	Hebrard	Kim		Why not expand the 2 lane road (Hwy 212) from Rock Creek Junction to Damascus and Boring to 4 lanes before creating a 6-8 lane highway to meet up with existing 2 lane Hwy 212 at Rock Creek Junction?	The area east of Rock Creek is outside of the study area boundaries of this project. Clackamas County and the City of Damascus are currently studying the Hwy 212 corridor from Rock Creek to Hwy 26 as a separate project.
980	121	I	Hebrard	Kim		Where will the wildlife go once construction begins on the new 6-8 lane highway system?	Wildlife typically follow a path of least resistance that also provides cover and escape routes from predators. It is anticipated that wildlife will continue to use the corridor once construction is complete as it will still provide these functions relative to the land uses that surround it.
982	121	I	Hebrard	Kim		What about tire dust, air and noise pollution that will come with the super highway?	The impacts on air quality are addressed on p. 133-39. The evaluation of impacts is limited to air pollutants in vehicle emissions that are regulated by the Environmental Protection Agency (such as

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, volatile organic compounds) and can be computer-modeled. Additional discussion of mobile source air toxics and dust was also provided in the SDEIS. The effects of tire dust were not evaluated. Noise impacts were discussed on pages 127-30.
981	121	I	Hebrard	Kim		How will our hillside be stabilized for this superhighway? Will ODOT guarantee the stabilization of the hillside?	The impacts of site grading on the stability of existing slopes have been identified. Two mapped landslides have been identified along the slopes adjacent to the preferred alignment (see Figure PA-47 in the FEIS). Adequate alignment width has been provided to allow for the incorporation of engineering design of mitigation measures to address the potential slope stability issues associated with the landslide areas. Mitigation measures may include adjusting the elevation of the roadway, minimizing grading/cutting of the slope, adding buttress fills, and use of retaining structures such as soldier pile and secant pile retaining walls.
985	121	I	Hebrard	Kim		Where is the money coming from to obtain the right of way and construct this superhighway? Given our economic times, this is not the time to be planning this superhighway. People are losing their jobs and homes.	It is likely the Sunrise Project will be built in phases over time as increments of funding become available. Some funding is already programmed to begin a first phase of the project.
987	121	I	Hebrard	Kim		I'm sure USF Reddaway and the Fred Meyer Distribution Center are pushing this project right along. As far as I'm concerned, ODOT can build a road from their distribution centers to I-205 for truck traffic only.	This proposal would not satisfy The Purpose and Need or Goal 1 of the Goals and Objectives of this project.
989	122	I	Fromhiller	Patrice		...cannot tell if there will be a separate bike path built in the right of way for the I-205 to Rock Creek junction. Since there is a bike path along I-205 I can not imagine ODOT would leave out a reasonable connector coming from the east. Especially in this day and energy age, bike/people paths are not extras, they are essentials. Damascus plans on extensive non-motorized pathways and would logically hook up to one next to the Sunrise Parkway. Like I said, I could not tell if one is on the plans, but it is a requirement these days and needs to be added	A multi-use path is proposed for the Sunrise Project, from I-205 to the Rock Creek junction. East of the Rock Creek junction, existing shoulder/bike lanes are available along OR 212 to SE 172nd Ave.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						if not already there.	
990	122	I	Fromwhille r	Patrice		I know it is too late for anyone to see the forest for the trees, but the cloverleaf is laughable except it will become a reality as it is shown. I was told there were all sorts of new rules involved in moving cars via a cloverleaf which is why it is so massive and ugly. Again, most of the world is trying to limit the impact of autos as much as possible, but ODOT plans for what must be a record breaking concrete monster. It would be interesting for ODOT to seek a professional outside (non Oregon) opinion on the size and looks of the cloverleaf. Fresh eyes to maybe force the planners to look subjectively at the design.	Two different interchange designs were evaluated, and the Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI) [D-3] was selected as the tightest possible design, with smallest footprint, that would preserve the most developable land in vicinity. Although the SPUI design does have a smaller footprint, it does require three crossings of Rock Creek, whereas the other "folded diamond" designs [D-1, D-2] only require two crossings.
1094	125	I	Russell	Pat		Generally speaking, the freeway concept is ill-advised and unsustainable today and in the future. It promotes the consumption of depleted resources (oil, geography, urban communities, water and fish and wildlife habitat and corridors).	The Regional Transportation Plan has identified the Sunrise Corridor as a future throughway. The project selection process will determine the design characteristics of the selected facility based on consideration of all comments received through the public hearing process.
1097	125	I	Russell	Pat		It is growth inducing in a region which is politically committed to growing in, not out. It forever, in our lifetime, commits the conversion of limited rural lands to urban uses in our region.	The pattern and extent of future growth and expansion is directed by the Metro 2040 Growth Concept. The Sunrise Project has been identified in the Regional Transportation Plan as an improvement needed to implement this concept.
1102	125	I	Russell	Pat		Today, in Clackamas County, public opinion polls point away from building new freeways and major arterials through raw land, and emphasize the need to take care of what public assets we have to today and perhaps expand modestly only where we need.	The decision on the selected alternative for the Sunrise Project will be made by elected officials for Clackamas County and the cities of Happy Valley and Damascus. These officials are responsible for understanding and representing the public opinion of their respective jurisdictions.
1103	125	I	Russell	Pat		The federally mandated SDEIS process is too inflexible and rigid (and too broad-based, lacking specificity) to be responsive to local planning needs at the neighborhood level. Any SDEIS certifications and approvals will leave local concerns to change and politics. Mitigation measures will be so broad that the proposed solutions will not be able to assure that the many	The EIS process is responsible for identifying and addressing community impacts that are a direct result of implementing the resulting project. The selected alternative must also be in conformance with adopted local comprehensive plans. Affected city and county elected officials will determine whether the selected alternative adequately

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						problems/impacts at a more local neighborhood level will address concerns.	addresses local community needs and effectively protects local resources.
1104	125	I	Russell	Pat		This SDEIS process should be basically shelved and we should start over when discussing and planning for our transportation needs. This document is written to justify the funding and construction of a freeway and less to frame the long term planning consequences.	The Sunrise Project is directed by the Regional Transportation Plan and the 2040 Growth Concept. In the course of choosing between the No-Build Alternative and possible build alternatives, elected Metro, County, and city officials will determine whether this direction is appropriate for the project's service area.
1100	125	I	Russell	Pat		The study area certainly does have its fair share of the traffic problems and needs for a certain level of improvement. However that does not translate into 8 lane freeways, mega interchanges, 5 lane arterials and a major shift in traffic patterns adversely impacting neighborhoods.	The project's design is based on adopted standards of mobility and operational performance. Agency and elected officials developing, recommending, and selecting the project alternative will determine the extent to which these standards are met.
1105	125	I	Russell	Pat		Finally, stating in a Notice of Issuance of the SDEIS that those who do not comment leaves decision makers with the assumption that the individual is not interested (or perhaps implies that the SDEIS is adequate or that freeways are the "solution" to our transportation), is an inappropriate comment about the magnitude of this proposal.	The SDEIS process relies heavily on the public awareness of elected officials in performing their role of selecting a Preferred Alternative. The hearing process is not intended to be a vote on which alternative should be selected.
1019	125	I	Russell	Pat		The county, Metro and ODOT have not done enough to utilize the I-205 Gladstone interchange link to the Clackamas Industrial Park Sanctuary through explicit advanced signage along the freeway (south of Gladstone) and reconfiguration of the interchange for easy on and off access for large trucks. The super-elevated and hard right turns (and circle ramps) are not conducive to truck needs.	The Gladstone Interchange is outside of the study area for this project. However, this interchange is currently underutilized due to its location, and the land-use/demand served by this interchange, as well as design constraints, and might provide more relief to the Clackamas Hwy interchange to the north. ODOT has studied options to make the Gladstone interchange easier to use for trucks, but no plans for improvements are in place. Regarding signage, signage for this project will be compliant with the most current Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).
1112	125	I	Russell	Pat		The Lawnfield freeway access cannot be reached from any industry other than those along Lawnfield Drive, and those industries cannot get to the Clackamas Highway	Clackamas County currently has a project that will connect Industrial Way and 98th Court between Lawnfield Road and Mather Road. These

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						without using I 205 or SE 82nd Drive. There is no north-south connectivity east of the r/r between these 2 industrial streets. Further, residential areas in Happy Valley/Sunnyside are discouraged from tying into the Lawnfield interchange because there is no direct, convenient collector.	connections will allow vehicles to travel between Hwy 212/224 and Sunnybrook Boulevard. This project is schedule for construction summer 2010. The realignment of the Industrial Way connection under the proposed Sunrise Project, connecting to Mather Road is also part of this project.
1117	125	I	Russell	Pat		Further, the interchange is not friendly to trucks arriving from out of the area, and they are not signed to use the exits to get into the industrial areas east of the r/r. Trucks will though use the Lawnfield ramp to get onto I-205 if they are in the area, again mixing local traffic with freeway-destined traffic.	Signage will be compliant with the most current Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).
1092	125	I	Russell	Pat		A mega interchange is not needed to accomplish these modest local connectivity goals, and , as stated earlier, there is already an east-west freight corridor of state wide significance between Portland and eastern Oregon.	The interchange has been designed in coordination with the traffic and transportation forecasts for the area. According to Metro's travel demand modeling programs, the proposed interchange is appropriately sized and accomplishes the purpose and need for the project.
1108	125	I	Russell	Pat		This traffic will NOT be able to use the proposed freeway (such as go to I205 and then get off at the Sunnybrook/Sunnyside braided interchange). This projects to over 10,000 more vehicle trips in the corridor compared to today's trip counts. This means failing intersections at both SE 82nd Drive and Sunnybrook Blvd and SE 82nd Drive and Sunnyside Road.	Based on project estimates, there are roughly 5,000 vehicles per day that would have to find alternative travel routes due to the braiding of ramps along I-205 with this project, primarily between the Sunnyside/Sunnybrook Interchange and the Hwy 212/224 Interchange. That is the reason for the new direct connection (5-lane cross section) between 82nd Avenue and 82nd Drive.
1113	125	I	Russell	Pat		This traffic [Damascus traffic and industrial traffic destined for the regional center] should be intercepted as far east as possible. East of I-205, and directed north to Sunnybrook Blvd and 97th Ave.	The Sunrise facility is the appropriate roadway to accommodate traffic from Damascus to the regional center. The goal of this project is to not create cut through traffic, but to place trips onto the appropriate facilities.
1109	125	I	Russell	Pat		The county and SDEIS note that 82nd Drive should be widened to 5 lanes and support double the traffic it does today. Further, there would be no local business access north of Clackamas Highway to literally Clackamas Rd cutting off the services for travelers and the	The existing access points along 82nd Drive between Hwy 212/224 and Clackamas Road would result in severe safety concerns if left open. As part of the project, alternative access will be provided for anyone losing their current access.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						neighborhood.	
1110	125	I	Russell	Pat		Further, this street widening is noted to be constructed by others. It is confusing just when access to individual lots would be eliminated and road improvements completed. There is no indication that road widening would take into consideration local shopping access needs, pedestrians, aesthetics (such as street trees, raised landscaped medians, focal planting areas, neighborhood signage, etc.) The plans do not call for any mid-block signals to provide more convenient left turn movement needs from side streets. Clearly, there should be a signal at Clackamas Rd and either Jannsen or Tolbert Roads.	The design you are suggesting was reviewed as part of the SDEIS refinement process. Roadway improvements resulting from this process have been included in the Preferred Alternative, as described in the FEIS.
1111	125	I	Russell	Pat		Many of the side streets are in very poor condition or lack needed urban amenities (curbs, sidewalks, street trees, HC access). In some areas the roadway has given over to gravel, bottomless potholes and indiscriminate parking patterns.	For local roadway issues that are not influenced by this project, please contact either your City or County representatives in their respective Transportation departments.
1114	125	I	Russell	Pat		Access should not be closed to local side streets, such as Adams/Alansa Street or Hood street, but rather should be modified into a mid-block signalized intersection to permit access to the noted mini interchange concept.	A signal at either of the two intersections mentioned would fail to meet Clackamas County signal spacing standards.
1093	125	I	Russell	Pat		Creating a 5 lane corridor and doubling the traffic loads with outside traffic severely impacts the local business trade and commerce and services for both travelers and residents on a 3 lane street that presently handles traffic fairly well.	The project analysis has shown that even today this area fails to meet jurisdictional standards. By 2030, this area is expected to suffer extremely long delays and failing operations.
1115	125	I	Russell	Pat		With a few more signals and much less freeway ramp traffic (that wants nothing to do with the 82nd Dr corridors) 82nd Drive would return to a local business artery that the neighborhoods live by.	The freeway ramp volumes were determined using industry standards and are therefore the closest estimation for the year 2030. As demand increases between now and 2030, the areas already at capacity will deteriorate further.
1116	125	I	Russell	Pat		Another alternative is to just turn the expressway into a 6 lane strip corridor, slow the traffic down, similar to the TV highway in Beaverton/Aloha/Hillsboro.	This proposal would not satisfy Goal 1 of the goals and objectives of this project "meet...capacity needs for statewide and regional travel within the Hwy 212/224 Corridor."

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
1098	125	I	Russell	Pat		The unilateral closure of Lake Rd at Johnson would force 7000 resident neighborhood to rely solely on the Webster Rd access to the expressway, or force more people to try and jump on the I 205 to "go around" the congestion	The design you are suggesting was reviewed as part of the SDEIS refinement process. Roadway improvements resulting from this process have been included in the Preferred Alternative, as described in the FEIS.
1118	125	I	Russell	Pat		This puts an undue burden on a local collector, not designed, nor intended to service the entire area. Further, Webster Rd intersection with the expressway is the primary link into industrial distribution centers, and the primary link to Linwood Ave which is the only north-south link between Gladstone and the NE area of Milwaukie leading into Portland.	The design you are suggesting was reviewed as part of the SDEIS refinement process. Roadway improvements resulting from this process have been included in the Preferred Alternative, as described in the FEIS.
1106	125	I	Russell	Pat		The county, ODOT, Metro, Tri Met and the City of Milwaukie need to plan this expressway corridor for land use and transportation prior to opening up a new freeway to Damascus	See response for Entry # 1038.
1101	125	I	Russell	Pat		...the Sunrise Corridor is dead on arrival. The freeway does not adequately support the concept of inward growth and focus on a "centers concept" in the Region 2040 plan.	See response for Entry # 1097.
1099	125	I	Russell	Pat		ROW acquisition and mega interchanges adversely affect existing business and should be avoided. A scaled down version of extending the Milwaukie Expressway eastward will allow more industrial and commercial integrity	The project's design is based on adopted standards of mobility and operational performance. This proposal would not satisfy Goal 1 of the goals and objectives of this project "meet...capacity needs for statewide and regional travel within the Hwy 212/224 Corridor".
1095	125	I	Russell	Pat		Dust becomes a serious PM-10 problem, let alone the smaller particle impacts. As vehicles reliant on petroleum are switched to non-petroleum propulsion, some of the air quality around interchanges can be greatly enhanced.	At this time, the Portland area has air quality that meets the NAAQS. In the future, regulation of fuels and vehicle technologies will help to decrease emissions of fine particulates (PM2.5). However, area-wide emissions of very fine particulates (PM10) are expected to increase.
1119	126	I	Owen	Bob		If you guys go around and buy property during a terrible recession at "market value" I would think you could basically steal everyone's property if the recession is bad enough. My question is how can we make sure the Sunrise project doesn't cherry pick property during a	The acquisition of right-of-way will begin toward the end of the 2010 to 2012 range stated in the SDEIS. The property acquisition process for purchasing road right-of-way is governed by specific Federal and State laws identified on page 105 of the Right-

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						depressed real estate market?	of-Way Technical Report. Only property that is needed for the project can be purchased under Eminent Domain laws, with few exceptions. One exception is property that is no longer of economic value to the owner due to the purchase of part of the property for the project. In that case, ODOT or the County would offer to purchase the remaining property. Another exception is early or advance acquisition. This can happen if a property owner places the property up for sale in a location that is very likely going to be needed for the project. An advance purchase also has strict and specific requirements that must be adhered to during the purchasing process.
1121	126	I	Owen	Bob		We would never sell our property under these circumstances until the market stabilized and brought us a fair price, not a price that is drastically reduced due to current market conditions beyond our control. Our family has owned this property since the 1960's and to lose 30 to 40% of its real estate value because of a terrible recession would be unconscionable for the county to do to its property owners and tax paying citizens. Is this issue being addressed?	The acquisition of right-of-way will begin toward the end of the 2010 to 2012 range stated in the SDEIS. The property acquisition process for purchasing road right-of-way is governed by specific Federal and State laws identified on page 105 of the Right-of-Way Technical Report. As stated in the Mitigation Measures on the same page, "just compensation is based on valuation of the needed property by an experienced and qualified right-of-way agent or by an independent fee appraiser." That valuation must be determined by comparison with recent sales of similar properties sold. The laws that govern the process will not allow the compensation to be based on a historic value of the property or a future projection of the value.
1125	127	I	Yoder	Robert		The noise impact alone is not acceptable	See response to Entry #1126.
1126	127	I	Yoder	Robert		The No Build or Build with no midpoint interchange with mitigation noise walls should be added the full length of the above bluff. Starting with Camp Withycombe to just past 212/224 intersection.	This comment has been noted as an expression of preference for either the No-Build or the no-midpoint alternative. As far as the sound walls, there are very specific FHWA and ODOT guidelines for when sound walls can be included in a project. The criteria are listed in the Noise Technical Report on pages 62 and 63. A great deal of effort was given

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							to trying to find mitigation that met the criteria so that a sound wall could be recommended for the bluff neighborhood. However, no mitigation was identified that met the criteria. A detailed discussion of the mitigation considered is included in the Noise Technical Report on page 70 and in Appendix G of the technical report. If a sound wall does not meet the FHWA and ODOT criteria, federal and state funding cannot be used for noise mitigation.
1123	127	I	Yoder	Robert		The midpoint interchange will cause too much congestion on 212.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1128	128	I	McClain	Richard		Rather than spending unknown millions on building new overpasses to connect the new Sunrise highway to the existing 212/224 why not build an off ramp that could connect the two by building a roadway under the new highway that comes out at the stop light at Rock Creek. This would reduce the economic cost on building the new highway but also cost on the local economy.	There are too many vehicles using the Sunrise Project at and west of Rock Creek to end at a signalized intersection. There are also future plans to continue this grade separated limited access expressway east through the City of Damascus to Hwy 26.
1131	129	I	Andrews	Rick		I would like to know when this project is scheduled to start.	The SDEIS included an anticipated schedule on page ES-35. The schedule shows construction beginning in 2013 at the earliest, pending approval and funding. Final design, permitting, and right-of-way acquisition could begin in 2010, and would take two years.
1130	129	I	Andrews	Rick		A group that I belong to uses the Clackamas Community Center on SE 90th on a regular basis. How will the community center be affected by this project?	The Clackamas Community Club, located at 15711 SE 90th Ave. would be acquired for right-of-way for the Preferred Alternative. The property acquisition process for purchasing road right-of-way is governed by specific Federal and State laws identified on page 105 of the Right-of-Way Technical Report. If the building is displaced, relocation assistance will be provided to the

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							Clackamas Community Club. A summary is provided in the ODOT brochure entitled, "Moving Because of the Highway or Public Project." Benefits can include search expenses, moving expenses and some reestablishment expenses. A Relocation Agent works with the business to help with the relocation benefits. The laws do not cover the loss of business value.
1132	130	I	Steigledger	Tom		Please...get this project done	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1134	131	I	Gonzales	Jim		I think this project would increase traffic and crime in our community	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1133	131	I	Gonzales	Jim		From all people I've spoken with in the project area we all have the same response. NO SUNRISE PROJECT.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1137	132	I	Henderson	Sandra		I would like to express my concerns regarding the Option C3: modified follow tree-line alignment. This alignment would require excavation of a large treed hillside between 142nd and 152nd Aves. This hillside is a wildlife corridor that is home to deer, coyotes, and hawks. We purchased our home in this neighborhood because we love the woods and wildlife that surround us. According to the arterial views at the meeting, part of our subdivision would be in the path of excavation. This option would ruin our quiet neighborhood but cutting down the trees that insulate us from the current Highway 212, wiping out homes and cutting through neighboring lots. Options C3 would also be more expensive than other proposals due to the excavation required to build the road along this alignment.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
1136	132	I	Henderson	Sandra		I believe options C1 or C2 would be far more practical than cutting into the hill.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.</p>
1142	133	I	Hall	Debra & Richard		<p>Livability-it seems that having a major 6 lane highway completely diminishes any quality of life in/at our home. We realize that we chose to live directly off Hwy 212, however we determined that we would accept the level of noise of a 2 lane hwy. The increased noise levels and carbon emissions from even more traffic really upsets the factor.</p>	<p>At certain modeled locations south of the proposed highway and east of OR 224, the noise levels for the build alternatives are predicted to be lower than those under the No Build Alternative because of the alignment and elevation of the highway and other topographic features. (See Figure 49 of the SDEIS, sites 118, 119, 120 and 124.) In addition, with the proposed facility, less congestion will improve livability from a mobility standpoint. That is, traffic will be better able to move through the area and access OR 212 more easily than under the No Build. The negative impacts would be from higher volumes of vehicles than under the No Build alternative, which will result in more air emissions for residents closer to the highway, although pollutant levels overall are expected to diminish due to increasing emission controls over the next 25 years.</p>
1143	133	I	Hall	Debra & Richard		<p>Diminishing ability to sell our homes and diminishing value. As most people, we value our home. We had expected that with a lot of work we could have our house contribute to our nest egg upon selling. If the highway is one a meager 150 ft away from our property line, we can expect zero ability to see and zero added value to our house. This is a very disturbing situation and we ask you as a group of people who are making decisions for us to place yourself in our shoes.</p>	<p>The project team acknowledges that the noise is a significant problem for residents on the bluff and that under federal and state rules, allowable mitigation was not found to be cost effective nor feasible. Because of the extremely high mitigation costs, no federal or state funds are available to financially mitigate properties along Bluff Drive and 135th Avenue that face noise and visual impacts if the Sunrise Project is constructed as proposed in the Sunrise Project SDEIS and FEIS, nor does the County have the resources to financially mitigate these properties. At this point, no source of such a large amount of mitigation funds is in sight.</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
1145	133	I	Hall	Debra & Richard		Zero concern for the people who live off the highway. In one meeting we had a couple years ago we asked the questions "can we expect the county or ODOT to build a sound barrier to help with the expected traffic noise?" A very disappointing answer was shared: we were told that a barrier wall would not go up unless a certain decibel level was breached. My questions to this comment is shouldn't the people who live near the highway decide whether or not a wall should be placed, it should be up to the home owners, That comment from the ODOT employee really makes us angry.	Nationally accepted federal procedures for evaluating and mitigating traffic noise are being followed in developing the Sunrise project. Where noise barriers or other forms of mitigation are found to be feasible and cost-effective, they are included in the Preferred Alternative.
1148	134	I	Bradley	Margie		I just hope you do enough improvement so you don't have to tear up the streets right after you finish the project. We need to plan so that we don't redo things so much. If we know there is going to be a street going in lets put the sewer trunk in now so that it is ready when the development is started. May cost a little more but in the long run much less expensive on the tax payers as the streets will not have to be re-dug and paved over and over again.	These types of details will be handled in the final engineering design of the Preferred Alternative. The County and the cities of Happy Valley and Damascus are involved in the project management team and will coordinate construction projects as much as possible to minimize disruption to the community. Currently we are only at a conceptual 5-10% design level.
1146	134	I	Bradley	Margie		We must do what we can to protect historical spots in our society. If things need to be moved to protect them, so be it. Progress is always going to make for things to change but progress is good most of the time. With the projected amount of people coming to our area we need to be ready for them	Thank you for your comment. The selection of a Preferred Alternative requires the balancing of tradeoffs between choices. Public input is an important factor in the decision-making process. An analysis of impacts to historic structures was conducted as part of the SDEIS. Results can be found on pages 183-190 of that document.
1152	136	I	Parkin	Gary		The project does not adequately analyze and mitigate for the impact to the Milwaukie Expressway (Hwy 224.) The project proposes three west bound traffic lanes of the project abruptly transitioning to the existing 2 traffic lanes at Johnson Rd. Hwy 224 has been identified by ODOT and the City of Milwaukie (2007 TSP) as being near capacity currently, and the need for a refinement plan is specified as a high priority need.	ODOT's Interchange Area Management Plan resulted in recommendations for potential mitigation in that area, including a plan to continue the three lanes to/through Webster/Lake Road. This is part of the Preferred Alternative and is analyzed in the FEIS.
1153	137	I	Waldemar	Martha		I approve alternative 2 with new Lawnfield alignment-to allow Lawnfield businesses (especially those with long	Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						trucks/trailers) to easily access I 205 without having to cross railroad tracks	are included in the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1155	137	I	Waldemar	Martha		I approve midpoint-single point interchange, to reduce the additional construction of new roads required for the split interchange	Thank you for your comment. The single interchange at SE 122nd Ave. was selected in the Preferred Alternative. Design Option B-2 (split-diamond interchange) was not selected. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1156	137	I	Waldemar	Martha		East end of midpoint-design option C-2 to reduce the impact on properties to the north, including problems with sound	Thank you for your comment. Design Option C-2 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1158	137	I	Waldemar	Martha		Rock Creek junction-design option D3 that provides more land for private businesses.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1157	137	I	Waldemar	Martha		The folded diamond interchange and the similar variation takes up valuable land needed for some major projects that will bring much-needed family-wage jobs to the area.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1160	137	I	Waldemar	Martha		Install a traffic light on the west end of the Clackamas	The southbound I-205 ramp terminal at Hwy 212 is

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						overpass. Continuous flowing east-bound traffic from Roots Road and Clackamas Rd to McKinley Rd makes it very difficult for south-bound traffic to get onto I-205. The southbound traffic has to stop and wait for a gap in the eastbound traffic in order to cross that lane. The southbound traffic clogs the westbound intersections as far back at 102nd Ave.	<p>proposed to be signalized and improved as part of this project.</p> <p>The intersection of McKinley Ave at Hwy 212 is not being proposed as a signal because it is located too close to an interchange ramp terminal to be signalized. The westbound traffic from a signal would cause additional congestion on the I-205 Mainline.</p>
1161	137	I	Waldemar	Martha		Eliminate the left turn lane to go north onto SE 98th Ave (non-signal) from east bound Hwy. 212/224.	A right-in/right-out only is proposed at this intersection. The proposed widening of OR 212/224 with the addition of a third westbound lane creates a safety hazard with unsignalized left-turn movements crossing 3 lanes of traffic, instead of current 2 lanes of traffic.
1159	137	I	Waldemar	Martha		There is a signal at SE 102nd Ave that will accomplish the same purpose. When vehicles want to make the left turn, they have to cross two lanes of continuous flowing west bound traffic. If the inside lane stops to allow the driver to try to cross, that lane can be held up for several minutes while the crossing driver debates/tries to see how/when they can cross the outside lane. Visibility is very difficult, especially if large trucks are blocking the line of sight. I have also been told that there are drivers on SE 98th Ave on the south side of Hwy 224/212 trying to make a left turn onto Hwy. 212/224 by maneuvering the above left turn lane to access the west bound lane of the highway. By making all traffic use the signaled intersection at SE 102nd Ave to make left turns, traffic will flow fast and safer on this busy highway.	ODOT's Interchange Area Management Plan resulted in recommendations for potential mitigation in that area, including a plan to limit SE 98th Access to Highway 212/224 to right-in right-out and routing left turns to the signal at 102nd Avenue. This concept is part of the Preferred Alternative and is analyzed in the FEIS.
1162	138	I	Emmert	Terry		I think that should be the Lawnfield option of building it, for several reasons. The should build the Lawnfield extension due to the fact that we're going to lose a lot of major business in that area. Oregon Iron etc. if they have to be relocated they will not relocate in the county. They will move to the state of Washington. So for that reason, I feel that it should be built. And also for the flow, that	<p>Thank you for your comment. Both the Tolbert Rd. over-crossing and the North Lawnfield Rd. extension are included in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the</p>

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						they can run up to Sunnybrook. I think its a good option.	selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1164	138	I	Emmert	Terry		...due to the fact that we're going to lose a lot of major business in that area. Oregon Iron etc. if they have to be relocated they will not relocate in the county. They will move to the state of Washington. So for that reason, I feel that it should be built. And also for the flow, that they can run up to Sunnybrook. I think its a good option.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1163	138	I	Emmert	Terry		I think definitely a midpoint interchange. I believe it should be a single point, midpoint because I don't think it's worth the extra cost.	Thank you for your comment. The single interchange at SE 122nd Ave. was selected in the Preferred Alternative. Design Option B-2 (split-diamond interchange) was not selected. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1165	138	I	Emmert	Terry		I don't agree with the split diamond	Thank you for your comment. The single interchange at SE 122nd Ave. was selected in the Preferred Alternative. Design Option B-2 (split-diamond interchange) was not selected. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1168	138	I	Emmert	Terry		I believe it should be a single point, midpoint because I don't think its worth the extra cost, and I don't believe that its necessary to have an on-ramp on 122nd and 135th. I believe that one would be quite sufficient, because the whole purpose of doing this is to flow truck traffic and to make the traffic flow on 212, and that can be accomplished with a single interchange.	Thank you for your comment. The single interchange at SE 122nd Ave. was selected in the Preferred Alternative. Design Option B-2 (split-diamond interchange) was not selected. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1166	138	I	Emmert	Terry		I am in favor of the C-3, as it is less destructive to the businesses along Hwy 212. There are also large parcels of vacant property, whereas if they took the other options,	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						it would be dissecting them, and the remainder would basically be no usable and worthless. And I think there would be a lot of opportunity for industrial or commercial in that area in future, due to the proper alignment using C-3	to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1167	138	I	Emmert	Terry		Also C-3 builds on a little bit higher ground, gaining elevation as they go to get over the highway, or 162nd, climb up over 162nd and a couple other side benefits that it gives us. ODOT, in their design, is going over the top of the freeway on 142nd and I believe that's a good idea.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1169	138	I	Emmert	Terry		I believe the D-3 option would be the best because it's less destructive that's really a major point for Providence's property development site.	Thank you for your comment. Design Option D-3 was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1170	139	I	Dulcich	Jeff		I would support either alternative	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1173	139	I	Dulcich	Jeff		What I would not support is the D-2 or D-3 or C-2 sections	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1172	139	I	Dulcich	Jeff		I think it would be a shame to knock out existing businesses that have conducted their business for years along that Hwy 212 in favor or pressure put on by Providence Hospital to have an easier time developing their land. After all, Providence is in a situation to acquire land, if they need it, or move their design any way they want.	Multiple factors including area planning objectives, protection of natural and community resources, and project design objectives are considered in defining a Preferred Alternative. Project decisions are not based on favoring a specific land owner's interest.
1174	139	I	Dulcich	Jeff		I also want to point out that D-2, D-3, and C-2 take out the industrial area in favor of residential area. It would be much easier for industrial properties and businesses to coexist with an expressway rather than residential area.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
1197	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		The purpose and need for the project is suspect because of the current downturn in the economy and the general reduction of property values.	The project is intended to serve planned patterns and densities of future growth and development. Changes in the economy may affect the rate of growth but the planned patterns and densities haven't changed - - it just may take longer for the assumed 2030 levels of development to occur. It is fully expected that the Sunrise project would be built in phases over time in a manner that is appropriate to the rate of development and the availability of funding.
1198	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		Future growth of the area is overestimated and appears to be based on the overly optimistic projections (fuzzy math) of county planners and engineers from 15-20 years ago. The repeal of Measure 37 has also significantly reduced the potential growth of the area. The projections need to be updated with dose of reality. Statements such as "this area is expected to double its employment by 2012" are questionable given current economic conditions.	See response to Entry # 1197.
1199	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		The paradigm that the only way to address development is through new and wider roads is 1950's and 1960's thinking and is obviously out dated. Building the road will only create more urban sprawl.	See Response to Entry # 113.
1200	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		It is not clear in the document if the project is reactionary to development or is intended to be a stimulus to development. Statement on page 61 "this alternative is not expected to stop future planned development in the long tern, but it could reduce the rate at which planned development occurs" This project appears to be supportive of "planned development" whatever that is.	See Response to Entry # 113.
1201	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		The homeowners above the project on Bluff drive will bear the brunt of the negative impacts, with decreased property values.	The project team acknowledges that the noise is a significant problem for residents on the bluff and that under federal and state rules, allowable mitigation was not found to be cost effective nor feasible. Because of the extremely high mitigation costs, no federal or state funds are available to financially mitigate properties along Bluff Drive and

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							135th Avenue that face noise and visual impacts if the Sunrise Project is constructed as proposed in the Sunrise Project SDEIS and FEIS, nor does the County have the resources to financially mitigate these properties. At this point, no source of such a large amount of mitigation funds is in sight.
1202	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		Noise is identified as a significant impact with no mitigation measures proposed because as the SDEIS states there are no feasible mitigation measure. In fact, why should homeowners on Bluff Drive bother to do any improvements to their homes with the prospect of little or negative returns on investment.	Because of the extremely high mitigation costs, no federal or state funds are available to financially mitigate properties along Bluff Drive and 135th Avenue that face noise and visual impacts if the Sunrise Project is constructed as proposed in the Sunrise Project SDEIS and FEIS, nor does the County have the resources to financially mitigate these properties. At this point, no source of such a large amount of mitigation funds is in sight.
1203	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		Why wasn't the bridge over the railroad tracks near 82nd drive widened when it was reconstructed a few years ago? An additional lane was added eastbound, but no additional westbound lanes were added. Instead, a wide concrete median was constructed. An additional lane may have provided some congestion relief to the 212/82nd drive intersection	The funding package for the 2005/2006 third eastbound lane on OR 212/224, I-205 to SE Evelyn St. ('cracked bridge' bonding program) was limited to replacing (not widening) the northern span (WB) of the UPRR viaduct. Adding a third westbound lane at that time would have required additional improvements, and funds, downstream at the 82nd Dr. intersection. A project adding a third westbound lane has been identified in the SDEIS as part of Preferred Alternative. ODOT will assess entire bridge deck in the final design of the Sunrise Project to determine the best way to configure the lanes on the bridge.
1204	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		The document is very clumsy, cumbersome, poorly organized and seems to be incomplete. It is difficult to read at best, especially having to navigate between the document and the technical reports on the DVD.	The SDEIS was organized to highlight the most pertinent issues to the decision at hand, while following federal guidance. The project team attempted to present the tradeoffs between alternatives and design options as clearly as possible.
1205	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		It appears it was a rush job as the technical reports appear to be incomplete or draft versions of the reports. The document states on page ix "The technical reports	The technical reports provided the basis for the SDEIS. After the preparation of the technical reports, the SDEIS writer worked with the authors of

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						are important for determining whether sufficient analyses of the alternatives have been conducted". Given that statement, how can ODOT and the county, in clear conscience, present reports that appear to be incomplete, unsigned and undated? Maybe ODOT and the county didn't think anyone would actually read the reports given the format, size of the report and the short time allowed for review	the reports to summarize and highlight the key findings of their work for inclusion in the SDEIS. The technical staff was engaged in further analysis to update their analyses in support of the findings presented in the FEIS. Revised Technical Reports are available for public review.
1207	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		While there is an impressive list of preparers, there is no mention of an interdisciplinary team. NEPA requires that agencies "utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decision making which may have an impact on man's environment." Were there interdisciplinary team meetings that allowed the many specialists to interact in developing alternatives and design? Are there meeting notes available for public review? Who were the core team members of the interdisciplinary teams?	The list of preparers presented in the SDEIS (page 243) is a multi-disciplinary team that was assembled to work on the project. Among those listed are preparers of technical reports representing a range of disciplines, from transportation planners and transportation engineers to social and biological scientists. Included on the list of preparers for your information are the role, educational background, and years of experience of the members of the project team. The team worked together with design engineers to develop the alternatives and later evaluate impacts. The list of preparers has been updated in the FEIS.
1208	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		Typically a DEIS is a pre-decisional document, but the language in the document and discussions at the Nov. 13 2008 open house with ODOT officials indicates the decision has been made. On the signature page (no page number) the document states that "the project may be phased but no plans for phasing are proposed at this time" This is in direct conflict with a statement made to me by Mr. Picco who said that the first phase of the project would be build to the 122nd interchange. That implies that the project will be build and will be build in phases. On page ES-6 the document states "as such the project will likely be constructed in phases." Sounds like the decision has been made, so why bother reading the remainder of the document? Usually in NEPA documents the decision is made in the Record of Decision (ROD) and not in the DEIS or in this case SDEIS.	No decision was made at the time your comment was written. The SDEIS presented two build alternatives, one no build alternative, and multiple design options showing variations on the build alternatives that could be constructed at different points along the project. Public comments received on the SDEIS have been read, analyzed, and presented to decision-makers to help in the selection of the Preferred Alternative, analyzed and presented in the FEIS. The ROD will be the decision document for the project.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
1179	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		Given the length of time between the issuance of the first EIS and the current EIS, 15 years, a new EIS should have been initiated. The new EIS could have included some fresh thinking, rather than a rehash of the first EIS. A broader range of alternatives could have been developed instead of just the no action alternative and two very similar action alternatives. The times have changes, new technologies have been developed, what we know about ecosystems and endangered species has been evolved, and the earth's climate is changing. The point is that a new EIS should have been build from the ground up, instead what the SDEIS offers is a remodel job, build on a crumbling foundation.	In effect, the SDEIS is a new EIS. All of the previously considered alternatives were retested to determine whether they were still applicable in addressing a revised project purpose. As a result, alternatives being advanced in the SDEIS have substantial differences from previously considered alternatives. Additionally, all environmental and transportation evaluations were completely redone based on updated planning, public input, and environmental contexts.
1211	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		NEPA requires that a reasonable range of alternatives be considered and evaluated. Two very similar build alternatives and a no action alternative do not meet the intent of NEPA's reasonable range of alternatives. Table 5 summarizes the alternatives considered, but they are all basically slight variations of the current build alternatives. other alternatives to address the issues such as construction of interchanges in alternative locations along I-205 ought to be evaluation.	A broader range of alternatives was considered, including: transportation system and demand management (TSM/TDM) techniques only, arterial networks, high capacity transit, and other corridor alignments. These were not carried forward in the SDEIS because they did not effectively address the project purpose, were not consistent with local and regional planning, or would have substantially greater adverse impacts than other reasonable alternatives.
1215	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		For example, an interchange off an improved and widened SE Jennifer St could handle truck traffic from the nearby Safeway warehouse and other businesses. It seems that most of the warehouses and businesses in the area lie south of 212 and could accessed from Jennifer St. There could be an alternative that evaluates the impacts of a tunnel beneath the southern flanks of Mt. Talbert and day lighting around 135th. A tunnel would mitigate many of the potential surface impacts.	A new interchange connecting Jennifer to I-205 is not feasible because of spacing and operation standards. Jennifer St and 82nd Drive is being used as an alternative route to Highway-212/224 from the Gladstone interchange. It is expected that more traffic will use this route. However the analysis still shows the need for a new facility. A tunnel was not specifically evaluated in the SDEIS. Tunnels are typically cost prohibitive and require a stable geologic environment. If a tunnel were feasible it would eliminate some of the potential surface impacts. However, it has other environmental and community impacts. In addition,

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							there is a major increase in cost to construct a tunnel.
1213	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		The impacts of the actual construction seem to be minimized. The summary of impacts table (Table 2-page ES-25) just says potential lane closures and detour routes would delay some travel movements and effect accesses for local residences and businesses. Having experienced other ODOT projects, a project of this magnitude would likely have a significant impact on traffic issues. Travel times, length of construction activities, nor are safety addressed in the SDEIS. What is the modeled impact on travel times and safety, and what is the expected duration of construction activities?	In the short-term, [estimate 2-year construction period] there will be construction impacts at points where the proposed highway would intersect with existing roads. However, most construction would be for a new facility, and occur largely off of existing roadways. Travel times during construction are typically not modeled but are handled through ODOT policies and standards for contractors regarding construction impacts. For example, detour development and signage, implementation of mitigation for temporarily-affected businesses, etc. will be developed in consultation with residents and business owners. Furthermore, it is likely that the project will be constructed in phases, which should minimize corridor-wide impacts.
1180	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		Impacts to groundwater and ground water ecosystems are only nominally addressed. The soils and geology of water quality technical reports mention dewatering of slopes and the cover of impervious road surface, respectively, as potentially impact groundwater resources, but fail to address the actual impact to the local groundwater dependent ecosystems (fens, particular) or the larger potential impact to the Clackamas River fishery and whether there will be a violation of the Clean Water Act because of the construction of the road (during the after actual construction).	Local impacts to groundwater are anticipated during construction of the project, particularly where dewatering of shallow groundwater will be necessary during construction. Bioengineered controls to maintain groundwater recharge and storage will be implemented to maintain local hydrologic conditions and protection of the ecosystem. Such artificial controls often enhance local conditions and improve the ecosystem, thereby protecting the groundwater and surface water regime. Dewatering of slopes may be necessary where the westbound lane of the proposed project alignment parallels steep slopes and/or mapped landslides. Dewatering of slopes can improve stability and would not be completed without first being evaluated with respect to project requirements. Water removed during the construction can be used to recharge the local groundwater table by constructing infiltration basins (or similar structures) that allow the water to be re-

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							introduced into the subsurface. The majority of recharge to the Clackamas River is east of the project site, including flows from Rock Creek and other streams draining the large watershed east of the project. Construction of the road will fall under the jurisdiction of numerous regulatory agencies and enforcement, including the Clean Water Act. The project design team includes biologists and resource protection specialists who provide technical input and review of proposed Corridor improvements, structures, construction schedules, and staging areas. Construction methodology is then used to develop stringent erosion control measures to control sediment runoff associated with earthwork construction.
1212	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		A statement is made on page 61 that alternative 1, no build does not meet the local, regional and state policies that require creation of a through-route for freight in the OR 212/224 corridor between I-205 and US 26" This statement appears to be substantiated by the record. A review of both the transportation and land use technical reports found no reference to any such requirement in any local, regional or state policy.	The assertion of compatibility with land use plans and policies as noted in the comment is supported by the Land Use Technical Report. Page 97 of the report prepared for the SDEIS notes that Figure 1.13, 1.4, and 1.18 of Metro's 2004 RTP all show the proposed project as a regional highway facility and/or freight route. The goals of the Oregon Transportation Plan call for improved through-freight movement in the Highway 212 Corridor. Links: RTP: http://www.metro-region.org/index.cfm/go/by.web/id=137 OTP: http://www.lcd.state.or.us/ODOT/TD/TP/ortransplannupdate.shtml
1195	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		There is no discussion of potential loss of property values to those in the Bluff neighborhood where there is no mitigation of noise impacts offered. What impact to property values might those homeowners expect given that the project planners will provide for no mitigation of noise impacts?	The project team acknowledges that the noise is a significant problem for residents on the bluff and that under federal and state rules, allowable mitigation was not found to be cost effective nor feasible. Because of the extremely high mitigation costs, no federal or state funds are available to financially mitigate properties along Bluff Drive and 135th Avenue that face noise and visual impacts if the Sunrise Project is constructed as proposed in the

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							Sunrise Project SDEIS and FEIS, nor does the County have the resources to financially mitigate these properties. At this point, no source of such a large amount of mitigation funds is in sight.
1182	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		The document however fails to address how groundwater resources and groundwater dependent ecosystems, often associated with wetlands, especially fens, will be affected by the additional sediments and pollutants storm water runoff? Wetland I (page 167) receives cold water from ground water and cools local streams, apparently Cow Creek (which is 303(d) temperature listed) during hot months. How will the project effect the cold ground water the wetland receives and ultimately how will temperatures in Cow Creek be affected? The soils and geology report discusses de-watering of shallow ground water, how will that activity impact surface water resources, especially temperature of 303(d) listed streams and the fishery potentially impacted.	Please see response to Entry # 1185. These issues are also addressed in the Biological Opinion prepared for the project.
1184	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		The document however fails to address how groundwater resources and groundwater dependent ecosystems, often associated with wetlands, especially fens, will be affected by the additional sediments and pollutants storm water runoff? Wetland I (page 167) receives cold water from ground water and cools local streams, apparently Cow Creek (which is 303(d) temperature listed) during hot months. How will the project effect the cold ground water the wetland receives and ultimately how will temperatures in Cow Creek be affected? The soils and geology report discusses de-watering of shallow ground water, how will that activity impact surface water resources, especially temperature of 303(d) listed streams and the fishery potentially impacted.	Please see response to Entry #s 1185 and 1186.
1185	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		How will the groundwater resource be impacted by the project and ultimately how will that impact be realized in the Clackamas River system and it's fishery? For example will stream temperatures increase in the Clackamas River as a result of disruption of cold groundwater flow and	Construction of the project is not likely to impact groundwater flow or quality at well locations due to the shallow nature of proposed construction activities. Construction dewatering will be necessary in areas of shallow water groundwater;

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						how will that incremental increase, along with other incremental increases from other development projects in the Portland Metro area affect downstream water temperatures (cumulative effect).	however, this water can be stored in recharge basins for re-infiltration into the subsurface. This will reduce the amount of groundwater loss due to construction activities. In addition, stringent water quality requirements exist to ensure that infiltration water sources meet regulatory agency requirements. There are no anticipated impacts to protected fish species as a result of the project. Please refer to the Biological Assessment and Biological Opinion prepared for the project for more detail.
1183	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		The geology and soils section refers to a need for additional fill material since road cuts will not provide adequate fill material for the project. Where will the additional fill material come from and what are the off-site impacts of this connected action? A tunnel could probably provide more than an adequate supply of fill materials for the project.	Fill is often sourced locally. A specific source will be determined closer to project construction.
1186	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		Where are the groundwater wells in the area located and how will are they affected by the project.	Groundwater wells occur locally throughout the project area. Construction of the project is not likely to impact groundwater flow or quality at well locations due to the shallow nature of proposed construction activities. Construction dewatering will be necessary in areas of shallow water groundwater; however, this water can be stored in recharge basins for re-infiltration into the subsurface. This will reduce the amount of groundwater loss due to construction activities. In addition, stringent water quality requirements exist to ensure that infiltration water sources meet regulatory agency requirements. Periodic monitoring of water in the recharge basins will be conducted to document its quality and suitability for use as a recharge source. A groundwater treatment system currently exists in the western Corridor area just east of I-205. Due to the adverse chemical quality of this water, construction activities will limit

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							the amount, if any, of groundwater extracted from the subsurface in this area. If subsurface water is removed, it will likely require treatment to achieve regulatory agency standards for use as recharge.
1214	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		NEPA requires cumulative effects be addressed. The document includes a list of past, present and foreseeable future actions (starting on page 209), but fails to analyze the effects on the greater metro area. No analysis was done, only an opinion by the writer of the document on how the local project area would be affected. This does not suffice as a cumulative effects analysis. The document needs to address the cumulative impacts to the region as a whole. How can the decision maker and the public make an informed decision without the whole picture of the effects to the environment?	While the discussion of cumulative impacts in the SDEIS (p 207 to p 216) is focused on those impacts within the vicinity of the Sunrise Project, the actions that created these impacts were the result of larger regional processes acting over time in the Sunrise Project area. The interaction between the Sunrise Project area and the rest of the region is discussed at some length in the Transportation, Socioeconomic and Land Use Technical Reports. Cumulative impacts of a project and the interaction of the project with the region decrease with distance from the project. It is reasonable to assume the decision makers recognize this relationship and take it into consider when making decisions regarding a project and its impact on the project area and on the region.
1187	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		Biology Technical Report - this report is not signed or dated; is this report DRAFT?	The report published with the SDEIS is the final report developed for the SDEIS. A revised Technical Report has been prepared for the FEIS and is available for public review.
1188	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		Soils and Geology Technical Reports-the report appears to be DRAFT, as it is incomplete, unsigned, and undated. The authors names are displayed, but their affiliation is not indicated-are they county or ODOT employees? They are not currently listed as Registered Geologists or Registered Engineering Geologists in the State of Oregon. Are they therefore qualified to make any assessment of the soils and geology of the project area? State law states @ 672.525 Geologist registration; public practice of geology. (1) No person, other than a registered geologist, a registered certified specialty geologist or a subordinate under the direction of either, shall provide or prepare for	The preparers for the soils and geology technical report are listed in the SDEIS on page 243. The authors work at Kleinfelder West, Inc. The report was authored by a registered geologist.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						the public practice of geology and geologic maps, plans, reports, or documents except as specifically exempted in ORS 672.535.	
1189	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		Figures 13 and 14 reference in the [soils and geology] document are not in the document. They are not listed in the Table of Contents. Is this the final report? This report appears to be incomplete.	This was an oversight. Figures 13 and 14 can be found in the SDEIS on pages 181 and 182 (Numbered Figures 63 and 64) and in the FEIS as Figures 51 and 52. The revised Technical Report also includes these figures.
1190	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		HAZMAT Technical Report - This report is also not signed or dated. Is this a final report?	The report published with the SDEIS is the final report developed for the SDEIS. A revised Technical Report has been prepared for the FEIS.
1191	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		Land Use Technical Report - There is no list of preparers who actually wrote the document or what their qualifications may have been.	The list of preparers is included in the Technical Report and in the FEIS.
1192	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		Energy Technical Report - There is a list of preparers, but the report is unsigned and not dated.	The report published with the SDEIS is the final report developed for the SDEIS. A revised Technical Report has been prepared for the FEIS. The list of preparers is included in the Technical Report and in the FEIS.
1193	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		Socioeconomics Technical Report - This report is unsigned, undated and apparently had no peer review.	The list of preparers is included in the Technical Report and in the FEIS. All reports went through a review process, which included review by agency staff and other technical experts.
1194	140	I	Gusey	Daryl & Marla		Transportation Technical Report - There is no indication of who was the author(s) of the report nor are there any indications of their qualifications.	The list of preparers is included in the Technical Report and in the FEIS.
1217	141	I	Gillespie	John		The connection of Goosehollow Drive that's currently on 224. I guess the project right now basically is having it blocked off so we won't have access to 224, and the problem is, is that in our neighborhood, when you try to drive back through the neighborhood towards Eckert, that basically the road that we have to get back over to Eckert basically is kind of a reduced-sized road. It's not a normal-sized road, and it's a bad intersection there to try to get back and forth with kids and what have you, and I can see that eventually, if that's the case, that there will	The size of the roadways leading to and including Eckert Lane meet standards for neighborhood roadways. The current design includes a fully signalized intersection at Eckert Lane. This will allow you to gain access to/from Hwy 224.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						probably be some kind of accident there, and that would be my big concern, there by that road is very narrow. It's not adequate access. And I've driven a few times myself where they were trying to make a turn on that road, I have to pull my truck all the way up to make sure that someone is not whipping up the hill or down the hill, so that would be my concern as far as blocking off Goosehollow Drive.	
1219	141	I	Gillespie	John		The other thing was just that, hopefully, in the future, that on Highway 212 I heard that basically once this project, I guess, goes through or eventually ends up at 26, I'm hoping that 212 keeps continuing going all the way out to 26 just for the fact that we have another avenue besides, hopefully, Sunnyside, when it eventually goes out there, that we have another avenue to 26 because I spent my Saturday basically an hour sitting on 205. And basically, with an accident there, the other alternative is 82nd Avenue. And, really, it isn't an alternative if you get on 82nd Avenue. And, really, it isn't an alternative if you get on 82nd, you're not going to move, you are in the same boat.	Extending the Sunrise project beyond Rock Creek and other roadway projects to the east of the project area are considerations for the Damascus area master planning effort and the Damascus Transportation System Plan.
1220	141	I	Gillespie	John		So we really need to try to make as many avenues as we can to get out to 26, so when the expressway is -- all the way runs out to 26, that we don't have another parking lot, that people can get to whatever their destination is and stuff.	See response for Entry # 1219.
1223	142	I	McElroy	Russell		My concern -- a number of my concerns, but the one I want to make sure that I bring up right now is coverage for damage to my property, my home, because I live on a very steep hill overlooking the freeway and Alternative 2 would definitely, definitely impact. Alternative 1, not as much. But when they start working the construction, the environmental removal, potential removal of trees, earth, could damage my home, and Drywall damage, pipe damage, the whole thing, because it's a very steep hill I live on. And with the recent slide about a year and a half ago at the freeway, where this last house that just slid	When a project is under construction the contractor is required to carry liability insurance to cover any damages that occur as a result of construction activities. If damages occur that can be traced back to the construction activities, then that insurance policy will cover any damages. In general, any construction of buildings, roadwork, bridges, etc. that requires some soil disturbance should go through a geotechnical evaluation process. Under public work process, soil removal/disturbance for any structure foundation,

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						away, because the development of the freeway is after the homes have been built, even to build in the earth and to develop the -- what do I want to call it. On my property I have either one or two of the -- probably the ten or 12 tallest pine trees on the stretch.	retaining walls, or slope stabilization are required to be evaluated and recommended for a proper construction method by an Engineer of Record. The Engineer of Record can be either the agency's engineering staff or the agency's contractor's engineers. The evaluation process allows the engineer an opportunity to address any geotechnical findings or concerns before making recommendations for mitigation and construction. Regarding the tree removal concern, this section of the proposed Sunrise project has been identified as a wildlife corridor. Any unnecessary vegetation clearing or tree cutting will be scrutinized by ODFW and minimized to the extent possible. Revegetation can be used to minimize negative impacts.
1221	142	I	McElroy	Russell		I think it's -- as you move further out where the property and land is more level, it's not quite as steep, it may not be as impacted. But if somebody is moving earth out of there and takes out the tree and the ripple effect happens, and all of a sudden I wake up one morning with quarter inch cracks of Drywall or my wood floor pops up or a pipe got stressed and broke, I want to know that I'm going to be covered for a lot of years.	Two mapped landslides have been identified along the slopes adjacent to the preferred alignment (see Figure PA-47 in the FEIS). Adequate alignment width has been provided to allow for the incorporation of engineering design of mitigation measures to address the potential slope stability issues associated with the landslide areas. Mitigation measures may include adjusting the elevation of the roadway, minimizing grading/cutting of the slope, adding buttress fills, and use of retaining structures such as soldier pile and secant pile retaining walls.
1226	142	I	McElroy	Russell		Also, that would be -- impact the value of the property, knowing if I would want to sell my property, if there was a right or an insurance policy or coverage on it saying if anything happens to the house, it's covered by Clackamas County or whoever the organization is.	See response to Entry #1223.
1225	142	I	McElroy	Russell		Even if they had to remove trees and a tree falls the wrong way and it damages a house, who is going to cover the repair, replace, fixing of the property?	When a project is under construction the contractor is required to carry liability insurance to cover any damages that occur as a result of construction activities. If damages occur that can be traced back to the construction activities, then that insurance

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							policy will cover any damages.
1222	142	I	McElroy	Russell		I just spoke to two of the environmental and there has actually been shown there has been, further down towards the 205, two slides that have happened. And I just really need to have that covered.	Two mapped landslides have been identified along the slopes adjacent to the preferred alignment (see Figure PA-47 in the FEIS). Adequate alignment width has been provided to allow for the incorporation of engineering design of mitigation measures to address the potential slope stability issues associated with the landslide areas. Mitigation measures may include adjusting the elevation of the roadway, minimizing grading/cutting of the slope, adding buttress fills, and use of retaining structures such as soldier pile and secant pile retaining walls.
1227	142	I	McElroy	Russell		I believe in expansion, but I believe this is just one giant parking lot being built, simply because -- it looks great. It looks pretty. But when you have stop lights and you have something that ends at approximately at, whatever, 176th out here, that kink in the hose is just going to make everything continue to back up. Stop lights at 122nd or 130th will back up on the freeway, and all this is going to be is, it's going to be a real pretty parking lot, because that's the fact of life. People will then find shortcuts up 152nd, 142nd, 135th, and up to Sunnyside. And all this area, including Happy Valley, because people will start going up, and cutting up into Happy Valley to come back around down 129th to get around the traffic will impact all that area because that's just the way it is.	The at-grade signal at SE 172nd Ave. is intended to be interim. Additional local street improvements will be required to accommodate more efficient connectivity and access. This project addresses transportation needs to Clackamas Industrial Area, OR 224, and I-205. The modeling has shown that there will be less cut-through traffic up 152nd, 142nd, and 135th with the Sunrise Project than there would be without it.
1228	142	I	McElroy	Russell		I don't know the streets, Johnson Creek, all those, all that is -- needs to be -- it needs to be developed into a common sense, thinking outside the box, traffic flow control.	The Johnson Creek area is outside of the boundaries of this project. Planning for traffic and circulation outside of the project area is the responsibility for Metro and the local jurisdictions.
1232	142	I	McElroy	Russell		My personal opinion is, from having seen it work in San Diego, is that we need to have a four lane -- I don't want to use the word toll, but a four lane true freeway with three intersections that goes from the 205 to the 26 with four lanes -- or three lanes coming in, in the morning, and then three lanes going out in the evening, to expedite	This project is bounded on the east side by the proposed Rock Creek Interchange (west of 162nd Avenue). There is currently another study under way to analyze the corridor between the Rock Creek Interchange and Hwy 26. The ultimate intent is to create a limited access expressway between I-205

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						traffic flow. So people that want to get from here out to Damascus, out to Sandy, could just hop on and go without having to worry about having all these intersections and stop lights at 122nd and then another thing like this. that would truly impact traffic flow. Nothing is going to change from 2013 on because you still have your distribution of locations here, trucks still have to come in.	and Hwy 26. Upon full buildout, there will be no signals in the section between I-205 and Rock Creek on the new facility. The feasibility of tolling was explored and not found to be feasible.
1229	142	I	McElroy	Russell		You have - - you're forming the traditional left-hand turn lanes off of the freeway, which is going to make a giant parking lot there at 122nd.	There are no left-turns allowed from the Sunrise Project. Access/egress from the expressway will be from grade-separated interchanges.
1230	142	I	McElroy	Russell		Let's change how we're doing things into the 20th century as far as traffic flow and not just build a bigger parking lot.	The transportation planning process in this region is designed to help create projects that will meet specific state and local mobility standards.
1231	142	I	McElroy	Russell		I'm completely for making things better for people to flow, but it just is not proving out, when you look at the tunnels and how it impacts the 26. No impact happened on the 205 because we have exits at Johnson Creek at the 205 and down further with people trying to get off to cut around, it's just going to continue to back it up. And we'll spend a lot of money to look at a real pretty intersection and parking lot.	The analysis of the Sunrise Project was conducted using state of the art predictive planning and modeling software. The results of the proposed improvements in this area show operational improvements that allow vehicles to travel through the study area with minimal friction while allowing us to meet the Purpose and Need for this project.
1234	143	I	McLane	Mike		The first, of course is the noise that we're going to encounter. That the consensus is that nothing can be done about it, period. And honestly, from a residential or from a resident's standpoint, that's not an acceptable answer. Something should be able to be done in some way. Now, the choice, the options there are probably numerous, including a property tax relief, maybe some sort of stipend for triple pane windows, a number of things that would assist in alleviating this as soon as possible. It's never going to get rid of it.	Because of the extremely high mitigation costs, no federal or state funds are available to financially mitigate properties along Bluff Drive and 135th Avenue that face noise and visual impacts if the Sunrise Project is constructed as proposed in the Sunrise Project SDEIS and FEIS, nor does the County have the resources to financially mitigate these properties. At this point, no source of such a large amount of mitigation funds is in sight.
1240	143	I	McLane	Mike		But the other concern that we have is the path that the highway is proposed to take is as close to the residences as it can get going north. And although there may have been other considerations given previously to going further south, I would like to see a proposal go through or	See response for Entry #1239.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						over the industrial area and what kind of impact that would have on the residential folks. I don't know if that's even been considered at this point in time or to what degree.	
1239	143	I	McLane	Mike		I would like to see a proposal go through or over the industrial area and what kind of impact that would have on the residential folks. I don't know if that's even been considered at this point in time or to what degree.	An alignment through the industrial area was investigated and found not to be effective in reducing noise levels to below the federal threshold for noise impacts to residential receptors.
1235	143	I	McLane	Mike		...planting more greenery and more trees to help the noise, maybe even buying our houses so we can move somewhere else that we don't have to listen to a freeway 24/7.	The project team acknowledges that the noise is a significant problem for residents on the bluff and that under federal and state rules, allowable mitigation was not found to be cost effective nor feasible. Because of the extremely high mitigation costs, no federal or state funds are available to financially mitigate properties along Bluff Drive and 135th Avenue that face noise and visual impacts if the Sunrise Project is constructed as proposed in the Sunrise Project SDEIS and FEIS, nor does the County have the resources to financially mitigate these properties. At this point, no source of such a large amount of mitigation funds is in sight.
1238	143	I	McLane	Mike		Environmentally, wouldn't mass transit be better?	A broader range of alternatives was considered, including: system and demand management (TSM/TDM) techniques only, arterial networks, high capacity transit, and other corridor alignments. These were not carried forward in the SDEIS because they did not effectively address the project purpose, were not consistent with local and regional planning, or would have substantially greater adverse impacts than other reasonable alternatives.
1237	143	I	McLane	Mike		Of course when we purchased it we had no idea there was going to be a freeway there.	Property owners who are selling property and the realtors representing them have a legal obligation to disclose any conditions that exist or other pertinent information concerning the property that is for sale. Buyers of property are responsible for their own due diligence. We recognize that the problem that was mentioned may well have occurred, but it is beyond

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							the purview of the SDEIS process to address this problem.
1236	143	I	McLane	Mike		One more concern of mine is the downturn of the economy and truly is there going to be that much more traffic going down. Let's say people aren't buying and there is plenty of houses for sale on the Sunnyside corridor that have nobody in them, so is it truly necessary to build it?	See response to Entry # 1197.
1242	144	I	Lubake	Larry		I just don't want to bear the cost of it personally. I would like that spread across everybody who is going to benefit from that project. So if that means the county purchasing the property along the top of the bluff to mitigate the damage, or give a decreased value to the property, those are the two components that I like the best because they're direct feedbacks. To give me a tax relief in that property, it would take 20 years to realize the benefits from.	Because of the extremely high mitigation costs, no federal or state funds are available to financially mitigate properties along Bluff Drive and 135th Avenue that face noise and visual impacts if the Sunrise Project is constructed as proposed in the Sunrise Project SDEIS and FEIS, nor does the County have the resources to financially mitigate these properties. At this point, no source of such a large amount of mitigation funds is in sight.
1241	144	I	Lubake	Larry		I have concerns that there is going to be air pollution as a result of that freeway and the quality will decline	Pollutants from vehicle emissions are discussed in the SDEIS (p. 133-89). Vehicle emissions will increase because they are associated with the vehicle miles traveled. More emissions would be experienced by people closer to the highway than those further away with the proposed project than without it. However, pollutant levels overall are expected to decrease in the future compared to current levels due to increased controls on vehicle emissions.
1243	144	I	Lubake	Larry		I have concerns that my property is going to decrease in value significantly. They may purchase \$5,000 worth of my property off the bottom end of my property, but it may cost me \$100,000 value of that property because of noise impact, because of visual impact	See response to previous comment (Entry # 1242).
1252	145	I	Gusey	Daryl		...how does this project fit in with the governor's emphasis on mass transit and those types of projects rather than build more freeways and widening roads and doing that.	Regional and local transit planning was a key consideration in developing this project. Future High Capacity Transit (HCT) is planned for the Sunnyside Road corridor recognizing the higher potential for ridership than the Sunrise corridor. It

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
							is assumed that express busses from the Damascus area will use the Sunrise corridor improvements. Even with significant transit improvements, highway improvements are still needed to serve regional and intrastate travel and freight movement.
1251	145	I	Gusey	Daryl		But when we moved there, we were not told that this was happening, and we wouldn't have bought the house if we knew	Property owners who are selling property and the realtors representing them have an obligation to disclose any conditions that exist or other pertinent information concerning the property that is for sale. Buyers of property are responsible for their own due diligence. The latest phase of the Sunrise Project has been actively underway since 2004, with aggressive public notification, meetings, and media attention.
1246	145	I	Gusey	Daryl		So for us to sell the house for what we think it's worth is going to be very hard because the disclosure will have to be made that that's happening.	See response to other comments made associated with this letter.
1247	145	I	Gusey	Daryl		...so they were saying it's up to the county or the local jurisdictions to provide that mitigation, whatever that may be, they mentioned reduction in maybe property taxes even going to the other extreme of buying the property from those folks along the bluff where we are. I guess that seems too good to us.	Because of the extremely high mitigation costs, no federal or state funds are available to financially mitigate properties along Bluff Drive and 135th Avenue that face noise and visual impacts if the Sunrise Project is constructed as proposed in the Sunrise Project SDEIS and FEIS, nor does the County have the resources to financially mitigate these properties. At this point, no source of such a large amount of mitigation funds is in sight.
1248	145	I	Gusey	Daryl		[A reduction in] Taxes won't help us if we are trying to sell the house. I wouldn't buy it. How many people would buy a house if they knew that there was a 6 lane freeway down at the bottom of the hill, and the noise is going to triple what it is now.	See response to previous comments (e.g., Entry # 1247).
1254	146	I	McElroy	Russell		I am very concerned with the sound impact due to the fact that my property looks right down on the freeway. And my understanding, from speaking to the technical person who was not sure, is I would like to have the compensation defined for soundproofing, helping to reduce the sound, whatever, because my sound is going	There are very specific FHWA and ODOT guidelines for when sound walls can be included in a project. The criteria are listed in the Noise Technical Report on pages 62 and 63. A great deal of effort was given to trying to find mitigation that met the criteria so that a sound wall could be recommended for the

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						to go from very nice to being like on the 205 freeway by Fred Meyers. And with proper out of box thinking, I believe there is some ways to both visually and economically and environmentally to protect and create sound that will not be a problem	bluff neighborhood. However, no mitigation was identified that met the criteria. A detailed discussion of the mitigation considered is included in the Noise Technical Report on page 70 and Appendix G of the technical report. The FHWA and ODOT policies do not allow compensation for sound insulation of private residences. If a sound wall does not meet the FHWA and ODOT criteria, federal and state funding cannot be used for noise mitigation.
1253	146	I	McElroy	Russell		I would also like to know if there is a representation of all the Bluff house homeowners and representing the mortgage companies that own the homes on the bluff, if someone could advise me of that. Because the value of the homes are going to go the wrong direction.	There is not a Bluff Drive home owner's association (HOA). (There was/is a Hubbard Terrace HOA on the mailing list, but its area doesn't cover Bluff Drive.) The Sunrise Policy Advisory Committee (PAC), established in summer 2004 includes a bluff resident as a committee member. Sunnyside CPO is the official and active CPO for this area. All individual addresses (most recent tax assessor's records) on the bluff have been on the mailing list during the SDEIS process. The homes were built right around or just after the 1996 DEIS, so many residents say they did not know about the project when buying. Comments about noise and visual concerns have been submitted from residents on the bluff since the open house in June 2004. We did not fully understand the level of noise impacts or difficulty in mitigating until late summer to fall 2007. At that time we met with neighbors to discuss the problem. The impact still does not have mitigation.
1256	147	I	Braunstein	Amber		I am against it and there is a lot of reasons.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences regarding project alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
1258	147	I	Braunstein	Amber		I think that as residents, especially on the bluff line, that because there is so few of us, in the scheme of things I think that this really is more focused on the businesses	However, based on current standards we cannot mitigate the noise issues. The project will likely be constructed in phases over the next several years.

Entry Number	Comment Number	Source	Surname	First name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
						and the trucking and all that, and everybody coming from Damascus and that area, I feel like our voices are not going to be heard because there is so few of us in the general scheme of things	As the project is built we will work with you to and the rest of the community to design and minimize the impacts. The project team acknowledges that the noise is a significant problem for residents on the bluff and that under federal and state rules, allowable mitigation was not found to be cost effective nor feasible. Because of the extremely high mitigation costs, no federal or state funds are available to financially mitigate properties along Bluff Drive and 135th Avenue that face noise and visual impacts if the Sunrise Project is constructed as proposed in the Sunrise Project SDEIS and FEIS, nor does the County have the resources to financially mitigate these properties. At this point, no source of such a large amount of mitigation funds is in sight.
1257	147	I	Braunstein	Amber		And the noise levels are going up, increasing a lot, which when I bought my house, I didn't have any idea this was going on...	See response to Entry #1251.
1259	147	I	Braunstein	Amber		But I just think there is a lot of reasons why it shouldn't happen and I feel that we're just going to be steamrolled and caught up in the process of it and not really heard	See response to previous comments (e.g., Entry # 1258).
1255	147	I	Braunstein	Amber		I think is a lot of environmental impacts to that. I get deer all the time in my yard, and I have a feeling that they're somehow going to be impacted. And' I've seen all the posters and stuff and just looking at it, it seems that part of that nature is going to be taken away from this whole project.	Thank you for your comment. Preferences and supporting reasoning expressed for specific alternatives were provided to the project team and to regional decision-makers to support the selection of a Preferred Alternative.