

Hello! My name is Rachael Ludwick and I live in Seattle, WA. My family visits my sister in Portland. I have been somewhat following this project given that I care about our climate and also that I can't drive and thus future transit access is pretty important to me. I'd previously heard that climate & equity couldn't be explicitly used to select the alternative due to a ten year old project's "record of decision". This seemed wrong. But then I'd heard that high speed rail had been ruled out. I went back to the video of Wednesday's meeting to listen and try to understand.

After the mayor of Vancouver asked about tolling, the program administrator, Mr. Johnson, talked about how this process is about selecting *what* is being built, that is, this is about coming to a preferred alternative. He continued to say that once we have the "what", the preferred alternative, then we can talk about "how" which includes considering tolling and also going back to partners to work on issues related to climate and equity. However, once we have selected a single preferred alternative, then we have already locked in many climate & equity decisions.

Take climate. If the selected alternative adds additional general purpose capacity over the existing bridge because the ten year old record of decision allowed for that as serving the purpose and needs, then it WILL have significant climate impacts due to induced demand. That can't be easily fixed after the alternative is selected. The *what* here will heavily constrain how we address climate.

Consider equity. I can't drive due to a vision disability. If I want to visit my sister in Portland by myself, I have to take a slow, infrequent train that takes twice as long as driving would. Since this process can't center equity, it will not be considering the existing unequal access to regional transportation represented by I-5. High speed rail was "dismissed during the screening process because it neither increased vehicular capacity nor decreased vehicular demand". If equity were explicitly part of selecting an alternative, would this be decided this way?

By choosing to speed this project along by constraining it with a ten year old "record of decision", you are choosing to allow climate & equity to be sidelined. Those concerns were not considered ten years ago. You cannot sprinkle climate & equity fixes after the fact using "frameworks" and "committees" when the replacement alternative is being selected to fit goals from ten years ago that didn't really consider climate or equity.

Thank you for your time.