



OPEN HOUSE #2 – SUMMARY

Date: August 14, 2025
To: Oregon Department of Transportation, Region 3
From: Christian Watchie, Cogito Partners and Angela Rogge, PE, David Evans and Associates, Inc.
Subject: I-5 Exits 124/125 Interchange Area Management Plan & Garden Valley Corridor Plan

The following summary represents public input received from the in-person Open House on June 3, 2025 and the online open house live from May 27 to June 20, 2025. All comments are verbatim unless noted by parentheses.

OVERVIEW

The Online Open House (OOH2025) presented interim and long-term improvement alternatives for:

- I-5 Exit 124 (Harvard Interchange)
- I-5 Exit 125 (Garden Valley Interchange)
- I-5 Mainline between Exits 124 and 125
- Garden Valley Corridor (west and east of I-5)

The purpose of the open house was to gather community feedback on alternatives developed through prior technical memoranda and advisory committee input.

QUESTION RESPONSES

I-5 EXIT 124 (HARVARD INTERCHANGE)

Question 1: Of the alternatives presented, which one(s) best addresses the problems and concerns for this area?

In-Person Responses

- 124-A Option 1 has ROW issues, but a lot of requests/interest for bike lane on Harvard west of Umpqua.
- 124-A: Option 2. No. It will remove a safe area for children and families to play. This deadend road is well-used for families in neighborhood.
- 124-C Option 1 is closer to Harvard Ave so it is a better choice.
- 124-C Option 1 seems cheaper and more practical than Option C2.

- 124-E Deceleration lane is important for safety.
- 124-E Would help during peak hour for ques for SB ramp.
- 124-E I can see a real benefit for this.
- 124-E better idea than connecting lane from Garden Valley.
- Open-ended:
 - Need more non-busy roads that connect for bikes.
 - Consider a ped-activated light for the NB entrance ramp.
 - Install cones or curbing to separate WB and EB left turn lanes. There is morning congestion with WB and EB turns competing.
 - I like these ideas of connecting Bellows- Umpqua.
 - Not voting. Only roundabouts +++. And way BIGGER changes instead of litte bandaids “(but I understand economy)”.

Online Responses

- 124-A
 - Option 1: 7 responses
 - Option2: 3 responses
- 124-C
 - Option 1: 4 responses
 - Option 2: 2 responses
- 124-E: 1 response

I-5 EXIT 125 (GARDEN VALLEY INTERCHANGE)

Question 2: Of the **interim** improvement alternatives presented, which one(s) best addresses the problems and concerns for this area?

In-Person Responses

- 125-A Designated turn lanes may keep traffic moving better.
- 125-A Can the existing center thru lane be changed to a left/straight to the the 2 left turn lanes with minimal improvements?
- 125-A is a good idea because most of the traffic goes west.
- 125-B Double left NB offramp lanes would help get more cars per light off the off ramp and onto Garden Valley.
- 125-B Access management on Garden Valley is needed.
- 125-B would have much more issues with traffic merging right to get on I-5 south.
- 125-E Pick this one!
- Open-ended:
 - It is confusing to have four traffic lights for three lanes at the end of the NB ramp.
 - Today traffic was backed up on to freeway. Traffic waiting to turn left.

- 125-B would have much more issues with traffic merging right to get on I-5 south.
- Don't make 2-way street into shopping center until you improve traffic light.

Online Responses

- 125-A: 1 response
- 125-B: 1 response
- 125-E: 10 responses

Question 3: Of the **long-term** improvement alternatives presented, which one(s) best addresses the problems and concerns for this area?

In-Person Responses

125-C

- Keep Mulholland open.
- Seems to work in larger cities with higher traffic volumes.
- Possibly.
- Concern would be for pedestrians and bikes.
- Do not like losing the direct access to Mulholland.
- Not voting because good ideas but cost probability.

Online Responses

- 125-C: 8 responses

GARDEN VALLEY CORRIDOR

Question 4: Of the **interim** improvement alternatives presented, which one(s) best addresses the problems and concerns for this area?

In-Person Responses

- X-2 Synchronize the lights!!!
- X-3 Ped crossings on Garden Valley make sense. Bike lane east of I-5 would be nice but limited by ROW widths.
- X-4 If X-4 is a flashing, ped-activated crossing. It is a good idea, but I see so many peds that don't use them and cross elsewhere.
- X-6 I used to use this path often. Lighting and landscaping is also very helpful.
- Open-ended:
 - Tunnel under Garden Valley was not built with proper drainage. Homeless is another problem. Lights at Garden Valley and Stewart Parkway and Fred Meyer should be adequate for peds and bikes.
 - Align Highland and Fairmount good idea but don't need another light.

Online Responses

- X-2: 6 responses
- X-3: 6 responses
- X-4: 6 responses
- X-5: 0 responses
- X-6: 3 responses

Question 5: Of the **long-term** improvement alternatives presented, which one(s) best addresses the problems and concerns for this area?

In-Person Responses

- West-1 Synchronize the lights!
- West-1 Maybe.
- East-3 Bike lanes exist west of I-5. Bike lanes on Garden Valley east of I-5 would create connectivity with Stephens and Stewart Parkway.
- East 3 & 5 would both hurt traffic flow. Protected bike lanes are nice for families.
- East-5 No!

Online Responses

- West-1: 5 responses
- West-5: 1 response
- East-3: 1 response
- East-5: 6 responses

PARTICIPATION SUMMARY

ONLINE OPEN HOUSE

- 108 visits
- 76 unique visitors
- 152 page views
- 26 returning visitors

Historical overview and comparison

Visits 108	Page views 152	Unique visitors 76	Returning visitors 26	Bounce rate 50%
----------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------

↓ Export to CSV

