

From: [Terry Parker](#)
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Testimony to the Portland City Council related to agenda item #312 and the replacement of street lighting on NE Glisan Street for the May 5, 2021 council meeting.
Date: Tuesday, May 4, 2021 10:30:44 AM

Before PBOT replaces the street lighting on NE Glisan Street between 82nd and 162nd, and instead of just blaming drivers for an up tic of pedestrian injuries and deaths on Portland streets, a before and after comparison pedestrian incidence study needs to take place related to when the sodium vapor street lights were replaced with the existing LED lighting. The type of LED lighting the City installed, often called cutoff lighting, directs light straight down to the street and creates shadows. The streets as a whole appear much darker than with the former sodium vapor lighting which had concaved lenses to spread the light over more of the street surface, and therefore did not require lighting on both sides of many streets like Glisan.

With the cutoff LED lighting now in place, pedestrians, especially when wearing dark clothing, and when all too often are not following common sense such as jaywalking, seem to just appear from no where and out of the shadows. Drivers don't see them until it is too late. The City expended a lot of taxpayer dollars to replace the sodium vapor lighting with what is now shadow lighting. This shadow lighting has likely contributed to substantial number of the pedestrian deaths and injuries on Portland's streets.

In retrospect, the decision made by the City Council to replace the sodium vapor street lighting with cutoff LED lighting traded lower energy use and power costs for compromised pedestrian safety. Additionally, PBOT has been remiss by not having a rigorous program to promote pedestrian safety, including instructing pedestrians and school kids how to cross streets safely.

Equally as important, some types of LED lighting can be very effective and can provide for a well lit street. One such example is on Airport Way between I-205 and the terminal. When replacing the street lighting on NE Glisan Street, PBOT needs to install a type of lighting that will illuminate the entire street without shadows, and **NOT** be cutoff type of lighting.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Parker
Northeast Portland

From: [Mary Ann Schwab](#)
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Cc: [Parker Terry](#)
Subject: Fwd: Testimony to the Portland City Council related to agenda item #312 and the replacement of street lighting on NE Glisan Street for the May 5, 2021 council meeting.
Date: Tuesday, May 4, 2021 2:34:49 PM

Whoops — not sure this reached Keelan McClymont.
I hope the agenda item was held open for next 7 days.

With so many employees working from home — communication between constituents and those we elected into office is broken beyond repair.
mas

Begin forwarded message:

From: Terry Parker <parkert2012@gmail.com>
Subject: Testimony to the Portland City Council related to agenda item #312 and the replacement of street lighting on NE Glisan Street for the May 5, 2021 council meeting.
Date: May 4, 2021 at 10:30:50 AM PDT
To: Moore-Love Karla <cctestimony@portlandoregon.gov>

Before PBOT replaces the street lighting on NE Glisan Street between 82nd and 162nd, and instead of just blaming drivers for an up tic of pedestrian injuries and deaths on Portland streets, a before and after comparison pedestrian incidence study needs to take place related to when the sodium vapor street lights were replaced with the existing LED lighting. The type of LED lighting the City installed, often called cutoff lighting, directs light straight down to the street and creates shadows. The streets as a whole appear much darker than with the former sodium vapor lighting which had concaved lenses to spread the light over more of the street surface, and therefore did not require lighting on both sides of many streets like Glisan.

With the cutoff LED lighting now in place, pedestrians, especially when wearing dark clothing, and when all too often are not following common sense such as jaywalking, seem to just appear from no where and out of the shadows. Drivers don't see them until it is too late. The City expended a lot of taxpayer dollars to replace the sodium vapor lighting with what is now shadow lighting. This shadow lighting has likely contributed to substantial number of the pedestrian deaths and injuries on Portland's streets.

In retrospect, the decision made by the City Council to replace the sodium vapor street lighting with cutoff LED lighting traded lower energy use and power costs for compromised pedestrian safety. Additionally, PBOT has been remiss by not having a rigorous program to promote pedestrian safety, including instructing pedestrians and school kids how to cross streets safely.

Equally as important, some types of LED lighting can be very effective and can provide for a well lit street. One such example is on Airport Way between I-205 and the terminal. When replacing the street lighting on NE Glisan Street, PBOT needs to install a type of lighting that will illuminate the entire street without shadows, and **NOT** be cutoff type of lighting.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Parker
Northeast Portland