



## November 8 and 14, 2007 Open Houses

Public meetings were held on Thursday, November 8, 2007, at Highland Elementary School in the Highland neighborhood and on Wednesday, November 14, 2007, at Roth's Hospitality Center in West Salem to update the public on the Salem River Crossing project. The main purpose of the meetings was to recap what has been done to date and present the 13 preliminary alternatives. Attendees were asked to identify alternatives they felt should be selected for further study in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Each open house began at 5:00 p.m. and concluded at 8:00 p.m.

A meeting announcement was posted on the Salem River Crossing website and a press release was issued to local media on November 5, including the Statesman Journal. Notification in the form of the project newsletter was sent to approximately 1000 residents, businesses, and community leaders. Email communication was sent to approximately 585 people who had signed up on the website or otherwise indicated an interest in being on the distribution list. Several articles on the project (two on October 29 and 30) which included open house information were published in the Statesman Journal as well as a guest column by Jeff Scheick, ODOT Region 2 Manager on October 30 and an editorial on October 30th. A display ad promoting the Open Houses was published in the Statesman Journal on Saturday, November 3, and Wednesday, November 7.

Project managers Dan Fricke and Julie Warnke made presentations about the project and the open houses at several venues. Dan Fricke did a half hour interview on the Hispanic radio station KWIP on November 5; Dan and Julie did presentations at SEDCOR on October 11 and the Salem Rotary on October 31, and Julie did presentations to North Gateway Redevelopment Advisory Board on November 1 and to Northgate Neighborhood Association on November 13. We coordinated with Highland Elementary School principal Olga Cobb to send flyers home with all of the children and with Nomi Pierce, Highland Neighborhood Association president, to hold the east side open house on their traditional meeting night. The City of Salem sent open house announcement post cards to over 5,500 households in the Grant, CAN-DO, Highland, Northgate, and West Salem Neighborhood Associations

An open house format was used at the meetings, allowing members of the public to attend at their convenience and have the opportunity to discuss the thirteen preliminary alternatives with staff members and members of the Task Force. Julie Warncke, City of Salem and Dan Fricke, ODOT made brief presentations each evening at 5:30 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. and were then available for questions and comments. Juan Carlos Torres, Mid-Willamette Valley COG, was available both evenings to serve as a Spanish interpreter.

Attendees were encouraged to identify up to three of the thirteen alternatives that they would like to see advanced for more study in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. They were also encouraged to comment on which TSM and TDM options would help reduce congestion on existing roads and bridges and also on which of the funding options should be studied as possible ways to pay for the project. Approximately 120 people

---

attended the November 8th open house and 170 people attended the November 14<sup>th</sup> open house.

The following items were on display at the meeting:

- ◆ Welcome, purpose of the evening, and background
- ◆ Maps of the thirteen preliminary alternatives
- ◆ Transit and roadway efficiency (TSM/TDM) concept and discussion of a potential Low Build option
- ◆ Funding mechanisms, available funding, and potential new sources and potential local funding sources
- ◆ Neighborhood traffic impact graphics and evening trip distribution (east to west and west to east) data
- ◆ SKATS station

Handouts distributed at the open house included the following:

- ◆ Comment form
- ◆ Fact sheet for each of the alternatives which described the salient features of the alternative, project cost estimates, evaluation performance rating, and preliminary thoughts of the Task Force and Oversight Team
- ◆ Funding fact sheet packet
- ◆ Project newsletter
- ◆ Project fact sheets in English and Spanish

The following comments were submitted on individual comment sheets, were written on the flip charts by each alternative, or were offered during a question and answer period after the presentations.

## Verbal Comments and Questions

- ◆ How will comments tonight be responded to? *Please indicate on your comment form if you would like a response and a member of the project team will do so. All the comments from the open houses and the web site will be given to the Task Force and Oversight Teams to assist them in making their recommendations.*
- ◆ Who is on the Task Force and Oversight Team? *The Task Force is composed of a broad group of stakeholders (about 22 people) representing neighborhood associations, civic agencies, transit, businesses, bike/pedestrian, and environmental groups. The Oversight Team is made up seven people who are elected or appointed officials of local agencies and jurisdictions with regulatory responsibility for, or strong interest in, the project.*

- 
- ◆ Who makes the decision about which alternative to choose? *The Task Force will make a recommendation to the Oversight Team which will act on that recommendation and forward its decision to local governments, MPOs, and ODOT/FHWA.*
  - ◆ Is there an alternative with no new bridge? *The project team is considering a “low-build” option (which may or may not include a new bridge) and the EIS process requires that a no-build be analyzed. In addition, the team is looking to utilize transportation system management (TSM) and transportation demand management (TDM) as part of all of the other alternatives.*
  - ◆ Are there alternatives south of the existing bridges? *A study area refinement plan was conducted about a year ago which analyzed where alignments should be placed to achieve the best results in drawing traffic from the existing bridges. The conclusion was that the best location was from the existing bridges north to Salem Parkway between Pine and Tryon.*
  - ◆ It seems a faulty assumption has been made in traffic projections that population increase is in a straight line with increased travel trips. This does not take into account the higher price of gas which will affect travel behavior and result in an increase in transit use. *It is not a straight line assumption. While an increase in gas prices could change demand, it has not historically been a major factor. We are not able to predict the relationship well enough at this time to change the modeling assumptions.*
  - ◆ When will a low-build concept be available? *The possibility of a low build will be clarified in the next few weeks. No-build includes everything in the transportation plan and no new bridge*
  - ◆ What about building a bridge at Lockhaven – it would address a lot of the problems that Salem has?
  - ◆ Consider the impact to the Truitt Brothers and their 700 employees in alternatives which utilize Market/Gaines or Hood/Shipping. These would cause them to have to move the cannery and “close shop.”
  - ◆ Fuel prices in Europe haven’t impacted traffic.
  - ◆ Do all alternatives use the same bridge type? *We’re not at that design level yet but there will undoubtedly be different types.*
  - ◆ Has future development been considered? *To the extent that we know about it, it has been taken into account, although not all nuances are captured in our evaluation and we welcome input and any information people have about future development.*
  - ◆ Are you considering prices based on three lanes in each direction? *Yes – for all of the alternatives except Forest which has two separate bridges, with two lanes in each direction.*
  - ◆ Is the railroad bridge still being considered for emergency vehicle use? *Yes, it, along with the existing bridges will be included in the low and no-build options.*
  - ◆ Widening Wallace Road will have impacts on businesses. Won’t this inflate project costs? *Costs already include ROW acquisition numbers although assumptions about pavement and some ROW may not be fully reflected. Refinements may eliminate some of the system modifications or identify what is part of this project and what is a separate state highway project.*

- 
- ◆ Have you considered improving traffic signals and efficiency of moving traffic through the existing system? *A TSM/TDM alternative was considered (transit, parking fees, etc) but the conclusion was that some people would change their travel behaviors but not enough to meet demand. These options will be considered in combination with other alternatives.*
  - ◆ What is the cost of a 2-bridge alternative? *The Forest alternative which is a two bridge alternative is estimated to cost \$810 million.*
  - ◆ How many lanes will a new bridge have? *Three lanes in each direction.*
  - ◆ Where the structures are located will change the landscape dramatically! *The effects are significant on both sides of the river.*
  - ◆ What is the status of financing? *There is only money for preparing the EIS right now. A study is underway which will identify local, state and federal funding sources.*
  - ◆ What will the height of the bridge be? *The height is regulated by Coast Guard standards.*
  - ◆ What is the cost of this process? *It has been \$1.9 million so far and more will be required to complete the EIS.*
  - ◆ Who is doing the process and who can stop it? *It was initiated by the City of Salem with a request to ODOT. It could be stopped by the City, an MPO, or FHWA.*
  - ◆ Is there a possibility of building in stages – the bridge and then connection to Hwy 22 later? *Yes, and we will look at that.*
  - ◆ Have you carefully considered the elevations over Beaumont Hill? *Topography issues are understood and we may need to change the alignment location there to improve it.*
  - ◆ In the years after the Record of Decision (ROD) is issued how long do you have to maintain activity? *If we keep some level of activity going, we have three years at least.*
  - ◆ Are you compounding congestion? *Downtown congestion is reduced with the Red connection.*
  - ◆ How long will the gravel pit/agricultural land last? *It is outside the UGB so will not likely get developed. Also, the flood plain won't be developed. The gravel pit is considered resource land and is protected from development..*
  - ◆ What happens if my house is under a ramp? *Federal regulations require fair market compensation.*
  - ◆ Do models assume the increasing price of oil? *Not specifically.*
  - ◆ What are the stakeholders? *Interested parties, agencies, cities, counties, transit agency, business associations, and neighborhood associations, etc.*
  - ◆ Have purple and orange alternatives been eliminated? *Not finally. Preliminary thoughts are to eliminate these – the Task Force and Oversight Team will decide at their next meetings in December.*
  - ◆ A lot of people going through Salem are not stopping in the immediate vicinity. Why not tie in with the Newberg-Dundee project and then cross on to Hwy 22? *The COG*

---

*studied 16 corridors in 2002 and the Wheatland Ferry Rd. crossing didn't seem to carry a lot of people or divert traffic from the existing bridges.*

## Flip Chart Comments

### PURPLE

- ◆ Too expensive
- ◆ Doesn't relieve traffic
- ◆ Doesn't serve people coming from or going to Portland very well
- ◆ Promotes global warming and foreign oil dependency
- ◆ Above comment ignores reality
- ◆ Likes where it comes in on west side
- ◆ Removes Goesh House - beautiful, old - featured in Statesman Journal
- ◆ Noise impacts to nearby residences affect property values
- ◆ Best outlet on west side
- ◆ Best long term alternative

### ORANGE AND ORANGE + RED

- ◆ Skips around neighborhoods
- ◆ Splits traffic to different locations
- ◆ Promotes global warming and foreign oil dependence
- ◆ Above comment ignores reality
- ◆ Connect Hope to Orchard Heights and leave Wallace and Orchard Heights alone!
- ◆ Relieves congestion farther out Wallace and gives better access to High School
- ◆ The portion of Orchard heights park that would be affected is not developed and is only a dog run
- ◆ Concerns about impact of using Tryon on our neighborhood - noise, and the removal of homes in the area

### FOREST

- ◆ Promotes climate change and foreign oil dependence
- ◆ Above comment ignores reality
- ◆ Transportation demand model insensitive to petroleum cost and scarcity. Project planning basis flawed

- 
- ◆ Cannot afford cost of 2 bridges in the Forest alternative

### **YELLOW/GREEN**

- ◆ Promotes climate change and foreign oil dependence
- ◆ Above comment ignores reality
- ◆ At least one of the alternatives needs to provide for access from the eastern part of the Salem area
- ◆ Every plan has a diagonal cut from Orchard Heights over (or through) the hill to Wallace Road. However, that would do nothing to relieve the traffic jam between Hope and Wallace and the bridge. Why not go Hope to Orchard Heights? No homes, no hill – straight shot
- ◆ Green concept has to clear railroad tracks but what about railroad crossing at Liberty and Commercial? Traffic will back up past (south of) Market and on ramp. It will (the bridge) destroy Truitt Brothers; cut through Wallace Park; add more traffic to the already crazy Glenn Creek/Wallace intersection. White alternatives are better.
- ◆ Green concept – bridge, ramps and traffic counts will severely impact single family residences/livability of Grant and NE neighborhoods. Downtown office demand is not sufficient to use this amount of land; creating a pocket of underutilized property, i.e. trouble, crime, etc.
- ◆ Move the river

### **BLUE + RED**

- ◆ Promotes climate change and dependence on foreign oil
- ◆ Above comment ignores reality
- ◆ Suggestion was made to connect (blend) the white and blue options together on the west side such that the favored white option's terminus ends at Orchard Heights on the west side; i.e. combine white and blue ideas on west side
- ◆ N Salem/Highland is potentially the “walking” neighborhood to downtown, how do any of the options support a carbon footprint reduction?

### **WHITE OPTIONS**

- ◆ Hwy 22 connection a must!
- ◆ Promotes global warming and foreign oil dependency
- ◆ (RE: above – the bridge is a necessity)
- ◆ Above comment ignores reality – this is needed
- ◆ Railroad traffic is getting worse as far as congestion. Does the Pine Street traffic model take that into account?
- ◆ Building a new bridge and adding to existing bridges makes no sense!

- ◆ The white option makes best use of Salem Parkway; does not affect Truitt Brothers (Green alt); does not have to clear railroad on Front Street; moves Wallace Road traffic north.
- ◆ Ditto, but concerned about noise pollution in area's neighborhoods – still better than purple option
- ◆ Be cautious rerouting heavy traffic on Market Street by Grant Elementary School
- ◆ Can a benefit to the Highland neighborhood be defined to improve the desirability of any of these proposals?
- ◆ Difficulty of getting kids to Highland School across Broadway and Liberty

## Comment Forms

OPEN HOUSE – NOVEMBER 8, 2007 – HIGHLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

How did you hear about this meeting?

18 = Newspaper 12 = Project Newsletter 6 = Project Email/Website 8 = Word of Mouth 0 = TV/Radio 13 = Other (5-postcard, 2-mail flyer, 3-Neighborhood Association Announcement Card/newsletter, 2-Neighborhood Meeting, school flyer)

The project team is interested in hearing your ideas about the **13 preliminary alternatives**. Your choices are **not votes**. Instead, this information will be given to the community Task Force and the Oversight Team who will recommend a smaller number of alternatives that will be studied in the draft environmental impact statement (draft EIS).

Tell us which **three** alternatives you would like to see advanced for more study in the draft environmental impact statement (EIS). (Please check only three alternatives).

9 = Purple (Salem Pkwy. to Wallace Rd. at Brush College Rd.)

7 = Orange (Salem Pkwy. to Wallace Rd. at Hope Ave.)

12 = Orange + Red (direct connection to Hwy. 22)

8 = White (Salem Pkwy. at Pine St. to Wallace Rd. at Hope Ave.)

28 = **White + Red** (direct connection to Hwy 22)

19 = **White + Red Light** (direct connection to Hwy 22, but without the Pine and Hickory Street Couplet)

1 = Pink (Pine/Hickory St. couplet to Wallace Rd. at Hope Ave.)

14 = **Pink + Red** (direct connection to Hwy 22)

2 = Blue + Red (Academy/River St. couplet to Wallace Rd. at Orchard Heights Rd.; direct connection to Hwy 22)

2 = Yellow (Hood/Shipping St. couplet to Wallace Rd. at Orchard Heights Rd.)

4 = Yellow + Red (direct connection to Hwy 22)

11 = Green + Red (Market/Gaines St. couplet to Wallace Rd. at Glen Creek Rd.; direct connection to Hwy 22)

4 = Forest (on the Green and Pink alignments)

- ◆ 3 = **None** (No Build)
- ◆ (Next to Pink + Red) – Change west-side connection to Orchard Heights though (like Blue)

- ◆ (Next to Yellow) – Connect to Green –west Salem
- ◆ (Next to Green + Red) – No! Too negative to Grant School (Next to Forest) – No! Cannot afford two bridges
- ◆ (Next to Purple and Orange) – Least neighborhood impact, environment justice, best long term for W Salem development.
- ◆ (Next to all three white alternatives) – These are none starters (south of RR crossing that is projected to increase)
- ◆ (Next to Forest) – If two lane bridges that fit in a historic neighborhood (context sensitive)
- ◆ (Next to Forest) – Why must there be two bridges? Just Glen Creek and Market
- ◆ (Next to Forest) – Not practical; simply desirable
- ◆ (Next to Blue + Red) – No!

<b>How important were the following categories to you when you selected three alternatives to be advanced for further study?</b>				
	High consideration	Moderate consideration	Low consideration	Not a factor when Selecting alternatives
Business and/or Residential impacts	32	8	3	1
Parks and/or School impacts	16	16	6	1
Environmental impacts	17	20	3	
Bike and Pedestrian impacts	12	14	11	3
Local travel impacts	24	14	2	1
Regional and/or Through travel impacts	26	10	3	2

<b>Which TSM and TDM options below would help reduce congestion on existing roads and bridges in the Salem-Keizer area?</b>					
	Would help a lot	Would slightly help	Unsure	Would not help	Would make things worse
Flex times (workers arrive/leave work at times other than the usual rush hours)	18	21	2		
Car pool/van pool (encourage commuters to share cars or vans)	19	17	3	2	
Land use changes (provide jobs closer to where people live)	14	11	10	2	2
Congestion pricing or tolling (have people pay to travel during "rush hours" or to go on busy roads/bridges)	15	9	9	4	4
Priority lanes for buses (a separate lane for buses so that they can stay on schedule)	10	16	4	6	3

- ◆ (Next to "Land use changes") Or policies/plans that encourage people to move closer to where they work. We need to address urban sprawl and livability issues.
- ◆ (Next to "Land Use Changes") – I don't think this is a viable option – employers have their own ideas about where to locate.
- ◆ 2 = (Next to "Congestion pricing") – Has worked in London
- ◆ (Next to "Congestion pricing") - People who are offended by this tend to drive way out of their way to avoid toll ways – adds to air pollution.
- ◆ (Next to "Flex times") – especially the downtown state employees
- ◆ (Next to "Car pool/van pool") – unrealistic rural area west
- ◆ (Next to "Priority lanes") – unless you increase bus service
- ◆ (Next to "Priority lanes") – If you could get more to consider buses or park and rides (vote between "would help a lot" and "would slightly help")

<b>Which of the following alternative funding options should be studied as possible ways to pay for the project?</b>			
	Advance for more study	Unsure/need more information	Do Not Advance for more study
System Development Charges	20	10	4
Local Fuel Tax	21	8	7
Vehicle Registration Fee	19	11	7
Transportation Utility Fee	11	14	8
Property Tax	8	10	19
Tolls	26	7	7

- ◆ (Next to "Local Fuel Tax", advance for more study) – Maybe
- ◆ (Next to "Tolls") – The bridge
- ◆ (Next to "Tolls") – definitely, all bridges, including existing
- ◆ (Next to "Tolls") – probably the best for funding
- ◆ (Next to "System Development Charges") – developer should pay for impacts, new housing
- ◆ (Next to "Property Tax") – in Polk County
- ◆ (Next to "Property Tax") – Increase for areas with most congestion

**Is there anything else you'd like to tell us?**

- ◆ Stop ignoring the effects of climate change and the onset of the peak oil that will radically hurt our economy and destroy auto demand
- ◆ The traffic impact maps at tonight's open house were incredibly misleading for your average attendee. Red/increase in traffic on all roads on map should be indicated – not just on local streets. Engineers looking at the generated maps might understand but average folks who just look won't fully understand.
- ◆ Let's put \$500 million into bike/ped improvements, transit, and land use initiatives. The build alternatives only serve to accommodate suburban sprawl.
- ◆ I believe that the White + Red concept is most ideal in that it would give direct access to Hwy 22. With new options created by boring machines, I would hope that tunneling under the river would be considered as a possibility. The cost is going down for that option.

- 
- ◆ Consider connecting white to blue so that white then terminates at Orchard Heights.
  - ◆ Add for study Market Street to Orchard Heights with connection to marine Drive and Glen Creek Road.
  - ◆ Scope too narrow – need to think regionally and longer term.
  - ◆ The costs for alternatives do not include reasonable Right of Way acquisition. Example – Market Street is two lanes to Capitol, but widening is not factored into the relevant alternatives. For alternatives closer to downtown destruction of historic neighborhoods is required. Is this truly desirable?
  - ◆ Green + Red would require widening of Market Street as far as railroad. It would put too much traffic on Market next to Barrick Field and Englewood school. Eliminate.
  - ◆ Purple seems to be the only long term alternative.
  - ◆ Primarily need is to connect West Salem and Beach highway with Keizer and I-5 for commuter and recreation travel without driving traffic through downtown on neighborhoods.
  - ◆ Engineer ability to add rail at later time to new structure.
  - ◆ Need to connect as far north as possible and connect to Hwy 22. Stay out of the north downtown, does not mitigate the traffic congestion/issues.
  - ◆ Green + Red would wipe out my commercial property however seems the best if traffic is mainly going east and south. I'm told at this meeting that most people are wanting to go downtown? White + Red would make a better connection with people going or coming from the north.
  - ◆ Although Green alternative may have lowest projected costs, the plan would be more disruptive to more people and businesses: such as Truitt Bros., Wallace Park, North Downtown Urban Development (renewal), Grant Elementary School, more traffic at an already congested Glen Creek and Wallace intersection.
  - ◆ I live just north of Tryon Street so am very concerned about impact on my house. It appears the bridge proposals would put them very close to where I live, without being acquired as right-of-way. Would like to see a blow up map so I can positively identify my house – and some definitive word on whether the Tryon Street routes would mean my house would be purchased – or not – for right of way.
  - ◆ Please do not route any heavy traffic past Grant School! Prefer the curving bridge alternatives – less negative impacts. Thank you for having a public forum!
  - ◆ Please ensure that houses 50+ years or older are inventoried and counted as a historical loss in the detailed scoring analysis.
  - ◆ Is a bridge really necessary? Downtown already has bridges. Any new bridges should be north or south of the downtown area.
  - ◆ You need a better vision. Need help with that?
  - ◆ Please provide an analysis of housing trends in the Salem metro area and compare to Highland neighborhood rates to establish an evaluation of real estate values that reflects the “but for” impact of the proposed crossing. Consideration of bridges further north of Keizer, if development of the area continues.
  - ◆ Bus service is very poor in West Salem – have you considered increasing this to relieve congestion in the mean time?
  - ◆ I don't think dumping more traffic through a “filter” neighborhood is a good idea. If most of the peak traffic is coming from certain areas, they should bear the brunt of the cost to “fund” their problem. Impacting a neighborhood where many walk to stores/services or bike to work by making it riskier to bike or walk doesn't make sense.
  - ◆ Really don't like the Green Alternative as it would have neighborhood community impacts to NE neighborhoods Market and Center already are dividers of neighborhoods to schools/parks and add congestion and noise and air pollution.
  - ◆ Blue would be the worst would go right through my sisters house and accessible her rentals. Also would destroy my mother's house built in 1859!
  - ◆ I just returned from Dallas, TX and was amazed at the streamlined and efficient system – most funded by Tolls – The trip (2-ways) to airport cost about 7 to 8 dollars but much cheaper than hiring a van or cab!

- 
- ◆ How about sending all the illegal immigrants, criminals, and the people who live off the government “somewhere else” so as to ease the traffic congestion we are getting. Beaverton, here we come!
  - ◆ To the Bridge Location Decision Makers:  
My dear husband has used a wheelchair since 1980. He has Multiple Sclerosis. For over 5 years we went searching for an accessible house. NO luck. I also contacted several builders that were not interested in building such housing.  
We then invested several years planning, financing, and researching into how to make a home for us. We had an excellent local builder and skilled craftsmen and did finally realize our dream home. We were featured in “Fine Homebuilding, issue 76” and had many visitors and even a few handicapped builders from other states visit us.  
Our goal is to live our life here by the river and this property has already been willed to provide housing for other wheelchair users. This Academy street location would not be suitable for a bridge location. Every day we see traffic backed up for several blocks as they wait for the tracks to clear as there are several industrial businesses located between here and towards town.  
We also have some low-income rentals that are always filled and get inquires all the time from people who just cannot afford anything else. Low-income and accessible housing is urgently needed in the Salem area. The proposed bridge design is also a big safety concern of mine. The present bridge linking east and west Salem is the worst designed structure I’ve ever traveled over. The signage is confusing, the visibility is non-existent and you may have to suddenly stop as the traffic is bottled up on the road under the bridge! I have had two friend involved in accidents because of this poor traffic flow design.  
This area is not the place to locate a west-east second bridge to connect with downtown Salem!
  - ◆ Really favor a new bridge to the north – maybe Brooks, Lincoln, Zend to bypass Salem.
  - ◆ At 5:00 Wallace Road is very busy; many vehicles are returning from Amity, McMinnville, etc. Diverting that traffic from the existing bottle neck would certainly help.
  - ◆ Following review and discussion of alternatives presented at the November 14, 2007 open house and subsequent analysis of documentation provided, one alternative merges which appears to provide the optimal return on investment. That alternative is referred to as “Red + White.” It appears superior to all other options for the following reasons:
    - 1) **Optimizes through-traffic movement:** Currently, the majority of I-5 traffic approaching Salem from both the north and the south destined for state route 22 west funnels through the city on Mission Street. This significantly contributes to the high traffic volume on Mission Street and the high volume/high risk intersection at 25<sup>th</sup> Street. That traffic then creates additional congestion as it moves west to and through downtown Salem, crosses the river, and progresses westward on state route 22. Implementation of the Red + White alternative would provide new and more direct access, for southbound travelers on I-5 approaching Salem from the north, to Oregon state route 22 westward. Logically then only I-5 through-traffic approaching Salem from the south and headed westward on route 22 would, impact Mission Street. This should significantly reduce the traffic load on Mission Street, at the 25<sup>th</sup> Street intersection, through downtown Salem and across the currently existing bridge. Additionally, with the Red + White alternative, traffic on I-5 arriving from either the north or south and seeking to proceed northwesterly on state route 22 would also no longer be limited to only one route on Mission Street through Salem and then through West Salem traffic. Again, a net reduction of traffic volume on Mission Street could logically be expected.
    - 2) **Optimizes local traffic movement:** Given current and projected future growth on both sides of the river, the proposed location of the bridge should facilitate daily access and movement of local traffic, now and in the future, with some significant advantages. First, this bridge location is optimal. It is far enough north that residents in north Salem and Keizer can be expected to use it heavily. Perhaps more importantly however, it is near enough to the downtown Salem commercial, business and governmental core that people on the central east side will be willing to go the three minutes north to Pine Street to access it. This will be especially significant during daily peak traffic periods and should greatly improve our overall traffic management situation on both sides of the river. Secondly, the bridge delivery point on the west side, on Hope Avenue, is in a central enough location to provide easy and

quick access for people wanting to go either north or south when entering West Salem. (Conversely, these two points are equally true for people traveling from the west side to the east side.) In addition, direct and quick through access to route 22 west will also be greatly appreciated by local traffic moving from the east westward toward the coast. Again, this will serve to improve the overall traffic management situation, at all hours, for both Salem and West Salem.

**Summary and Conclusion:** Of the thirteen (13) potential alternatives provided by the task force, Red + White appears to be the alternative best capable of serving the needs of this city now and for the foreseeable future.

**OPEN HOUSE - NOVEMBER 14, 2007 - ROTH'S HOSPITALITY CENTER**

**How did you hear about this meeting?**

26 = Newspaper 13 = Project Newsletter 6 = Project Email/Website 17 = Word of Mouth 0 = TV/Radio 6 = Other (1- ODOT, 1-postcard, 1-BTA email, 2-Neighborhood Association Meeting)

The project team is interested in hearing your ideas about the **13 preliminary alternatives**. Your choices are **not votes**. Instead, this information will be given to the community Task Force and the Oversight Team who will recommend a smaller number of alternatives that will be studied in the draft environmental impact statement (draft EIS).

**Tell us which three alternatives you would like to see advanced for more study in the draft environmental impact statement (EIS). (Please check only three alternatives).**

10 = Purple (Salem Pkwy. to Wallace Rd. at Brush College Rd.)  
 7 = Orange (Salem Pkwy. to Wallace Rd. at Hope Ave.)  
 11 = Orange + Red (direct connection to Hwy. 22)  
 13 = **White** (Salem Pkwy. at Pine St. to Wallace Rd. at Hope Ave.)  
 24 = **White + Red** (direct connection to Hwy 22)  
 21 = **White + Red Light** (direct connection to Hwy 22, but without the Pine and Hickory Street Couplet)  
 7 = Pink (Pine/Hickory St. couplet to Wallace Rd. at Hope Ave.)  
 12 = Pink + Red (direct connection to Hwy 22)  
 6 = Blue + Red (Academy/River St. couplet to Wallace Rd. at Orchard Heights Rd.; direct connection to Hwy 22)  
 4 = Yellow (Hood/Shipping St. couplet to Wallace Rd. at Orchard Heights Rd.)  
 7 = Yellow + Red (direct connection to Hwy 22)  
 9 = Green + Red (Market/Gaines St. couplet to Wallace Rd. at Glen Creek Rd.; direct connection to Hwy 22)  
 3 = Forest (on the Green and Pink alignments)

- ◆ 4 = **None** (No Build)
- ◆ 2 = (Next to no build) – or Hope through park
- ◆ None of the plans for the west side, all of these plans go through my house or my neighbors
- ◆ I favor no build. I care about not wasting money and not wasting the environment.
- ◆ 2 = (No comment/alternatives selected, but has a big "X" through all of the alternatives)
- ◆ (Next to Purple) – still to close
- ◆ (Next to Purple) – Orchard Heights Alternative from Hope through Lindbecks should happen



- ◆ No Market! No Gains! No Hood!

How important were the following categories to you when you selected three alternatives to be advanced for further study?				
	High consideration	Moderate consideration	Low consideration	Not a factor when Selecting alternatives
Business and/or Residential impacts	38	10	4	
Parks and/or School impacts	14	20	8	3
Environmental impacts	14	23	6	3
Bike and Pedestrian impacts	7	20	13	4
Local travel impacts	37	8	1	1
Regional and/or Through travel impacts	30	12	4	

- ◆ The further out the better. Even out to Lincoln. Connect to 22, near McCoy. If someone tries to jump and ties up traffic on bridges there is an alternate route. I was caught in traffic from Portland for four hours.
- ◆ Please don't dump into Glen Creek only – it is already too congested.

Which TSM and TDM options below would help reduce congestion on existing roads and bridges in the Salem-Keizer area?					
	Would help a lot	Would slightly help	Unsure	Would not help	Would make things worse
Flex times (workers arrive/leave work at times other than the usual rush hours)	24	13	3	3	
Car pool/van pool (encourage commuters to share cars or vans)	19	13	6	5	
Land use changes (provide jobs closer to where people live)	11	16	12	1	
Congestion pricing or tolling (have people pay to travel during "rush hours" or to go on busy roads/bridges)	14	4	12	5	5
Priority lanes for buses (a separate lane for buses so that they can stay on schedule)	8	16	6	5	5

- ◆ (Next to "Land use changes") – more jobs in west Salem
- ◆ (Next to "Congestion pricing or tolling") – People have to travel
- ◆ (Next to "Priority lanes for buses") – This works great in Portland and Seattle
- ◆ (Next to "Priority lanes for buses") – Need better bus schedule

**Which of the following alternative funding options should be studied as possible ways to pay for the project?**

	Advance for more study	Unsure/need more information	Do Not Advance for more study
System Development Charges	23	10	3
Local Fuel Tax	20	10	8
Vehicle Registration Fee	17	12	11
Transportation Utility Fee	12	23	6
Property Tax	7	8	20
Tolls	22	7	13

- ◆ (Next to "Vehicle Registration Fee") – Local? Statewide?
- ◆ 2 = (Next to "Tolls") – advance electronic only and do not advance regular stop and pay tolls (both added above)
- ◆ (Next to "Tolls" in the Do Not Advance) – People will not use new bridge to save \$1.00 cost
- ◆ (Next to "Tolls") – Peak time only

**Is there anything else you'd like to tell us?**

- ◆ Imagine a long, environmentally and visually engaging bridge across that long stretch of flood plain – it can be done!
- ◆ Every plan on the west side goes through my house or neighborhood "the Orchard Heights Connection" I still don't understand why taking our 12-14 homes is a better solution than going through a dog run at the park. Hope Avenue is a direct route. There isn't any alternatives for this connection. Why not? And why haven't any of us in our neighborhood been contacted by the committee to let us know this information since it all affects us. I can't afford to move and with this my house won't sell.
- ◆ Get rid of the old railroad bridge put that money on the bridge at Lockhaven. This railroad bridge is a waste to the tax payer. (Attached map with No Alternative). Why? Because this needs to be at least a 50-year plan. You are planning a bridge that is obsolete before it is built, it is too close to the current bridge.
- ◆ Should advertise free bus across from transit mall west Salem to town more.
- ◆ Please seriously work on the no build option and seriously think about low build.
- ◆ The connection from Beaumont to the new Marine Drive goes right through my neighborhood – greatly affecting property value and the safety of over 20 kids that live on our street. BAD IDEA. Connect somewhere else! Like through Orchard Heights Park or already established Hope Road.
- ◆ Please give alternative/non bridge options and raise alternatives to bridges not just 13 bridge options.
- ◆ I would like to see the no/or low build alternatives to the project. I feel the only options that are available/or presented are a new bridge . . . no alternative presented
- ◆ I don't like any of your alternatives. They all put a road right in front of my house and will drastically reduce my property value!
- ◆ No new connections at Wallace Road and Glen Creek.
- ◆ Bridge should be located near downtown Salem to accommodate need for access to/from downtown, especially during rush hours. Sites further upriver (north) would adversely impact neighborhoods along the river, since noise travels over water for long distances. Sound and noise mitigation should be an important factor also in the design of the bridge.

- ◆ Using Hope as a connection to Wallace makes more sense than connecting to Wallace a short distance North of Orchard Heights.
- ◆ Use Hope to connect to Wallace Road.
- ◆ Do not undervalue the importance of the Wallace Marine Park! Green + Red is not a good alternative. *Please respond.*
- ◆ Study is great – nice sets of alternatives. Got to do something sooner, not later.
- ◆ Alternatives: Yellow, Yellow + Red, Green + Red, Forest and any alternatives involving Hood, Shipping, and/or Market Streets will result in the closure of Truitt Brothers, Inc. Canning and portion of prepared meals business, with payroll, water + sewer loss to the City . . . and potential transfer to our new facility in Kentucky.
- ◆ Consider a streetcar service over the old Union Street bridge – circulating a bit around west Salem and around downtown/state offices/Hospital/Willamette University. (It would help rush hour and downtown parking considerably.)
- ◆ West Salem traffic and patterns need more consideration and new modeling based on current usage.
- ◆ Consider extending Hope Avenue straight west across the unimproved part of Orchard Heights Part to connect directly to Orchard Heights at the area of the Lindbeck farm. This would take traffic off Orchard Heights intersection with Wallace and provide two accesses rather than ONE. Saves redirecting Kenard through people's homes. Extending Hope would not destroy homes.
- ◆ My concern is that my home will be worthless after building. The new road should go through the park and connect to Hope Street. It makes no sense to break through Beaumont and Valley View. Who's idea was this!? Use the park where people do not live!
- ◆ No new lanes on current bridge. How about a monorail from west Salem to downtown transit center using existing bridges? Could be elevated over one lane and go west to Eola with adequate parking there. Would like to know results of these open house comments.
- ◆ West Salem staging area for some sort of dependable commercial mass transportation to points north – Woodburn & Portland.
- ◆ Red/White Light Advantages: 1) Misses trains on east side of Willamette 2) Very little disruption of citizens homes 3) "Green" may be 200 million less, but adds to mess at Wallace and Glen Creek 4) Disrupts less infrastructure, i.e., Cannery/homes/schools along Market Street
- ◆ The Pink + Red plan should extend from Hope through the undeveloped park area and the Marine Drive should be a phase in option.
- ◆ Please do not impact the neighborhood with changing the Orchard Heights connection. It impacts too many neighbors' homes.
- ◆ Question – Why can't/don't you present a no-build alternative? #1 Suggestion – RR bridge exists, use it! Bike, walk, train, tram, bus, emergency. #2 Bridge toll for private (especially 1 occupant vehicles) pay \$1 for person walking or biking.
- ◆ 1) The new bridge must respect the N Downtown plan on Broadway. Market/Gaines/Hood does not accomplish this. 2) The new bridge must displace as few homes and businesses as possible. 3) Why would all west Salem people want to go to Wallace/Glen Creek to get across 2 bridges?
- ◆ Absolutely connect to Hwy 22 and Salem Parkway for travelers to and from Portland.
- ◆ Get it done!
- ◆ No build! Stop or slow development. I'll fight for it! (stop sign drawn)
- ◆ The first thing done to improve traffic flow is eliminate pedestrian crossing on Front Street (near carousel). Build a pedestrian tunnel or bridge and keep traffic flowing to improve efficiency on bridge.
- ◆ Work on TDM for existing system before constructing new bridges
- ◆ If you change Orchard Heights/Wallace Road intersection, could the curve start below Valley View? Or bypass Orchard Heights and cut straight through Hope and Park!
- ◆ Keep bridges as far apart as possible to minimize congestion.
- ◆ Can't Forest and Green be linked to Hwy 22 and avoid work on existing Marine Street Bridge?

- 
- ◆ Brush College Road end up?
  - ◆ A direct connection from the Salem Parkway is the only alternative that makes sense. By contrast, connecting in at Glen Creek is a nightmare.
  - ◆ Make Marine Drive with local access. We have dedicated to Salem our property for a future Marine Drive, but need local access to insure our residents can get on and off Marine Drive/both right and left turns in and out.
  - ◆ Stop lights on Wallace Road are annoying to me; how about using grade separation flyovers instead? I prefer small scale phased improvements, such as quick fixes to the existing bridge ramps. Lower cost is more important than unnecessary enhancements.