



Comments received by email and postal mail

DATE: December 7, 2007

2007

114. Comment – 12/5/2007 10:11 AM

Response – Not Requested

113. Comment – 12/5/2007 10:11 AM

I'm writing, as I'm sure so many others have, to express my opinion regarding the location of the next bridge, over the Willamette, should we eventually get to that point. FYI, I've resided in and around Salem since 1968 and have been a West Salem resident for most of the past 20 years. Actually, I was an early advocate for locating a potential bridge on the south side of town, being served, in some fashion, by Kuebler. That seems, however, to be unacceptable to way too many folks, so I would next hope that any new bridge would be served by Pine Street.

Market Street, given the level of construction activity in various parts of it, would not seem to be a practical alternative to me at this point. Thanks for your consideration and good luck on the extremely important project.

Response – Not Requested

112. Comment – 12/5/2007 10:11 AM

I'm writing, as I'm sure so many others have, to express my opinion regarding the location of the next bridge, over the Willamette, should we eventually get to that point. FYI, I've resided in and around Salem since 1968 and have been a West Salem resident for most of the past 20 years. Actually, I was an early advocate for locating a potential bridge on the south side of town, being served, in some fashion, by Kuebler. That seems, however, to be unacceptable to way too many folks, so I would next hope that any new bridge would be served by Pine Street.

Market Street, given the level of construction activity in various parts of it, would not seem to be a practical alternative to me at this point. Thanks for your consideration and good luck on the extremely important project.

Response – Not Requested

111. Comment – 12/5/2007 10:04 PM

To date and with the information I have reviewed, at this juncture, my initial preference would be for a third bridge at what is classed as 'Market Street' crossing. This would minimize saturation and increased traffic, that now existis, on Wallace Road NW especially to be effected on bridges that would cross north of the Market Street structure.

Response – Not Requested**110. Comment – 12/5/2007 9:27 PM**

Greetings, I have heard of the different choices for the new bridge over to West Salem. In my opinion, a bridge that goes straight to the Salem Parkway would be the most ideal. A bridge leading directly to the Salem Parkway has many advantages. 1) It's a straight shot to the freeway, so West Salem dwellers don't have to go through town to get to the freeway. 2) It's not as invasive of a cut through a quaint downtown neighborhood 3) It makes less driving time from West Salem to the freeway, therefore better for our environment. 4) Salem Parkway is a GREAT road, that is under-used as it is. 5) We, the residents of the Highland/Grant neighborhoods don't want our roads widened, more traffic through our streets creating more danger for our children, or the vintage-quality of our neighborhoods to be compromised. Please consider the least invasive solution to neighborhoods and schools, rather than the cheapest option for the city of Salem. We don't want to give up the quality of our neighborhoods. Thank you.

Response – Not Requested**109. Comment – 12/5/2007 7:33 PM**

I believe that this project is the most important that Polk county faces in the near and long term and all available transportation funds should be directed toward a new bridge. Polk county and ODOT have a dream of creating an autobaan from salem to the casino and that project is getting the cart before the horse if there is not a more direct route from hwy 22 to I-5. Spending that money is an absolute waste fo money without another bridge. The bridge project is the most relevant to the most people and should be done before any other major transportation projects Polk county. Therefore I believe any new bridge should connect to the parkway not residential surface streets. It does not make any sense to dump semi trucks anywhere other than the parkway.

Response –**108. Comment – 12/4/2007 3:46 PM**

Good evening. Please include the following e-mail as input for the record.

It has come to my attention that a sight being explored for a possible bridge linking West Salem/Polk County with Salem/Marion County is located at Market St. It seems to be a sight that would not make any sense in putting the bridge. The corner of Market and Broadway is in the process of completing a multi-million dollar project and adding a bridge on Market St would devalue that investment. The proximity of Broadway to where the bridge would be built seems to be of negative impact.

It is my understanding that Pine St has been looked at as a possible location and in my opinion would be an ideal location. Pine St would link the improvements made on Portland Rd. and would add positive traffic flow through an area that needs and is going through a revitalization effort.

The proximity of the Parkway would have a positive impact on locating the bridge on Pine St. as well.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. Thank you.

Response – Not Requested

107. Comment – 12/4/2007 6:14 PM

Obviously a bridge is needed to help with load now using the two bridges. I have, however, not seen any indication that a survey or any sort of orderly assessment has been made of those who use the bridges. As someone who overlooks Wallace Road near the urban growth boundry, it is clear many people come and go from well north of the city and would be better served by a bridge much farther north than the current proposals. This would mean less disruption of established areas and would surely give better options than more clogging of already busy streets. I would be interested to know what consideration has been given to this matter.

Response –

106. Comment – 12/3/2007 6:09 PM

I do NOT support any additional bridge at any location. The current bridges each have 4 lanes. The only bottlenecks are the on- and off-ramps and roads leading onto and off of the existing bridges. The best option is to redesign the on- and off-ramps and roads leading onto the existing bridges. Acquire necessary land through offering fair compensation or, if necessary, condemnation.

Response –

105. Comment – 12/3/2007 2:51 PM

Regarding the proposed new bridge, I would like to express my concern about a bridge that would adversely affect the operation of a major business like Truitt Bros., Inc. (green/red

alternative). A better alternative might be the blue/red crossing. I would, however, like to see a change in the design at Academy / River Streets. A more fluid traffic flow going North and South on Salem Parkway would be of great benefit.

Response – Not Requested

104. Comment – 11/30/2007 9:49 AM

All alternatives cross the 100 year floodplain and floodway. The Executive Order 11988 requires federal agencies to avoid the floodplain if practicable. It is good to see that one of your alternatives is to explore using existing infrastructure. This should be rigorously pursued to deem it's practicability. If avoidance cannot occur, than the Executive Order 11988 requires minimization of impacts. The FHWA typically tries to span the 100 year floodplain. In this case, that would not be possible. Therefore, the alternatives with the smallest footprint in the floodplain should be considered first, and if still considered to be practicable (considering environmental, economic and technical feasibility), than that alternative must be used. This evaluation should be done in concert with the Executive Order 11990 Wetlands, as the review requirements are similar. Finally, when evaluating the various alternatives, consideration for those alternatives that will encourage or "allow" future development to occur in the floodplain. Some alternative may better enable development to occur over others. Those alternatives should be avoided.

Response – Not Requested

103. Comment – 11/29/2007 1:06 PM

The Marion County Farm Bureau board of directors had their monthly meeting last night. The location of the third bridge for Salem was discussed and voted upon. The unanimous decision of the board is that the bridge should use Pine Street as it's east side location. Several of the reasons for this decision were:

1. Better access for farm equipment. From farms to the North and East.
2. As farmers we prefer to stay away from the city center with farm machinery.
3. Pine Streets proximity to the Salem Parkway is better suited for moving farm machinery.

In conclusion; there are many farmers with properties on both sides of the Willamette River. It is our view that Pine Street is the best choice for the East side of a new third bridge. Marion County agriculture contributes over \$538,000,000 to the mid-valley economy. Polk County agriculture also makes a significant contribution to this economy. Thank you for considering the position of Marion County Farm Bureau in this project which will have significant impact on the economy of mid-valley agriculture.

Response – Not Requested

102. Comment – 11/29/2007 12:56 PM

I am disappointed that the city would consider a market street crossing at all. It make little sense considering the huge projects that are under way at market and Broadway! Even Pine St would be a better choice! I think that most everyone has it wrong and the bridge should be located off the parkway where it turns south in Keizer and that a marine drive should be used to connect it to highway 22 there should also be a diversion from Front St so traffic would not need to cross four lanes to access Wallace or Edgewater. First this would eliminate the congestion that occurs from commercial to the Marion St bridge. Second this would also allow access to Wallace Rd and the homes on the west side from the north again relieving some of the congestion on Wallace at the Marion St bridge.

Third people who need to go to the north would bypass the area entirely again improving traffic flow. Fourth there would also be dramatic improvement in traffic flow down Marion and 22 because of the Front St crossing. I know that money and Keizer could be an issue but this needs done! Thank-You!

Response – Not Requested

101. Comment – 11/27/2007 4:42 PM

This correspondence is to state for the record my position as a Grant Neighborhood / Ward 1 constituent, on the location of the proposed 3rd Bridge in Salem. I frequent both Market Street and Pine Street regularly (as we live in between both roads). I strongly suggest crossing at Pine Street. Market Street would be too congested and is too close to the current bridges. Additionally, the Pine Street crossing would build up an area that is already developing into a commercial corridor and would connect more efficiently to Parkway traffic and thus I-5. Market Street already is a poor connector to I-5 on the street itself with many stoplights and congestion. For that reason, our family regularly uses Portland Road or the Parkway instead to get to I-5. Placing the 3rd bridge on Market Street would contribute horribly to that congestion, not to mention posing a real detriment to those high density neighborhoods adjacent to the road. Placing the 3rd bridge on Pine Street however, would spread out traffic more to the north rather than concentrating it in the center of town / downtown. Please utilize the Pine Street crossing in the City's planned model, for the best benefit of Salem.

Thank you for including my input in the record.

Response – Not Requested

100. Comment – 11/27/2007 7:54 AM

I am writing to you regarding the viable opportunity for a third bridge from West Salem to the downtown area. I believe that we would benefit greatly from this opportunity. We have

an opportunity to spread out the traffic that impacts both sides of the river. For this reason, I believe that we need to have the bridge outlet at least a mile north of downtown and close to the Pine Street intersection. We only have a chance to do this once and I believe that this will be looked at for years to come, as a wise decision.

Thanks for reading my input

Response – Not Requested

99. Comment – 11/27/2007 8:12 AM

First Merry Christmas is we don't see each other before the holiday. Now, about the bridges: 1) Salem needs a third vehicle crossing of the Willamette River and in my never-to-be-humble opinion is should be located North of Salem (my preference is an extension of Pine Street, but the other alternatives are also good. AND 2) Salem doesn't need to convert the railroad bridge to a walking/bike bridge! Before the City spends money on this boondoggle let's do a pedestrian count on the existing bridges (it's got to be close to zero.) This money can be better spent on the third vehicle bridge.

Thanks for listening.

Response – Not Requested

98. Comment – 11/27/2007 2:57 PM

Having worked on a bridge committee in the early 90's, I fide that it is time to add some comments that I would like to have included in the record.

With the now current locations for a new bridge being close to the center part of town I find this to be very short sided on the part of the powers to be. If, the bridge goes to Market Street or Pine Street this would do little to change the traffic problems of the Downtown area. Any traffic looking to go to I-5, South or West to Hwy 22 will still have to go through the downtown area and use the Center street Bridge. If you look at the location of a new bridge at Market Street, I find that North bound traffic may be good, it does nothing for South bound traffic. Then you have the problem of placement of the bridge on the west side. Looking at going through Wallace Park and out to Wallace Road does nothing but adds to the traffic trouble of Wallace Road.

It would be my opinion that a new bridge, if you are looking at placing it North would be to use Lockhaven across the river into Hwy. 221 This would keep all North bound traffic out of down town as well any traffic coming from the south could use I-5 and take the Chemawa next off I-5 to go north on the Westside. This says nothing of the connection to Hazel Green to

Cordon Rd. which will have a connection to Hwy. 22 on to Kubler and another connection with I-5 and South Commercial. And, if you can look into the

future, then Kubler should join with Browns Inland Road cross the river with the second bridge and back on to Hwy 22.

This would give you a great beltline around Salem with great connections to all the major highways in the area and keep a great deal of traffic out of the downtown area.

If, you have any questions please feel free to contact me.

Response – Not Requested

97. Comment – 11/27/2007 3:35 PM

Regarding the River Crossing, please note that building a bridge on Pine St. makes more sense than Market St.

There are enough projects on Market and Broadway and I think Pine would be a better location especially since it is a block from Salem Parkway.

Response – Not Requested

96. Comment – 11/27/2007 10:31 AM

As a Chamber of Commerce Board member, I support the location for the third bridge be North of Market St.

Response – Not Requested

95. Comment – 11/27/2007 9:14 AM

In my opinion the best choice for a third bridge is at Pine Street.

It is far enough away from downtown to eliminate further congestion and in a central north neighborhood that will service that growing area, plus connecting in an area of West Salem that is also experiencing rapid growth.

Response – Not Requested

94. Comment – 11/27/2007 8:56 AM

Greetings, I was on a bridge committee in the early 80's, will we really do it this time?

Given all the research on this issue, I'm all for a northern bridge- certainly not the Market Street proposal. Thanks for your work, go get 'em.

Response – Not Requested

93. Comment – 11/27/2007 8:59 AM

It is exciting to think that a third bridge might actually be built in Salem. The implications for Salem's future are huge. The presentation I attended recently at the Chamber meeting was very educational. I know you must be receiving lots of feedback, but I wanted to add my voice to the stack and to encourage consideration of the Pine Street option. I know all options have their challenges, but I feel the greater distance between crossings is a benefit of this option, as is the connection to the parkway and the better connection between the economies of West Salem and Keizer.

Response – Not Requested

92. Comment – 11/27/2007 4:24 PM

Mike and crew at the Salem Area Chamber of Commerce asked me to send you an opinion on the third bridge. I have been to two of the presentations and the "far north alternatives" (Pine Street or the White alternative(s) (I think) are the best options.) We do not want the bridge at Market St. or near the downtown area. Let me know if you need any additional information or comments.

Response – Not Requested

91. Comment – 11/27/2007 4:14 PM

I thought it important, as a large user of the interstate transportation system, that our company express to you and your staff the importance of the Willamette Bridge Crossing decision being one that makes sense for our current infrastructure in this city. I have been exposed to a few different options that are being discussed as to location and we would urge you to put efforts into the Pine Street location. Great access off of the parkway, yet far enough out of the downtown core to not disrupt local traffic patterns. Thank you for your efforts.

Response – Not Requested

90. Comment – 11/27/2007 4:57 PM

Have you considered a highway from the area of Doakes Ferry Rd. and highway 22, to the area of Wallace Rd. and Michigan City Rd. It could have on and off ramps from Eola Dr., Glen Creek Rd. and Orchard Heights Rd. This would relieve the congestion in West Salem and the highway could be built mostly on farm land, unless this project is put off to allow more homes to be built on the land needed. This may also provide a reason to have the proposed bridge location accessible, directly to this highway.

Response –

89. Comment – 11/26/2007 4:45 PM

I couldn't attend the bridge crossing meeting, but my opinion is that the Pine Street location is the best. Market Street makes no sense to me, as that area has undergone huge private and public investment recently, all of which would be seriously and negatively impacted by the bridge footprint. Please add my comments to the record.

Response – Not Requested

88. Comment – 11/26/2007 4:03 PM

Under not circumstances do I want our third bridge to be located off of Market Street. What makes more sense is placing the bridge off of Lockhaven to wrap around the city and tie into the other artery streets. As a West Salem Resident we need to do what is right for the entire community.

Response – Not Requested

87. Comment – 11/26/2007 3:22 PM

Please include my input in the public record. As a business owner at the intersection of Broadway and Liberty Street NE, my business will be directly impacted by the placement of a Third Bridge in North Salem. I request that the City NOT locate the bridge along Market Street. Pine Street is a much better location for the Third Bridge.

The corner of Market and Broadway is an area of significant commercial development that will revitalize the community. Construction and expansion of Market street to accomodate bridge traffic will disrupt the revitalization and cause undesirable traffic congestion in the area. Pine street is a better location because of the direct connection between Pine Street and Portland Road and the intersection of Salem Parkway and Pine street.

Response – Not Requested

86. Comment – 11/26/2007 3:13 PM

I would like my input considered that the River Crossing not be Market due to the many multi-million dollar projects already underway. Instead, I vote for north at Pine St. "Take the risk! We ALL WIN by taking the first step"

Response – Not Requested

85. Comment – 11/26/2007 3:13 PM

I have been made aware of the notion for a bridge crossing option at Market Street. I am not in favor of this option, a lot of study and hard work has been given toward the Pine Street crossing as well as options more to the North. We must narrow not expand the options if

we are to see a 3rd bridge at all. Thank you for taking note of my response to a Market Street crossing.

Response – Not Requested

84. Comment – 11/26/2007 2:57 PM

I agree that Market Street does not seem to be the right choice. Pine allows traffic be separated depending on where people need to go! Have a great Day!

Response – Not Requested

83. Comment – 11/26/2007 2:42 PM

I was told that you would be the person to contact regarding input on the location of the third river crossing in Salem. I have been following this project off and on for a while and have heard mention of making the crossing at several locations; including Tryon, Pine, Market, etc. I would like to weigh in, if I can, and say that the further north the crossing goes, the better the effects of the bridge will be on Salem in general.

I would propose that the bridge be placed with access either to Tryon or Pine instead of going to Market. The reasoning would be that traffic would have a much easier time navigating Salem streets on the way to the freeway via the Parkway than it would via Market. If the new bridge links to Market I don't think that it would be much better than dumping them out into the one-way grid of downtown. This is because the entire length of Market St is already closely developed and there is no other easy access towards I-5 from that point.

If the crossing were further north the Parkway would be much easier to link up with and it could funnel traffic out to I-5 very easily. Also, an exit could be place that would put west-bound traffic within easy reach of Market St for more central destinations. Perhaps this would require some sort of an on-ramp from the Parkway to I-5 south, which is currently a rather difficult transition to make as things currently stand. However, even with this detriment, I believe that the effects on city traffic will be much greater the further the bridge is from downtown and the costs could be less than paying to improve Market to handle the extra traffic load. (Especially considering the new developments currently under way at two corners of Market and Broadway.)

I hope that this helps you in some way. Thanks for your work on this project. No matter which way it goes it will be a great thing for the City of Salem.

Response – Not Requested

82. Comment – 11/26/2007 2:26 PM

Please let's do this right! Pine Street is the common sense location for the bridge!

Response – Not Requested

81. Comment – 11/26/2007 7:03 PM

1. After talking with the docents at a presentation I believe your traffic modeling is basically flawed. I don't believe you are basing traffic patterns on current reality. 2. I believe the thought pattern of the existing committee is based on what is good for downtown Salem to relieve traffic congestion there and has no regard or understanding of the effects of dumping traffic onto downtown West Salem. Nor in routing West Salem residential traffic away from downtown West Salem to cross the river. 3. In my mind the ONLY viable bridge alternative is the "Purple", from Salem Parkway to Brush College.

Response – Not Requested

80. Comment – 11/19/2007 8:22 PM

Very well put! Until we can be assured of cheap and non-polluting automobile travel for the next few decades, we shouldn't be sinking hundreds of millions into this "bridge to the past".

Response – Not Requested

79. Comment – 11/19/2007 4:53 PM

After thoughts from seeing the presentation at Highland School a couple weeks ago. It would seem that with news of health studies showing higher rates of influenza, etc. related to communities in close proximity to freeways, it would be in the long range interest of the community to locate the bridge as far north of developed neighborhoods as possible. The Tyron option is closest to that criteria.

Response – Not Requested

78. Comment – 11/15/2007 12:16 PM

Sorry I could not make either one of the Salem River Crossing hearings held 11/8 or 11/14 so I lend my strong email-voice in support of putting bicycle and pedestrian needs, if not AHEAD OF the motorized vehicle at least EQUAL to them.

It is unthinkable that any public transportation planning WOULD NOT provide for the non-motorized public. Further, I hope the 1% tax on all vehicle fuel is still gathered into the specific account for paying for this non motorized access system. (I realize it is going to cost more than that fund can cover however, the long range benefits of cleaner environment and better health more than pay for it.

Giving people the choice of using a motorized vehicle by allowing them safe access from point a. to point b. under their own steam begins to dilute the negative aspects of our current life style - need I list them? Not if I am preaching to fellow believers who are well positioned to make diversity of transportation modes happen.

Response – Not Requested

77. Comment – 11/14/2007 8:39 PM

... a quick perspective...I grew up in Brookline, Pittsburgh in the 30's and rode streetcars all over the city

For over half a century, Brookline travelers were connected to the city of Pittsburgh via a 600 mile network of trolley lines. Rail traffic in Pittsburgh peaked during the war years of the 40s and 50s, then slowly declined in favor of new bus routes. The Brookline trolley, which travelled West Liberty Avenue and Brookline Boulevard made its final run on September 3, 1966 _____. <http://www.spdconline.org/history/Trolleys/Trolleys.html>

Response – Not Requested

76. Comment – 11/14/2007 3:17 PM

The sooner we scrap this river crossing process the better for all concerned. We need to be investing in new infrastructure that will serve us well in the new world rushing to meet us, a world of very high priced energy and real limits on carbon emissions. This will be a tremendous challenge, one that will tax the creativity of our best thinkers and require that we rethink our notions about mobility and access. But it will be just that much harder if we squander \$500- \$1,000 millions on a new river crossing in Salem.

OK - I agree with you and can suggest a transport technology that could meet your objectives which is getting close to being market ready. It's being developed in Uppsala, Sweden by Vectus PRT which is backed by a large Korean steel company called POSCO. A test track and vehicles have been built and are now being operated in an extensive test program. Certification, for public use, by Swedish Rail is likely soon. You can see a movie of the test track in operation at: http://www.vectus.se/eng_press.html Vectus PRT Quicktime movie that shows one vehicle being operated on Uppsala test track, October, '07

You can see an animation of a PRT system designed to serve the Microsoft campus in Redmond, Washington at: <http://gettherefast.org/bettercampus.html>>Microsoft Campus, Redmond, WA Basically, this automated, electric, technology uses small guideways which would make a river crossing much simpler and far less costly. A PRT network could be designed for West Salem and central Salem that could make it quite easy for people to use it to reach several major central Salem destinations. There are several examples of such networks, designed for a variety of cities at: <http://faculty.washington.edu/jbs/itrans/itrans34.htm>. Want more details? See

<http://kinetic.seattle.wa.us/prt.html> and/or
<http://faculty.washington.edu/jbs/itrans/prtquick.htm>

Response – Not Requested

75. Comment – 11/14/2007 2:13 PM

I want to add my support to {name removed} excellent comments and expand on a point I have tried to make several times:

By failing to account for trip price in their trip demand assumptions, the demand projections purporting to justify this project tacitly assume an unlimited supply of essentially free motor fuel, which we enjoyed throughout most of the 20th Century. But now, as we near the maximum of global oil production (peak oil), we already see the chaotic price disruptions that inexorably increasing demand causes when met with constrained supply: there is simply no slack in the global oil market, nor will there be again. Whether we see \$100/bbl oil this year or not, the reality is that, before this bridge (or bridges) could even be started, \$100/bbl oil will be a fond memory.

This means that projects built on the basis of trip demand models are going to be like the giant battleships that the Navy built after the arrival of the airplane: obsolete from the start, representing only the most wasteful consequence of an expensive yet myopic "rear view mirror" planning process.

An example of the same kind of thinking was seen in this region in the WPPPS debacle, where similarly blinkered demand projections caused power planners to schedule the construction of five nuclear power plants, leading to the most expensive construction bond default in history when electric price increases caused the projected demand to evaporate.

Since then, Oregon has benefitted immensely from participation in the Northwest Power and Conservation Council, a body that has been essential to helping the region overcome the tendency to discount the value of conservation and efficiency in meeting power needs. As a result of their work, the region has undergone a transformation, helping millions of people get their needs met without continuing to build ever more power plants.

Oregon clearly needs a similar body for transportation because the state is clearly still a prisoner of the mindset that places automobiles at the center and shoves the needs of people and the natural environment into a ditch on the side of the road. Thus, we see proposals like this third bridge to deal with Salem's brief twice-a-day "rush hour," which is like trying to treat heart disease with butter.

The sooner we scrap this river crossing process the better for all concerned. We need to be investing in new infrastructure that will serve us well in the new world rushing to meet us, a world of very high priced energy and real limits on carbon emissions. This will be a tremendous challenge, one that will tax the creativity of our best thinkers and require that we rethink our notions about mobility and access. But it will be just that much harder if we squander \$500- \$1,000 millions on a new river crossing in Salem.

Response – Not Requested

74. Comment – 11/14/2007 12:27 PM

I regret that I will be unable to attend tonight's open house on a proposed new bridge across the Willamette. I have attached written comments for your review. Please enter them into the public record.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on various proposals for a new bridge across the Willamette River in Salem.

The realities of a rapidly warming climate, increasingly severe budget constraints, and a carbon-constrained future make it essential that we embrace visionary thinking in our transportation planning.

As our population ages, budgets shrink, and climate warms, we need to make transportation investments that reduce our need to drive, rather than build projects that could have been designed in the 1950's. One out of every four Oregonians – roughly a million people – are too young, old, sick, or poor to drive. This number will grow as our population ages. Our investments need to be better coordinated with our larger goals and land use strategies, and meet the needs of all Oregonians, not just those who can drive.

Global warming threatens Oregon's economy, Oregonians' health and safety, vulnerable fish and wildlife habitat, and our quality of life. Recognizing these threats, the 2007 Legislature committed to stopping the growth of greenhouse gas emissions by 2010, to reducing them by 10% below 1990 levels by 2020, and to reduce them 75% below 1990 levels by 2050. Strong and decisive action is required.

Given the targets adopted by the legislature any new transportation project should substantially improve bicycling & pedestrian movement *and must not encourage increased auto-dependent sprawl*. We can't meet our greenhouse gas reduction goals if we focus our spending on widening roads and building new bridges to serve new low-density car-dependent development.

New transportation investments, like a hugely expensive new bridge, must reduce our need to drive *and* the number of miles driven by expanding transit, pedestrian, and bicycle accessibility and improving the local street systems needed for short trips.

We simply cannot afford to build a new bridge if it will disrupt neighborhoods and contribute to ever-greater reliance on gasoline and single-passenger auto trips.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide comment.

Response – Not Requested

73. Comment – 11/11/2007 5:35 PM

There's really little I can add to what's most likely been already said about this. Basically, there's plenty of need for bridges on either side of the river that wouldn't cross the river itself. Alternative means of transportation need encouragement and if facilities, such as the stretch of Liberty between Browning and Commercial were improved to accommodate cyclists better, there would be less need for access to crossing the Willamette.

If congestion limits the desire for the home in the country, there's less dependence on petroleum, and the accompanying suburban sprawl. It sure looks like the builders are banking heavily on the general population of Salem, and the state, to foot the bill to build a bridge for the buyers of their new homes and subdivisions in West Salem.

I'm concerned about the effects of such a structure being placed in the selected communities, and its effect on the users of alternative transportation, or even inhibiting their desire to use something other than the automobile.

We're looking at funding a structure that will last at least 50 years. I think that most folks are counting on business as usual, that all people of means will continue to depend on the automobile as we've known it and that we have an unlimited amount of fuel to hold that notion up with. I've been attending the Salem Progressive film series, and that doesn't paint that kind of picture. Not to mention that China is now the second largest user of petroleum, and growing.

While I served on the ODOT Bike/Ped committee, it was pointed out that new highway projects were out of the question, that just maintaining the existing system was straining the finances of the department -- and that in the very near future, even that was in question. More facilities to maintain, better gas mileage, less funds to go around.

I just can't see the justification of spending this sum of money on one structure to support and encourage the use of the automobile – at everyone's expense.

Response – Not Requested

72. Comment – 11/08/2007 10:25 AM

I do not live in Salem. I am an insurance investigator in Eugene. I ride my bicycle daily to and from work. I also ride for pleasure at other times. I have enjoyed riding the dedicated bicycle lanes in the Eugene area. I understand the Willamette and McKenzie Rivers are not as wide in Eugene as the Willamette is in Salem so having bicycle only bridges here are less costly.

I would hope that any alternative for the Salem River Crossing chosen will provide a safe and separate dedicated bike lane for crossing. In addition the access to and from a bridge

crossing is very important. The I-5 to Gateway crossing in Eugene is a good example of accommodating bicycle/pedestrian traffic.

The intersections lane changes and traffic congestion faced by a bike rider will in large part determine how many will use the route. I avoid heavy traffic areas with poorly laid out bike and vehicle interaction because they are just not safe.

Thank you for considering alternatives that include walking, bicycling and alternative methods to get around. I know vehicle traffic is the major cost and concern.

Response – Not Requested

71. Comment – 11/08/2007 10:30 AM

I would like to see better and more bike lanes so that I can use my bike with out feeling like someone is going to run me over with the car.

Response –

70. Comment – 11/07/2007 9:59 PM

I am E-mailing you to oppose the Salem Bridge Crossing project. It will be hugely expensive, and building more roads just encourages more driving.

My husband and I come down to Salem to do lots of organized bike rides, and in October we passed through Salem (going south and coming back north) on a self-supported bike tour. I feel another bridge would just make such rides less safe, and less pleasant.

I believe that the money is better spent encouraging people to vanpool, use flex time to minimize rush-hour traffic, and other ways of encouraging alternate commuting.

Response – Not Requested

69. Comment – 11/01/2007 11:08 AM

We lived in Salem 1962-1964 and a new bridge was needed then. We've lived in Keizer since 1989 and a new bridge has been badly needed all along. I like the Orange with Red alternative. This is the best alternative when thinking about growth, and about traffic movement in and through Salem. This one makes the best use of existing main routes, connecting Hwy 22 with the new bridge, and the Parkway and I-5 without routing the bulk of traffic through downtown and city streets.

Response – 11/2/2007 12:39 PM

Thank you for your comment. We will share it with our community Task Force and Oversight Team as they make their recommendation on which alternatives to further

analyze. Your comment is consistent with the Purpose and Need that was created to guide the development of project alternatives - the basic elements of that statement are to improve mobility on the existing bridges while alleviating congestion on the surrounding local streets.

I encourage you to attend one of the open houses, scheduled for Thursday November 8 (5-8 pm) at Highland School and Wednesday November 14 (5-8 pm) at Roth's West Salem to see the latest information on the project and provide comments.

68. Comment – 11/01/2007 11:08 AM

Thanks for getting back with me. May be I wasn't very clear. For the reasons given and more, it would be my recommendation to add improvements to the northbound off-ramp to Front St. from eastbound Center St. bridge to the alternatives that also include connection to Hwy 22.

Response – Not Requested

67. Comment – 10/31/2007

Dear Mr. Fricke,

I have low vision – please accept my printing. I am responding to the river crossing alternatives article in 10/26 newspaper. If we're trying to avoid congestion the crossing can't be to Glen Creek!

I suggest Tryon to Hope Ave. There will be much heavy commercial traffic (trucks) and a connection can be made from the end of Hope to Hwy 22 – thus by-passing the congestion of downtown west Salem.

Response – Not Requested

66. Comment – 10/31/2007 9:29 AM

Thanks for your thoughtful reply and explanation. My rough plan was intended to provoke ideas that took into account the increased future traffic to and from the beach via Hwy 22 and I-5, and to stimulate the notion of minimizing the impact of construction.

However much the new bridge reduces traffic on the existing bridges, I felt the idea of a crossing into West Salem would compound a frightful traffic condition that is there and presupposes people in West Salem needing to go to I-5 rather than downtown, meanwhile there is no relief for commercial traffic and vacation traffic from from the I-5 corridor to the beach on Hwy 22.

I will try to attend some of the hearings.

Response – Not Requested

65. Comment – 10/29/2007 10:38 AM

Thanks for the reply.

By the way, what's your thoughts regarding the need for a direct connection of Hwy 22 to any new bridge alternative? Just curious.

Two, you say "all alternatives include the improvements that are already funded as a result of the Bridgehead Engineering Study. This includes doing some widening on the Center Street bridge off-ramp to southbound Front Street and a installation of a traffic signal for the Center Street bridge off-ramp to northbound Front Street. This signal will allow the traffic heading north to the Parkway to clear off of the ramp more efficiently. A free-flow ramp is not possible without moving the piers that support the Marion Street bridge."

Okay, so is moving the piers part of the discussion? I sure hope so.

Why, improved viability. At first glance, it seems likely to eliminate the need for the "new" bridge location to be as close to the current ones, which would reduce the need to alter Truitts Bro. or dump down into any residential communities on the east side. From what I am reading at least one being a big concern for residents on that east side. Also, I believe, any traffic wanting to go to or pass through these areas, could instead use the north off-ramp flow improvements off the Center St. bridge to gain access to areas of town without additional difficulties to those effected neighborhoods. This would allow the "new" bridge location to move farther north to: improve it's flow characteristics with both the Parkway and any commercial or personal destinations in Keizer and the northern edge of Salem; make it more viable long term with regard to growth happening farther out Wallace Rd.; improve traffic flexibility with regard to the cities long term vision for any enhancements or changes to the areas surrounding east side along Front St. and/or Commercial St. N.E., with this recommendation traffic from the west side would have two good alternatives to the east side verses one without it; etc.

Look forward to your comments. Thanks again.

Response – 10/31/2007 8:53 AM

Many of the 13 preliminary alternatives include a direct connection to Hwy 22 (referred to as "red"). According to our traffic modeling, this connection helps draw more people to a new bridge. For the alternatives without the direct connection to Hwy 22, we are looking at improvements to the existing bridges, including a more significant modification of the ramp from westbound Center Street to northbound Front Street. Additional lanes would also be needed on the existing bridges. I encourage you to attend the open houses to view what these might look like.

64. Comment – 10/29/2007 10:23 AM

I submitted my info to the mailing list and when I sent the info, I could not tell if you received it or not. I would like a phone number of the ODOT office. I can not attend either open house and would like to visit the plans, but need the phone number to find out where those plans are. Thanks in advance.

Response – 11/2/2007 10:36 AM

Thank you for your interest in the Salem River Crossing project. Your information has been added to our mailing list.

All of the information on the 13 alternatives is available on the project website at www.salemrivercrossing.org/alternatives.aspx. If you click on the alignment colors, you will be able to view a thumbnail of the alternative and then if you click on that thumbnail map, you will open a more detailed map.

Please let me know if you have further questions and I would be happy to put you in contact with the appropriate project team member.

Thank you again for your interest in the Salem River Crossing project.

63. Comment – 10/26/2007 7:07 PM

I read in today's Statesman Journal that the number one option recommended by the 21 member task force comes over the river from the west and connect at Market Street. It doesn't make sense to send a load of traffic to cross three school crossing zones through neighborhoods that feed schools that are bisected from busy Market Street. Market would need to be widened to deal with the additional traffic because currently Market has no left turn lanes, nor does it have bike lanes and the sidewalks are substandard. There are utilities to move, etc. Salem Parkway is already wide enough to accomodate traffic.

Response – 10/31/2007 8:06 AM

Thank you for your comment on the Salem River Crossing project. The alternative that connects on the east side of the river at Market Street (Green Alternative) was the highest scored alternative using the Evaluation Framework developed by the stakeholder Task Force and the Oversight Team. The Evaluation Framework consists of 5 goals and over 40 individual measures related to congestion, project cost, community impacts, etc. The framework is one tool that the Task Force and Oversight Team will use to reduce the current list of 13 alternatives down to the most promising that will be advanced into the environmental impact statement (EIS). To this point, the Task Force has made no recommendations on their highest ranked alternatives. They, and the Oversight Team, have reviewed all the information currently available (including the scoring from the Evaluation Framework) and will also consider the public comments provided at the scheduled open houses and through the project web site before making a recommendation on the alternatives for the EIS. The open houses are scheduled for Thursday November 8 (5-8 pm)

and Highland School and Wednesday November 14 (5-8 pm) at Roth's West Salem. There will also be a survey posted on the project web site beginning November 1 where the public can express their opinions on the alternatives.

Again, thank you for your interest in the Salem River Crossing Project. I encourage you to attend one of the open houses and continue to visit the web site to get the most up-to-date information on the project.

62. Comment – 10/26/2007 10:39 AM

I believe any concept or recommendation that doesn't include a Hwy 22 component, connection north to the Parkway, would be shortsighted. Additionally, I am leaning to having the crossing point as far north as possible to accommodate future growth in the Orchard Heights Rd. and northern area of West Salem. Thank you.

Response – 10/29/2007 9:52 AM

Thank you for your input, both this email and your email from August 2, 2007. This input was and will be shared with the community Task Force and Oversight Team. Your concerns about addressing traffic mobility across the Willamette River are reflected in the Project's Purpose and Need Statement. All solutions will need to respond to the Purpose and Need by improving mobility while alleviating congestion on the connecting highway and arterial street systems. We are currently seeking public input on which of the 13 alternatives should be eliminated, and which merit additional evaluation in the Environmental Impact Statement document. We will be posting an on-line survey starting November 1 where you can share your specific input. We also have open houses scheduled for November 8 (at Highland Elementary School) and November 14 (at Roth's in West Salem) - both last from 5 to 8 PM, with presentations at 5:30 and again at 7 PM.

With regard to improvements to the existing bridges, some of the alternatives identify improvements needed on the existing bridges, including additional travel lanes. Also, all alternatives include the improvements that are already funded as a result of the Bridgehead Engineering Study. This includes doing some widening on the Center Street bridge off-ramp to southbound Front Street and an installation of a traffic signal for the Center Street bridge off-ramp to northbound Front Street. This signal will allow the traffic heading north to the Parkway to clear off of the ramp more efficiently. A free-flow ramp is not possible without moving the piers that support the Marion Street bridge.

Once again, thank you for your input and we hope to see you at one of our open houses. – Julie

Response – 10/31/2007 8:19 AM

Thank you for your comment on your alternative preferences for the Salem River Crossing project. Currently, the 13 alternatives that are described on the project web site are being considered by the stakeholder Task Force and Oversight Team. Both groups will make their final recommendations on the alternatives to be advanced into the environmental impact statement in early December. They will consider the technical information produced to date

along with the public comments received at the open houses scheduled for Thursday November 8 (5-8 pm) at Highland School and Wednesday November 14 (5-8 pm) at Roth's West Salem, and through the project web site. Beginning November 1, a survey will be posted on the web site that will allow the public to express their preferences on the alternatives.

Thank you for your interest in the Salem River Crossing project. I encourage to attend one of the open houses and to take the survey on the web site to express your preferences on the project alternatives.

61. Comment – 10/26/2007 10:09 AM

I think that the area that is being focused on is incorrect. All that is being done with the current plans is funneling even more traffic in the same general area (Front St N of the existing bridges). If we placed a bridge to the SOUTH and funnel all the traffic from Mission St to Hwy 22 in W Salem, it would be a better step and address future needs instead of creating more traffic in the same area.

Response – 10/31/2007 8:37 AM

Our preliminary traffic analysis has validated the results of the work completed by the Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments (MWVCOG) in 2002. That study resulted in the selection of the Tryon/Pine corridor as a locally preferred alternative for a future river crossing. Our current analysis indicates that a new crossing somewhere between the existing bridges north to Tryon Avenue will result in the largest reduction in traffic on the existing bridges. Significantly more traffic will be removed from the existing bridges when the direct connection to OR 22 is included. This is consistent with the Purpose and Need statement that has been developed to guide the development of project alternatives - the basic elements of that statement are to improve mobility on the existing bridges while alleviating congestion on the surrounding local streets. The data supporting these conclusions is contained in the Study Area Refinement memo which is available on the project website.

Thank you for your comment. I encourage you to attend one of the open houses, scheduled for Thursday November 8 (5-8 pm) at Highland School and Wednesday November 14 (5-8 pm) at Roth's West Salem to see the latest information on the project and provide comments. Also, beginning November 1, you will be able to take a survey on the project web site to express your comments and preferences on the project alternatives. All public comments received will be considered by the stakeholder Task Force and Oversight Team in forming their recommendations on the alternatives to be advanced into the environmental impact statement.

60. Comment – 10/26/2007 9:20 AM

Ref. Statesman Journal column of 25 Oct 2007, To whom it may concern: I was disappointed in seeing bridge options almost totally being viewed as coming from I-5 through the north part of Salem and crossing somewhere into west Salem north of the Marion St bridge. Let

me suggest a different approach; Exit I-5 somewhere around the Hwy 22 interchange and proceed along the airport boundary and Bush Park so as to cross over to Minto Brown Island and interchanging with Hwy 22 somewhere west of Eola. This has the advantage of giving east west Hwy 22 access towards the beach as well as I-5 traffic, north or south bound. The biggest advantage is a minimal disruption of travel in Salem during construction. The other advantage is avoiding the almost impossible traffic conditions on Wallace Rd in West Salem. I hope that you give this concept a good look!

Response – 10/31/2007 8:39 AM

Our preliminary traffic analysis has validated the results of the work completed by the Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments (MWVCOG) in 2002. That study resulted in the selection of the Tryon/Pine corridor as a locally preferred alternative for a future river crossing. Our current analysis indicates that a new crossing somewhere between the existing bridges north to Tryon Avenue will result in the largest reduction in traffic on the existing bridges. Significantly more traffic will be removed from the existing bridges when the direct connection to OR 22 is included. This is consistent with the Purpose and Need statement that has been developed to guide the development of project alternatives - the basic elements of that statement are to improve mobility on the existing bridges while alleviating congestion on the surrounding local streets. The data supporting these conclusions is contained in the Study Area Refinement memo which is available on the project website.

Thank you for your comment. I encourage you to attend one of the open houses, scheduled for Thursday November 8 (5-8 pm) at Highland School and Wednesday November 14 (5-8 pm) at Roth's West Salem to see the latest information on the project and provide comments. Also, beginning November 1, you will be able to take a survey on the project web site to express your comments and preferences on the project alternatives. All public comments received will be considered by the stakeholder Task Force and Oversight Team in forming their recommendations on the alternatives to be advanced into the environmental impact statement.

59. Comment – 10/26/2007 9:10 AM

The reason why none of the 13 bridges work well is that the alternatives don't include a south Salem option. It is obvious to someone who's lived in this town forty years, and lives in central Salem now, that much traffic should be siphoned off to the biggest growth areas. It would be easy to take a bridge from River Road S to West Salem, it would automatically relieve a huge load from the downtown areas and probably be less expensive. Why is this not being considered? I have to assume that once again, the realty interests in South Salem have insulated themselves from harm. It's always been more attractive to the powers in Salem to mess up central Salem than south - and this comes from someone who's spent most of his life in south Salem. The reasoning I've heard is ludicrous - "Downtown is where the traffic is, therefore that's where the bridge should be." The traffic is there because the bridge is there. I drive to and from West Salem all the time, and many, many times I would have given my right arm for a south Salem bridge option. If you go back to the old Beltline plan Salem traffic used to have, it would fit right in. We have to stop funneling all the traffic

through a few narrow spots. Don't put the whole load on Wallace. Don't put the whole load on Mission. Spread the traffic out, and traffic will flow more smoothly.

Response – 10/31/2007 8:41 AM

Our preliminary traffic analysis has validated the results of the work completed by the Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments (MWVCOG) in 2002. That study resulted in the selection of the Tryon/Pine corridor as a locally preferred alternative for a future river crossing. Our current analysis indicates that a new crossing somewhere between the existing bridges north to Tryon Avenue will result in the largest reduction in traffic on the existing bridges. Significantly more traffic will be removed from the existing bridges when the direct connection to OR 22 is included. This is consistent with the Purpose and Need statement that has been developed to guide the development of project alternatives - the basic elements of that statement are to improve mobility on the existing bridges while alleviating congestion on the surrounding local streets. The data supporting these conclusions is contained in the Study Area Refinement memo which is available on the project website.

Thank you for your comment. I encourage you to attend one of the open houses, scheduled for Thursday November 8 (5-8 pm) at Highland School and Wednesday November 14 (5-8 pm) at Roth's West Salem to see the latest information on the project and provide comments. Also, beginning November 1, you will be able to take a survey on the project web site to express your comments and preferences on the project alternatives. All public comments received will be considered by the stakeholder Task Force and Oversight Team in forming their recommendations on the alternatives to be advanced into the environmental impact statement.

58. Comment – 10/22/2007 6:46 PM

The Willamette Greenway stretches from Eugene to Portland along the Willamette River. It represents some of the most beautiful and desirable real estate in Oregon, and certainly in Salem. The Grant and Highland neighborhood districts are the gateway to the Willamette Greenway in the north part of Salem, and should be the gateway to Salem's downtown business core. Oregon's former governor Tom McCall advocated for and established the Willamette Greenway for all Oregonians. Tom McCall was one of the finest governors Oregon has ever had. His visionary contribution is something we can be proud of as long as it remains. The Willamette Greenway is his legacy to us. Will we run roughshod over it? Or will we advocate for it as strongly as he did? A bridge is a permanent structure. It affects the area in which it's located in dramatic ways for generations. Bridges come at enormous cost in terms of their construction, in terms of the impact on affected neighborhoods and in terms of significant narrowing or elimination of future options. The opportunity cost of a new bridge is decidedly difficult to gauge, but it's clear that alternatives for livability will be lost for a relatively small short-term gain. The immediately obvious reduction in traffic for West Salem residents can be easily outweighed by surrender of exceptionally valuable real estate just north of Salem's downtown business district. How can that loss be measured? How valuable is the median strip of the freeways in Los Angeles today? Influential people in Los Angeles, seeking short term and shortsighted gain, sacrificed their median strip

decades ago. They traded away the city's ability to offer mass transit in favor of automobiles, much to the chagrin of their children. Is there a parallel to a new bridge in Salem? Yes. We're contemplating the same destructive forces the people in Los Angeles faced...surrender of our heritage and our city to automobiles. A bundle consisting of the TSM/TDM concepts, Salem's Vision2020 and less radical improvements, including Marine Drive, widening the Marion Street Bridge, and improving access to the existing bridges is a perfectly acceptable recommendation by the Salem River Crossing Task Force. In other words, a recommendation that includes everything short of actually building a bridge. That's a recommendation all of Salem can support.

Response – Not Requested

57. Comment – 10/10/2007 4:58 PM

I would like the following to become part of the public record for the Salem River Crossing Task Force:

We are a country in decline. We are conducting an expensive, internationally unpopular war in Iraq. The dollar has recently reached a record low relative to the Euro. We have record national debt that's growing. America's economy is not as globally dominant as it once was. At the same time, the economies of China and India are rapidly expanding.

Peak oil is imminent. Consensus among experts worldwide is that we have already reached or are about to reach peak oil in the world. That means the amount of oil readily available for use is beginning to decline. The rapid build-up of interest in ethanol is a clear indicator that we face a future with less readily available energy.

In a capitalist economy, supply is balanced by demand through price. The price of oil is rising rapidly at the same time our buying power is sinking.

The climate is in crisis. Argument over the reality of global warming has receded to disputing individual facts, not the reality itself. The cost of polluting fossil fuels is increasing the threats to our forests and watersheds, our cropland and our very existence.

In the recent showing of "The End of Suburbia" at the Salem Progressive Film Series, we were offered a harsh look at a reality we are increasingly likely to face in our cities and neighborhoods. Our traditional American way of life is heavily dependent on inexpensive energy in limitless abundance.

How do all of these things relate to the task at hand? A new bridge over the Willamette River in the Salem area represents a nexus of these forces and our inability to comprehend what they mean to each of us as citizens. Our way of life is being transformed. The way we have lived will not continue unchanged.

The studies upon which your bridge recommendation will be based predict that the population of West Salem will nearly double between 2005 and 2030, with smaller but

significant population increases in Dallas and Monmouth-Independence. The implication is that large new volumes of cars, each containing the national average of slightly more than one occupant, will need to cross the Willamette River on the Center and Marion Street bridges.

It's assumed in this study, without formal acknowledgement, that growth of that kind is both desirable and inevitable. It further assumes that our accustomed way of life will continue unchanged for at least 23 years and probably well beyond.

It's best to let our West Salem neighbors answer whether or not a near doubling of population there is desirable. They will live at the center of that growth.

The inevitability of rapid growth in West Salem is a different matter. Even if our leaders are unwilling or unable to choose livability over growth, simple economic forces are highly likely to limit growth. As the facts stated above suggest, it's hard to imagine our historical way of life continuing indefinitely. It's much more likely that through a gradual transition, our individual trips in one-occupant vehicles will decline significantly, perhaps even dramatically, as the costs of heating our homes and feeding our families demands more and more of our shrinking purchasing power.

Imagine what it might be like when driving to work consumes a major portion of your daily wages. You may already face that reality. Will you be dreaming of a wonderful life in the country when it means a longer commute to work and a significant reduction in your buying power?

You're more likely to think about carpooling or mass transit as alternatives to driving alone. Better yet, you might begin to see the exceptional value of living in close proximity to your workplace.

The City of Salem's Vision2020 is a view to a very realistic and sustainable alternative. It's a very good start. The area north of the downtown core being considered for bridge abutments, high-volume traffic corridors and the resulting concrete ghetto could be turned into a high-quality, high-density housing and business mix. In fact, that's already happening with the development of the YWCA's facility.

The downtown core is easily accessible from that area, without a need for automobile trips. Vibrant businesses in the downtown core are dependent on large volumes of people within easy traveling distance. The Grant and Highland neighborhood districts are the key. They also boast a highly desirable riverfront well out of the floodplain. There are currently half-million dollar houses at the terminus of some of the proposed bridge alternatives. These houses have backyards opening onto the Willamette Greenway. Wild geese arrive, uninvited, in park-like backyards at these homes. The riverfront between Keizer and the abandoned railroad bridge has the potential to be the most desirable area in all of Salem.

Many cities in America have realized the overriding value of their downtown riverfronts and developed them in ways that vault them to the top of the chart. Boise and San Antonio are among the finest examples.

The Grant and Highland districts have the potential to turn Salem into a jewel of a city. That's a vision worth pursuing.

A new bridge is a means of moving people out of the downtown area, away from the business core, away from any sense of community. It's a questionable attempt to continue a lifestyle that can no longer be considered sustainable. It's a bridge to the past, a bridge for a lifestyle that's fading away, not a bridge to the future.

Response – 10/17/07 1:11 PM

Thank you for your input. I will distribute your email to our community Task Force and to our Oversight Team at their meetings this week. Your comment will also be included in our on-going documentation of input received on the project. For your information, we have a web site (www.salemrivercrossing.org) where project updates are posted and where you can submit comments to the project team.

56. Comment – 10/10/2007 4:58 PM

Hello- I am interested in this project and would like to be put on the mailing list. I grew up in the Wheatland area near Maud Williamson Park but have spent my entire "adult life" working and living in the Portland area. I just recently moved back to the area. While the Wallace Road traffic pales in comparison to Portland's I still think something needs to be done about it. My main concern is the huge inconsistency. Sometimes I can leave for work and it only takes 15 minutes. Some days it takes 45. I don't know how to plan for this! I would like to offer some suggestions to allow the area to continue to grow: A. Widen Wallace Road to an additional lane in each direction to Brush College B. Build a bridge connecting Chemawa Road to Wallace Road and widen Wallace Road to 2 lanes in each direction up to this point. This gives West Salem an easy route to I-5 C. Connect Kuebler to highway 22 This gives West Salem direct I-5 access and also Dallas and Rickreall direct I-5 access. Beyond that I would also like to laud the effort to extend the commuter rail into downtown Salem. I think this should be given a lot of attention. I can envision more people living in the Salem area and commuting North to Wilsonville and maybe even Portland if a better rail option were available.

Response – 11/2/2007 12:30 PM

Thank you for your comment on the Salem River Crossing project. Our preliminary traffic analysis validated the results of the work completed by the Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments (MWVCOG) in 2002.

That study resulted in the selection of the Tryon/Pine corridor as a locally preferred alternative for a future river crossing. Our current analysis indicates that a new crossing somewhere between the existing bridges north to Tryon Avenue will result in the largest reduction in traffic on the existing bridges. Significantly more traffic will be removed from the existing bridges when a direct connection to OR 22 is included. This is consistent with the Purpose and Need statement that was prepared to guide the development of project alternatives - the basic elements of that statement are to improve mobility on the existing bridges while alleviating congestion on the surrounding local streets.

The data supporting these conclusions is contained in the Study Area Refinement memo, which is available on the project website (www.salemrivercrossing.org, Materials, Project Library).

Several of the alternatives also identify the need to widen portions of Wallace Road - this may end up as a separate project in the region's transportation systems plan. To view the associated system improvements for each alternative, go to the alternatives page of the web site at:

<http://www.salemrivercrossing.org/Alternatives.aspx>

Then click on the name of an alternative (such as Purple). This will show you the crossing location. To see more detail, click on the map and you will get a more detailed map showing related system improvements, including widening of Wallace Road.

The 2002 study by the MWVCOG also identified a future need to study an additional crossing to the south of the existing bridges with a connection to Kuebler Boulevard. This is still an outstanding issue in the Regional Transportation Systems Plan, but is not part of the current Salem River Crossing project.

I encourage you to attend one of the open houses, scheduled for Thursday November 8 (5-8 pm) at Highland Elementary School and Wednesday November 14 (5-8 pm) at Roth's West Salem to see the latest information on the project and provide comments. All public comments received, including your email, will be considered by the stakeholder Task Force and Oversight Team in forming their recommendations on the alternatives to be advanced into the environmental impact statement.

55. Mailed Comment – 09/15/2007

I understand that you provide some of the staff assistance to the Salem River Crossing Task Force. I write to make a suggestion on the location and form of a bridge and its access. Please read my proposal and consider passing it on to the task force. From the reports I've read, my input is not too late in that the bridge options under consideration do not eliminate this idea.

The reports suggest that if there is to be a bridge recommended, a bridge north of the existing bridges is the most likely recommendation. My proposal is in agreement with a location north of the existing bridges as a first step. I fear, however, that a single bridge is inadequate to resolve the situation on any long-term basis. I propose that a recommendation be made for a more comprehensive approach, similar to what the City of Eugene began with its northern Beltline.

I see the beginning of an approach like Eugene's in the Salem Parkway between Keizer and Salem. I propose that an extension to the Salem Parkway be recommended that will tie in with a northern bridge site. That bridge would not simply "dump" traffic onto Wallace Road. There would be access to and from Wallace Road, but the thoroughfare would continue on through the hills of West Salem and connect up with Highway 22 somewhere between College Drive and Doakes Ferry Road. There should also be access to other West Salem streets that intersect with the thoroughfare.

I suggest an approximate location of the connection to Highway 22 so that a future expansion of the thoroughfare would work to include southern Salem via another bridge.