

**SALEM RIVER CROSSING
CONCEPTS UNDER CONSIDERATION (8/10/07)**

| Name/Suggestion | Comments | Mobility Standard | PMT Recommendation | Suggested By |
|--|--|-------------------|--|------------------|
| Include in Range of Alternatives | | | | |
| Purple | | 1* | Include | 5/15/2007 PMT |
| Orange + Red | | 1* | Include | 5/15/2007 PMT |
| White + Red | This is an Orange-Pink hybrid with an interchange on the east end. | 1* | Include | 6/26/2007 OT |
| Pink + Red | | 1* | Include | 5/15/2007 PMT |
| Blue + Red | | 1* | Include | 5/15/2007 PMT |
| Yellow + Red | | 1* | Include | 5/15/2007 PMT |
| Forest | Two arterial bridges (no direct connection to Hwy 22) in the locations of Pink and Green. | 1* | Include | 5/15/2007 PMT |
| Orange | | 2* | Include | 6/20/2007 TF |
| Pink | | 2* | Include | 6/20/2007 TF |
| Yellow | | 2* | Include | 6/20/2007 TF |
| Green + Red | | 2* | Include | 5/16/2007 TF |
| TSM/TDM (Transit and Roadway Efficiency) in combination with concepts above | The TSM/TDM (Transit and Roadway Efficiency) concept will be combined with any/all of the concepts above following the evaluation process. | 2* | Include | 7/18/2007 TF |
| 1* : Both ODOT and the City of Salem have adopted mobility standards that apply to roadways in the project area. These standards vary from 0.80 to 1.0, depending on the type of facility. | | | | |
| 2* : These concepts have been developed to meet a lesser mobility standard (that is, allowing for more congestion), typically around 1.0. For these concepts to be constructed, the agencies with jurisdictions over the affected roadways would have to adopt alternate standards or expectations to current standards. | | | | |
| Do Not Include for Further Study or Already Incorporated | | | | |
| Doaks Ferry Road (direct connection) | The Purple concept (Wallace Road to Tryon/Brush College) connects to Doaks Ferry via Brush College - this function is already represented in the range of alternatives. | | Do not include (function already included) | 5/16/2007 TF |
| Marine Drive (connect to new bridge alignments and/or use as N-S arterial/reliever) | Marine Drive helps performance of other alternatives. | | This has been incorporated into new bridge concepts | 5/16/2007 TF |
| Pink (interchange on east side rather than couplet) | Footprint of an interchange would be significantly larger (similar to Yellow or Green) and White concept provides similar traffic function and performance. | | Do not include | 6/20/2007 TF |
| West Orange/East Blue hybrid (Academy/Broadway Streets to Wallace Road/Hope Avenue) | The function provided by this concept is already provided by Blue with Marine Drive connection, as proposed. | | Do not include (function already included) | 5/16/2007 TF |
| West Blue/East Orange hybrid | Traffic operational results would be similar to orange. Current concepts include these alignment components. This suggestion does not represent a unique alignment that requires evaluation. | | Do not include | 6/26/2007 Public |
| Further detail on new bridge concepts presented on 5/16/07 | Incorporated into above. | | Incorporated into new bridge concepts | 6/20/2007 PMT |
| Blue with directional "Y" interchange on east end | No. Providing east-west connectivity is important to reduce traffic on the existing bridges and meet the Purpose and Need. | | Do not include | 7/18/2007 TF |
| Transit and Roadway Efficiency - could you run a streetcar on the railroad bridge? | Included in the Transit and Roadway Management concept. | | Already included in Transit and Roadway Efficiency concept | 6/20/2007 TF |
| Yellow - On west side, could EB to SB ramps be added? | They could, but they are not warranted based on future traffic volumes. | | Do not include (no change) | 6/20/2007 TF |
| Yellow - On east side, could you remove connections to Shipping and Hood? | No. Providing east-west connectivity is important to reduce traffic on the existing bridges and meet the Purpose and Need. | | Do not include (no change) | 6/20/2007 TF |
| West Yellow/East Green hybrid (Orchard Heights/Wallace to Market Street) | Traffic operational results would be similar to Yellow. Current concepts include these alignment components. This suggestion does not represent a unique alignment that requires evaluation. | | Do not include | 5/16/2007 TF |
| Green - What about an interchange on west end instead of 11-lane intersection? | Included in refined Green concept. | | Incorporated into Green concept | 6/20/2007 TF |

| Name/Suggestion | | Comments | Mobility Standard | PMT Recommendation | Suggested By |
|--|---|-----------|--|--------------------|--------------|
| Red - Could you close Rosemont interchange and move it to Eola instead? | Might be possible but it is beyond current study. Red solution works as proposed. Future refinements may determine whether Eola is a better location. | | Do not include (no change) | 6/20/2007 TF | |
| Red - Could you exit directly to Edgewater rather than down long frontage road as a way to avoid impacts on open space and pedestrian-friendly historic business district? | No, it does not appear to be feasible. | | Do not include (no change) | 6/20/2007 TF | |
| Red - Should Hwy 22 be 6 lanes? | Four lanes are being proposed for the purposes of this project. Six lanes will likely be required at some point in the future but when has not yet been determined. | | No change | 6/20/2007 TF | |
| Why is a bridge closer to the existing bridge (between Green and Teal) not being considered? | Several reasons. On the east side, there is not a good east-west street connection point. Belmont, Union, and Division are all located where the Commercial/Liberty couplet or Front Street bypass are located. On the west, the connection point would either be Glen Creek or the old railroad right-of-way which is too close to the existing bridgeheads. | | No change | 6/20/2007 TF | |
| New Bridge Concepts - Make Salem Parkway to Hwy 22 the major movement and the connection to Wallace Road the minor movement. | Not being considered. Traffic modeling shows east-west traffic to be roughly 2/3 of the volume and north-south to be 1/3. | | Do not include (no change) | 6/26/2007 Public | |
| Connect Purple to River Bend instead of Brush College | Not being considered based on Purpose and Need. Connection at Brush College ties in to arterial network of West Salem (Doaks Ferry) whereas Riverbend connects to local/residential streets. | | Do not include (no change) | 6/26/2007 Public | |
| Further definition of TSM/TDM concepts | Currently under preparation by staff. | | Incorporated as warranted by performance | 7/18/2007 TF | |
| Tunnel (from Blue on west to Orange on east) | A tunnel under the river poses many engineering challenges including the additional space needed to descend under the river and climb back to the surface - this would result in tunnel entrances some distance from desirable locations. A tunnel does also not address bicycle and pedestrian access. Tunnel costs are orders of magnitude greater than other concepts. | | Do not include | 6/26/2007 Public | |
| Double-deck the existing bridge | No feasible improvements to the existing bridges as stand-alone concepts were identified in this process, in particular with respect to connecting the expanded bridges to the street systems at either end (see response to Teal and Teal Medium below). Similarly, double-decking the existing bridge would have the same issue. In addition, a double-decker bridge (e.g., Fremont Bridge in Portland) requires longer distance and more space to provide ramp connections which would make it difficult at best to tie in to the existing constrained areas in downtown or west Salem. | | Do not include | 6/26/2007 Public | |
| Existing bridge as a stand-alone concept (Teal and Teal Medium) | Traffic analysis has shown that 3-4 lanes would need to be added to the existing bridges to carry the anticipated future traffic. While this in itself is possibly feasible, the design team was not able to develop any concepts that would make all of the key connections to the bridges perform adequately, either under the Adopted or Alternate Mobility Standards. Therefore, this concept was removed from further consideration as a stand-alone concept. | 1* and 2* | Do not include | 6/20/2007 PMT | |
| Two 2-way bridges at the location of the existing bridges (Brown) | The intent of this concept was that by making both existing bridges two-way, one bridge could function for local traffic and the other for regional or through traffic, thus improving traffic flow by reducing the conflicts or merges between the two streams. While this principle is sound, the design team was not able to develop any concepts that would meet either Adopted or Alternate Mobility Standards. As with other existing bridge concepts, one of the key constraints is the physical space on either end of the bridge to include the required number of approach lanes. | 2* | Do not include | 6/20/2007 TF | |