

## Comments received by email and postal mail

DATE: May 5, 2008

### 2008

#### 133. Comment – 5/4/2008 7:13 PM

Thank you for providing this forum for input. My work schedule including commute prevents me from attending one of the locally organized "live" comment meetings. I have lived in Salem most of my life and the past 9 years or so have lived on Front Street NE near Pine Street. I have commuted for over 10 years now westbound each morning on the Marion Street bridge heading out toward both Grand Ronde and now to Corvallis. I appreciate the consideration being given to a variety of options for a second Willamette bridge crossing in the Salem area. Because of both my living and commute situations, I offer a different alternative for consideration. Adding another bridge crossing anywhere near the existing Marion Street bridge crossing will not, over time, present an ideal solution. Given that the majority of growth in the Salem area continues and can be forecasted to be in the West Salem, South Salem and Keizer areas and that many people have no need to commute through the downtown Salem core, I recommend a bridge at a more NW or South crossing location be investigated. Pushing and pulling more commuters through the downtown core when they could benefit more from a different bypass arrangement without clogging already busy arterials would seem like a more viable alternative. In particular, a crossing w/ fast byways serving north Keizer (& N. I-5 commuters) tied in with a NW (West Salem) crossing would provide a solution that 10 years from now when completed would have a more proactive and positive impact on traffic flow and congestion than the 3 current alternatives being investigated. Thank you for your efforts and for taking the time to accept and review input from the community.

#### Response – Not Requested

#### 132. Comment – 4/30/2008 3:44 PM

Thank you for soliciting public input on this important and expensive project. However, please be mindful of the needs of the entire community and taxpayers as this moves forward. A new bridge would disproportionately benefit one part of the city, so any increases in broad based taxes must take into account the transportation needs region-wide, and that includes the need for more street capacity and a more robust transit system. Tolls should pay for the lion's share of the cost. If drivers are unwilling to pay those tolls at those prices, then there is not a need for a new bridge and the existing ones will suffice. A better use of public funds would be improving the current bridges and the ramps to handle more traffic, ensuring the new footbridge can accommodate ambulances in the event the other





















