



## Task Force Feedback on Alternatives

The Task Force (TF) is charged with providing a balanced representation of stakeholder interests, nearby communities, and geographic areas as well as serving as a communication link with those interests and communities. The TF is an advisory group tasked with developing a recommendation to forward to the local decision makers serving on the Oversight Team (OT). The OT will consider the TF feedback, together with the analysis contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and public comment, when making their final decision on the locally preferred alternative.

Based on the discussion during the July 1, July 24, and August 15 2012 meetings, the following alternatives were determined to be worthy of further consideration by the OT: Alternatives 1 (No Build), 2A, 4A, and 4D. **The tables below outline the opinions and reasons provided by TF members for including each alternative. The Draft EIS contains detailed results of impact analysis conducted for each alternative.** Individual TF meeting summaries provide greater detail on the reasoning for advancing these and eliminating Alternatives 2B, 3, 4B, 4C, and 4E.

During the August 15 meeting, the TF reviewed and updated the information below to ensure that all of the comments were collected and that nothing was misstated. The group was asked to vote for one alternative that they preferred. The results of that vote were:

- Alternative 1 (No Build)      7 TF Members
- Alternative 2A                      1 TF Member
- Alternative 4A                      2 TF Members
- Alternative 4D                      10 TF Members
  
- 20 TF Members voted, 2 TF Members abstained from voting

### Alternative 1 (No Build)

Task Force Comments in Favor		Task Force Comments in Opposition	
1	Focus money and study toward alternative modes of travel, a new bridge or modifications are not needed now		No capacity to accommodate future traffic congestion, which is expected to double
2	None of the alternatives proposed solve the problem in a suitable way; minimal cost/benefit for the amount of time saved compared to the cost of the alternatives		The traffic bottlenecks in West Salem will get worse; having one bridge limits the urban form and growth of the city
3	Concern that the benefit of a new bridge may be overestimated because it is based on what may be inappropriately high traffic forecast model results		Does not provide a secondary bridge in case of emergencies should either the Marion or Center St. bridges be closed
4	Continuing concern about the ability to fund the alternatives, which was not addressed		Cost/benefit of a build alternative goes beyond time saving and direct construction cost; also includes money lost with businesses locating in other cities, pollution, etc.

### Alternative 2A

Task Force Comments in Favor		Task Force Comments in Opposition	
1	Low cost, while still being effective		Traffic stays where it is now, doesn't solve the problem of congestion in downtown or West Salem, including at the bridgeheads
2	Apart from the full alternative, there are elements of this alternative that reduce congestion on the current bridges and might be kept in mind for any Preferred Alternative		Does not provide a secondary bridge in case of emergencies should either the Marion or Center St. bridges be closed
3	Marion Bridge improvements by themselves (i.e. without Center Bridge improvements) or a subset of them may partially help relieve congestion		Getting to/from West Salem is the primary congestion issue, and this alternative doesn't adequately solve the problem
4	Meets many of the project goals (natural, cultural, neighborhood) better than other Build alternatives		Doesn't provide long-term mobility improvements; system Vehicle Hours of Delay is highest: 461 / 303 (am/pm)
5	Good for addressing local traffic needs		Least amount of VMT reduction (6.6%)
6	Concern that the benefit of a new bridge may be overestimated because it is based on what may be inappropriately high traffic forecast model results		Construction impacts to traffic would be greater than other alternatives
7	Lowest impact to the neighborhoods, parks, businesses, and residences		Noise and visual impacts to the West Salem Edgewater/2nd Street commercial district
8	Low impact on the environment (natural/cultural resources)		Substantial land use changes to south side of Edgewater district
9	Includes an overcrossing for bikes/peds over Wallace Road from the Union Street Bridge (to replace loss of bike path and sidewalks on current bridges)		
10	Does not need a State land use Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands) and Goal 14 (Urbanization) exception for going outside the Urban Growth Boundary; will likely need an exception to Goal 15 (Willamette Greenway)		

### Alternative 4A

Task Force Comments in Favor		Task Force Comments in Opposition
1	More bang for the buck	Concern that the benefit of a new bridge may be overestimated because it is based on what may be inappropriately high traffic forecast results
2	Possibility for phasing with other add-ons (4B and 4D)	Doesn't include connection to Salem Parkway or OR 22
3	About 30% of future bridge traffic is shifted to the new bridge; allows truck and through traffic to bypass downtown	Location of this bridge is not far enough north
4	Provides transportation system redundancy for emergency situations; provides another local bridge choice	Increased traffic on Pine and Hickory streets (minor arterial); fear of future widening of these streets
5	Moderate VMT reduction (14.1%)	Long-term impacts to Highland Neighborhood; barrier for children getting to schools in the neighborhoods
6	The traffic increases (on Pine/Hickory) to the neighborhood could potentially be mitigated by the City (traffic calming methods)	Socioeconomic impacts to neighborhoods on both sides of the river
7	Fewer residences displaced (30-40) than 4D	Noise increases to the neighborhood in North Salem
8	Visual quality rating is least negative of all the build alternatives (pg 3-343 of DEIS)	Potential difficulty meeting state land use regulatory requirements
9	Least amount of elevated structures	

#### Alternative 4B

This alternative was dropped from consideration by the TF on 8/15 (12 votes for dropping, 4 votes for keeping). A few members felt strongly that keeping 4B in consideration would allow for phasing, as needed in the future. The opinions of the group are listed below for the OT to consider.

Task Force Comments in Favor		Task Force Comments in Opposition
1	Possibility for phasing (2A, then 4A) or with other add-ons (connection to Highway 22) at some future date	Concern that the benefit of a new bridge is overestimated because it is based on inappropriately high traffic forecast model results
2	Meets many of the project goals (natural/cultural resource preservation; quality of life; cost effective)	Doesn't include connection to Salem Parkway or OR 22
3	Good for local, only fair for regional	Location of this bridge is not far enough north
4	Provides transportation system redundancy for emergency situations; provides another local bridge choice (4A)	Increased traffic on Pine and Hickory streets (minor arterial); fear of future further widening of these streets (4A)
5	Allows truck traffic a route that bypasses downtown.	Long-term impacts to Highland Neighborhood; barrier for children getting to schools in the neighborhoods (4A)
6	Moderate VMT reduction (18.9%) - highest of the remaining four build alternatives	Socioeconomic impacts to neighborhoods on both sides of the river (4A)
7	Traffic impacts (on Pine/Hickory) to the neighborhood could potentially be mitigated by the City (traffic calming methods)	Noise increases to the neighborhood North Salem (4A)

8	There are several other modifications that could be done in conjunction with this alternative to make it work effectively	Noise and visual impacts to the West Salem Edgewater/2nd Street commercial district
9		Substantial land use changes to south side of Edgewater district
10		Potential difficulty meeting state land use regulatory requirements

#### Alternative 4D

	Task Force Comments in Favor	Task Force Comments in Opposition
1	Opportunity to phase the project, building 4A first	Highest cost, of remaining alternatives
2	Good for local, good for regional	Concern that the benefit of a new bridge may be overestimated because it is based on what may be inappropriately high traffic forecast model results
3	Moderate VMT reduction (11.6%)	Higher negative impacts to the residential neighborhoods on both sides of the river; residences displaced (85-95) and businesses displaced (65-75)
4	Provides transportation system redundancy for emergency situations; provides another local bridge choice	Substantial land use changes to south side of Edgewater district
5	About 40-45% of future bridge traffic is shifted to the new bridge	Highest impact to environment/natural resources, of remaining alternatives
6	Allows truck and through traffic to bypass downtown	Noise and visual impacts to Wallace Marine Park and the West Salem Edgewater/2nd Street commercial district
7	Provides direct connection to OR 22 and the Salem Parkway	Potential difficulty meeting state land use regulatory requirements
8	10-20% less traffic on Pine/Hickory compared to 4A	
9	<b>Plans for and accommodates the future growth of the Salem-Keizer region and cities west of the Willamette River in Polk County</b>	
10	<b>Provides economic benefit to communities west of the Willamette River by providing direct and convenient access to the I-5 corridor</b>	