

Written Testimony

City Council

Monday, August 8, 2016

6:30 PM

Council Chambers

3.2a. [16-124](#)

Initiating major comprehensive plan amendments pertaining to the Salem River Crossing preferred alternative.

Ward(s): 1, 5, and 8

Councilor(s): Bennett, Dickey, Lewis

Neighborhood(s): Highland and West Salem

Recommendation: Adopt Resolution No. 2016-35 (Attachment 1), initiating major comprehensive plan amendments pertaining to the Salem River Crossing preferred alternative.

Attachments: [Resolution No. 2016-35](#)
[Salem River Crossing Preferred Alternative Description](#)
[Request for Salem River Crossing Regional Planning Action.pdf](#)
[8-1-16 Written Testimony 1.pdf](#)
[Request Letter to Polk County](#)
[Request Letter to Marion County](#)
[Written Testimony 2](#)
[Written Testimony 3](#)
[Written Testimony 4](#)
[Written Testimony 5](#)
[Written Testimony 6](#)
[Written Testimony 7](#)
[Written Testimony 8](#)

Add - Request letters to Polk and Marion Counties, and written testimony.

Amber Mathiesen - My Support of resolution 2016-35

From: "Todd Londin" <todd@abcwindowsor.com>
To: <citycouncil@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 8/8/2016 12:35 PM
Subject: My Support of resolution 2016-35
CC: "Nick Williams" <Nick@SalemChamber.org>
Attachments: image009.jpg; image002.jpg; image004.jpg; image006.jpg; image008.jpg; image011.png; image013.jpg; image015.jpg

To Salem Mayor, Anna Peterson and Salem City Council,

I want you to know that as a local business that makes many trips across the current 2 bridges, at all times of the day, **I strongly urge you to pass the resolution 2016-35.** Let's move the bridge project forward, I have heard enough about the pros and cons, the Pro's far outweighs the cons and as a community we must look at this as the future of Salem.

Sincerely

Todd S. Londin ~ President

ABC Windows and Building Maintenance LLC

[503-363-4457](tel:503-363-4457) Office

[503-991-7270](tel:503-991-7270) Cell

www.ABCWindowsOR.com

Use these links to find out more or leave a POSITIVE comment



From: <epwhitehouse@comcast.net>
To: <Citycouncil@cityofsalem.net>
CC: <manager@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 8/8/2016 1:46 PM
Subject: Comment, August 8, 2016 Council Meeting, Agenda #3.2a

Dear Mayor and Councilors:

Regrettably, I will not be able to attend tonight's meeting, and so I ask that these comments please be included in the public record:

My name is Evan White, and I live in Ward 7. Four years ago, when I ran for Salem City Council, I remember that my friend Jim Lewis and the Salem Association of Realtors asked for my thoughts about the third bridge. I suspected that the "right answer" was "great idea, let's do it as soon as possible, regardless of the costs and benefits." I replied by saying that I was aware that a draft EIS was being prepared, and that I could not answer the question until I reviewed the EIS.

I subsequently obtained a copy of the EIS. For a price of eight hundred million dollars, it would be possible to reduce travel times by an average of about four and a half minutes – twenty years from now.

A hearing was then held before City Council. There was a parade of witnesses from the Chamber of Commerce, the Homebuilders Association, and various realtors who thought that this plan to Los Angelize West Salem was a wonderful idea. Council subsequently adopted the "Preferred Alternative," which would cost only half as much and do less damage to the environment. However, I've seen no estimate of the benefits that might occur from spending more than four hundred million dollars.

One of the purposes of Oregon's land use planning laws is to protect forest and farm lands from unnecessary urban sprawl. I suspect that those who favor the third bridge are actually interested in more urban sprawl, and less interested in efficient urban transportation systems. Why did the Chamber of Commerce so vigorously oppose the payroll transit tax that would have been used to improve our crippled urban transit system? To me, the notion that Oregon's land use planning regulations should be used to encourage more urban sprawl is obscene. Thanks for listening.

Amber Mathiesen - No third Bridge meeting at city hall.

From: Dawn Watson <dw079302@gmail.com>
To: <citycouncil@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 8/8/2016 1:56 PM
Subject: No third Bridge meeting at city hall.

City Council of Salem Oregon:

August 8/ 8/ 2016

I am unable to be at the City Hall in Salem Oregon this evening in protest of the building of a third bridge here in Salem. I do not want to lose the home, we live in on Hope Ave. NW. I do not want the value of my property to decrease in value. Can't you keep an open mind about this, there are empty buildings all over Salem and it is a disgrace to see so many new buildings setting empty there are a growing number of homeless people all over the city, couldn't you put your ideas and money to better use then building a bridge that most of the people of this City don't want??? Have you forgotten that Salem is the Capitol of Oregon? What has happened to the pride why with so many homeless people would you not fix that situation first and foremost.

Who is going to pay for this bridge the good people of Salem?? What about our homes becoming eminent domain properties of the city so you can build this bridge? What about the 45 homes and 25 businesses, can Salem afford to do this stupid project, who decides you or the people?? I guess I know the answer to that but I probably won't hear back about this and I probably wouldn't like your answers anyways, but take the time to answer it would be good protocol, and would ease my mind. To your reply.

D. S. Watson, NW Salem Citizen

dw079302@gmail.com

Amber Mathiesen - New Bridge


From: <barb.hackeresch@summitwm.net>
To: <citycouncil@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 8/8/2016 3:36 PM
Subject: New Bridge

Councilors,

Please vote to continue bringing the third vehicular bridge to fruition. We need it desperately to keep Salem vibrant and attractive as the community continues to grow.

Thank you for your service, it is greatly appreciated.

Click on my business card and its tabs to learn more.

Are you on track?	Investment tools and insights	Make an introduction
		

 Save details to address book

Sincerely,

Barbara Hacke Resch
 Senior Financial Advisor
 PIM Portfolio Manager
 Summit Wealth Management

Wells Fargo Advisors Financial Network, LLC | 1500 Liberty St. SE Suite 250 | Salem, OR 97302
 Tel: [503-798-4340](tel:503-798-4340) | Toll-free: [855-707-4330](tel:855-707-4330) | Fax: [503-798-4333](tel:503-798-4333)

barb.hackeresch@summitwm.net | <http://www.summitwm.net>

To unsubscribe from marketing e-mails from:

- An individual at Wells Fargo Advisors Financial Network: Reply to one of his/her e-mails and type "Unsubscribe" in the subject line.
- Wells Fargo and its affiliates: Unsubscribe at <https://www.wellsfargoadvisors.com/wellsfargo-unsubscribe>

Neither of these actions will affect delivery of important service messages regarding your accounts that we may need to send you or preferences you may have previously set for other e-mail services.

For additional information regarding our electronic communication policies, visit <http://wellsfargoadvisors.com/disclosures/email-disclosure.html>

Investment products and services are offered through Wells Fargo Advisors Financial Network, LLC (WFAFN), member FINRA/SIPC, a registered broker dealer and nonbank affiliate of Wells Fargo & Company. 1 North Jefferson, St. Louis, MO 63103. *P*

This email may be an advertisement or solicitation for products and services.

Amber Mathiesen - Bridge - Resolution 2016-35

From: "Dirk Moeller" <dirk@bcanswer.com>
To: <citycouncil@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 8/8/2016 1:53 PM
Subject: Bridge - Resolution 2016-35

Salem City Council:

The time has arrived for the citizens of Marion and Polk Counties to get a regional push for additional vehicle capacity over the Willamette River. In 1996 I moved my family back to Salem and a city counselor said *"Even if we had all the money we needed for another bridge, it would be another ten years before the first bus, car, truck or bike will cross it"*...that was 20 years ago and progress has stalled.

ODOT's annual budget is over \$5 Billion. If the regions elected officials work together, the Salem region should be able to get a piece of the \$5 Billion budget so we can build a bridge that will be used by our children and our grandchildren. If the Salem region continues to be passive, Multnomah and Washington County will gladly continue to take the majority of ODOT funds.

Dirk Moeller

Business Connections - Never Underestimate the Power of the Personal Touch

International Award Winner for Outstanding Service 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015 & 2016

660 High Street N.E.

Salem, Oregon

[503-363-0056](tel:503-363-0056)

dirk@bcanswer.com

www.bcanswer.com

August 8, 2016

Salem City Council
555 Liberty Street SE
Salem OR 97301

RE: Agenda Item 3.2a: Resolution to initiate UGB amendment for the Salem River Crossing

Mayor and Councilors:

I have three comments for your consideration.

1. Make upgrading the existing bridges to survive a Cascadia Subduction Zone earthquake the city's top transportation priority.

While we've been studying how to better address future transportation needs, we've discovered that our transportation system faces a much bigger challenge, specifically a Cascadia Subduction zone earthquake. Experts now say that there is a 20% chance of a magnitude 8+ earthquake striking Western Oregon in the next 50 years. And, if that happens, ODOT says the Marion and Center Street bridges are likely to collapse. We need to get our priorities straight: fixing our existing bridges so that they survive an earthquake is simply much more important to keeping our community livable and prosperous than building a new bridge. We should put off planning for a new bridge until we have funding in place to make our existing bridges earthquake-safe.

2. The city can - and should - move forward with Marine Drive and the proposed bike path without a UGB amendment.

At last Monday's meeting (August 1), the council was advised by staff that a UGB amendment was needed to allow construction of Marine Drive and/or a bikepath on the Marine Drive alignment. That advice was incorrect. The Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) lists transportation facilities and improvements that may be allowed on rural lands (i.e. outside of a UGB) without a goal exception. The rules clearly allow for bikepaths and, in limited circumstances, new collector roads. Specifically, the TPR allows two-lane collector roads where the function of the road is to reduce local access on circulation on a state highway. It appears that Marine Drive, as currently called for in the city's transportation plan would meet this requirement: it is intended to reduce local traffic and provide for local circulation away from Wallace Road, which is a state highway.

Here are the relevant portions of the TPR (OAR 660-012-0065):

(3) The following transportation improvements are consistent with Goals 3, 4, 11, and 14 subject to the requirements of this rule:

- (a) Accessory transportation improvements for a use that is allowed or conditionally allowed by ORS 215.213, 215.283 or OAR chapter 660, division 6 (Forest Lands);
- (b) Transportation improvements that are allowed or conditionally allowed by ORS 215.213, 215.283 or OAR chapter 660, division 6 (Forest Lands);
- (c) Channelization not otherwise allowed under subsections (a) or (b) of this section;
- (d) Realignment of roads not otherwise allowed under subsection (a) or (b) of this section;
- (e) Replacement of an intersection with an interchange;

- (f) Continuous median turn lane;
- (g) New access roads and collectors within a built or committed exception area, or in other areas where the function of the road is to reduce local access to or local traffic on a state highway. These roads shall be limited to two travel lanes. Private access and intersections shall be limited to rural needs or to provide adequate emergency access.
- (h) Bikeways, footpaths and recreation trails not otherwise allowed as a modification or part of an existing road;

Marine Drive and the proposed bike path are both good projects that will help make West Salem more livable and ease traffic problems on Wallace Road.

3. If you do move forward, adopt a schedule that gives the public a meaningful opportunity to participate in this decision.

The essence of good land use planning is that the public be given a meaningful opportunity to participate, especially in major decisions.

An urban growth boundary (UGB) amendment and goal exception are big land use decisions. They need to be carefully considered and properly justified. Specifically, to meet state land use requirements for a UGB amendment for a new bridge the city must show that there are no reasonable options for meeting transportation needs within the UGB. However, the analysis to support this decision has yet to be done. Neither the Draft EIS prepared in 2012 nor the Land Use Technical Report prepared in 2013 provide necessary information to address land use requirements. Detailed technical reports that address land use requirements have yet to be completed. Until these reports are available, and the public and elected officials have had a meaningful opportunity to review, comment and discuss them, a decision is premature.

A two or three month process with one or two public hearings provides too little time and too little opportunity for meaningful public participation or a well-considered decision. If you do adopt this resolution, you should adopt a schedule that builds in sufficient time and additional public hearings so that you can carefully consider the information and make well thought out decision, and also give the public, including the city's neighborhoods, a chance to effectively participate in this decision.

Sincerely,

Robert Cortright

373 Suncrest Avenue NW
Salem, OR 97304