



# CITY OF SALEM

## Written Testimony

### City Council

555 Liberty St SE  
Salem, OR 97301

---

**Monday, July 16, 2018**

**6:00 PM**

**Council Chambers**

---

**Special Meeting**

**2.a.**    [18-317](#)            State Street Corridor Plan Project

Ward(s): 1 and 2  
Councilor(s): Kaser and Andersen  
Neighborhood(s): NEN and SESNA

**Recommendation:**    Advance Ordinance Bill No. 4-18 to second reading for enactment, amending the UDC, Comprehensive Plan, Comprehensive Plan Map, NEN-SESNA Neighborhood Plan Map, and zoning map to adopt new zoning and a new street design for the State Street corridor.

**Attachments:**    [Attachment 1 - Ordinance Bill 4-18](#)  
                              [Attachment 2 - Exhibits to Ordinance Bill 4-18](#)  
                              [Written Testimony Received to 5 p.m. on 7-11-18](#)  
                              [Written Testimony 1](#)  
                              [Written Testimony 2](#)

*Add- Written Testimony.*

Page  
Break

TO: Salem City Council  
FROM: Kirk Leonard  
RE: State Street Corridor Plan  
CASE FILE: CA 18-02

July 16, 2018

I am a SESNA resident living three blocks from 21<sup>st</sup> and State and a supporter of a road diet for the full corridor, as preferred by participants in public meetings on the project by large majorities – 60% to 80% depending on the specific question. My recollection of one of the electronic votes taken in the Nov 2016 meeting was 80% of residents attending supported a full corridor road diet.

Those votes presented a consensus of many predominantly local area residents, of course, not the larger population that wants to be able to speed through to destinations elsewhere. That's a critical choice point of the State Street Corridor Plan project – do we support largely single occupancy vehicles passing through or the people and businesses living here? I believe the full road diet option presents a much more sensible, economic and sustainable future for both the corridor and the city.

A road diet has been suggested in city and citizen considerations about the future of State Street in this section for over 25 years. It evolves from very basic logic and a realistic perspective on existing development, which is unlikely to change anytime soon. The physical characteristics, a small, 56' right-of-way with numerous properties abutting it and a 42' roadway are not suited for a fully functional 4-lane road and "a vibrant, walkable" corridor. You simply cannot have both.

The quest to maintain maximum vehicle volumes through the corridor flies in the face of future progress in bringing new development and addressing the city's impact on our air shed as we grow. We need to prepare for a different future – to enable people to safely use bikes and to increase transit use. More frequent transit and straight-through bike lanes could help realize these needs on State Street. Reduced vehicle use and increased transport by other modes are both essential to a sustainable future and a more welcoming environment for this part of the street and the city as a whole.

The Planning Commission recommendation perpetuates the auto dependent patterns of development that led to the decline of State Street, dwindling development and sprouting of surface parking lots simply but sadly demonstrate the consequences. That won't change unless we stop trying to use the corridor as a mini-freeway, a place to get through as speedily as possible, rarely stopping for more than red light or a bus that has to stop in a traffic lane or someone turning left onto side streets because there are no left turn lanes. It can also be very scary for pedestrians.

When I sense the vision of State Street as a pedestrian, bike and transit friendly corridor I see a lively community, one of the most dense and diverse in the city, supporting immediate needs for personal products and services, many old houses renovated and converted for a diversity of retail businesses, and new, complementary office and infill residential development, an attractive place where people can get via bike, bus, car and foot to take care of life's essentials, like ice cream, coffee and tea, sandwiches, books and computers, pet care, haircuts and yes, cannabis and tattoos. I see a thriving small business marketplace supporting jobs in the neighborhood and an enjoyable place to be for everyone who lives or visits here.

A full corridor road diet makes this possible. Neither the Commission nor Planning Division recommendations will.

## Amy Johnson

---

**From:** L Milan <milanlm@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 16, 2018 1:30 PM  
**To:** citycouncil  
**Subject:** State Street Corridor written testimony

David and I walked over to State Street and looked at the property behind Victoria Court. We both feel that the proposed ordinance changing the zoning to MU2 is much better than the zoning now in place which does not have the mandatory setbacks. We support MU2 zoning which requires parking at the side and back of buildings. Overall, we think that MU2 is much better to support and protect our well established neighborhood. I would add that we ask for the same limitation of height 45 ft buildings that the historic district is asking to minimize the impact on neighboring residences. Our neighborhood immediately to the east of the Court/Chemeketa Historic District is a stable community and another important anchor and support for the vibrant mixed use corridor proposed in the State Street Corridor Plan.

We oppose the Four Lane recommendation by the Planning Commission especially in view of the fact that traffic analysis found this option to have the worst performance of the three options. We support the Hybrid Alternative as the best alternative to support a pedestrian and business development friendly environment, have less impact on neighborhood traffic, and ability to phase in improvements. We understand that further traffic analysis will be done on neighborhood impact.

This plan or a parallel effort does need to address how development might impact flooding in neighborhoods near Mill Creek in the impacted area.

We support a this well thought out plan for the future of State Street.

Lorraine Milan and David Greysmith  
1998 Court St. NE  
Salem, Or, 97301

## Amy Johnson

---

**From:** Greg Warnock <greg@warnock4oregon.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 16, 2018 10:37 AM  
**To:** citycouncil  
**Subject:** Please note for the special, July 16 council meeting

I grew up in Salem, and I raised my family here. We are committed to investing all we have to make Salem the best city in the Oregon.

The historical, Collins-Downing Home is now my home in the historical district.

I'm very concerned about the recommendation to opt for the Diet plan, that formally routes pedestrian and bicycle traffic onto Chemeketa instead of planning for it on State street. If one intention is to make state street a destination, then routing bike traffic onto our quiet neighborhood street, with reduced parking here is counterproductive, and at the same time drastically changes the dynamic of a peaceful, historical downtown neighborhood.

I also think the state and city historical community stakeholders need to fully review these plans, and provide their own, separate review to the city council, so that tunnel vision for state street improvements don't have a permanent negative impact on our incredibly valuable historical district assets.

Please consider delaying the State Street Corridor Project for enough time to get all city and state stakeholders fully informed of the impact on the relevant historical district.

I will personally assist in anyway possible to expedite any last minute processes to see this project through in a way that we all benefit.

Greg Warnock  
1340 Chemeketa St NE  
Salem, OR 97301



Sent from my iPhone