

Amy Johnson

From: Bob Coe <coe2bob@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 04, 2019 9:41 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Third Bridge

Mayor and Councilors:

As a 40-year resident of West Salem, I've followed the 3rd bridge deliberations for most of that period, right up to the January 30 work session.

It has become increasingly apparent that the 3rd bridge is not the promised panacea of traffic decongestion, as its proponents claim, as long as habits of personal mobility stay the same.

The studies and reports bear this out. Some intersections may improve for a time with a 3rd bridge, others will worsen. Clots of congestion will shift. Some streets will experience temporary relief, then soon fill up again. Complaints will percolate up from different quarters. Bridge advocates will soon agitate for a 4th bridge (and if you look closely, they already are).

These mixed and uncertain results illustrate a common phenomenon experienced in most cities, that traffic expands to fill the available space. Build more road space at enormous cost and traffic will increase to fill it, barring a change of behavior. Traffic jams are like an immune-resistant virus, often impervious to construction cures.

One small and controversial element in the voluminous reports on the 3rd bridge addresses behavior--and that is tolling.

The limited discussion on tolling generally acknowledges that if tolling becomes necessary (which is likely) as a component to fund Bridge 3, then tolling must also be implemented for Bridges 1 & 2, because otherwise drivers might under-utilize Bridge 3.

Which raises an interesting proposition: Would tolls on Bridges 1 and 2, by themselves, solve the "congestion question"?

Roads and bridges are not free, nor is their use. The word "freeway" is pure propaganda. The true cost of roads and bridges entails a lot more than the money to build them, and maybe people should be reminded of that on a daily basis.

You, the City Council, have been handed a tough decision to make, apparently with no room for compromise. However it comes out, thanks for your thoughtful deliberations.

Sincerely,

Bob Coe
1007 Parkway Drive NW
West Salem

Amy Johnson

From: Donna R <donna.m.robinson72@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 25, 2019 8:49 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Highway thru our neighborhood

Please do not construct a highway through pioneer village! I won't give details why. I don't want to be in the paper again. Thank you

Amy Johnson

From: E Easterly <emeasterly@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2019 11:08 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Bridge Crossing

February 11, 1019

Agenda item ____ Bridge Crossing

Salem City Council,

If you choose to positively respond at your February 11th meeting to the EIS environmental and LUBA remand issues requested by Councilor Lewis, please consider the time and expense that your decision will engender. For example, the NEPA issues have not been adequately addressed. I offer several examples below.

I. Environmental Impact Study

Page **xviii** of the Q & A staff report identifies the sequence of EIS events. Among those events is:

“Public review and comment, and response to comments on the DEIS;”

That process was suspended in 2017. Will the parties be able to provide the necessary responses to the draft FHWA EIS recommended findings before Council actually endorses the Final EIS prior to September 2019 Record of Decision deadline?

Page **xvii** of the Q & A staff report states:

“... the Federal Highway Administration has made a preliminary determination that the impacts of the project to Wallace Marine Park are de minimis under Section 4(f)...”

That finding was challenged during the 2017 public comment period. Among the multiple 4(f) challenges was (a) the limiting of the project findings to recreational impacts on Wallace Marine Park, (b) the absence of historical building impact findings, (c) the absence of a social equity finding, and (d) an unsupported noise impact analysis conclusion. No response to these challenges has been issued by FHWA.

For example, the de minimis noise conclusion, which was not even discussed during the January 30th work session, raised many questions:

(1) http://www.salemrivercrossing.org/wpcontent/uploads/2014/02/Salem_DEIS_Executive_Summary.pdf states the original Alternative 4D crossing proposal at page ES-32 will generate “54” noise impacts. The 2016 noise report reduces that number to “25” noise impacts. Why?

2) A review of Appendix F of that document lists the same 2008 noise model receptors sites listed in the October 11, 2016 “Summary of Preliminary Noise findings”. The Existing 2016 noise model report appears to contradict the existing 2008 model findings. How do the consultants explain these modeling variances?

3) Why would 2016 modeled ambient noise levels be less than 2008 ambient noise levels?

4) The modeling differences are further modified by the “input” corrections to WR113 and WR118 cited below. What were the technical “inputs” to the model that needed revision? Are there other receptor sites in need of revision? Why or why not?

5) Were the technical modeling inputs used in the preliminary 2016 report on-the-ground verified with actual auditory samplings as was reported in the 2012 document detailing the 2008 noise assessment parameters?

6) How and why do the 2016 noise impact site inputs result in greatly reduced noise impacts in 2040 for the Salem Preferred Alternative when compared to the 2035 Alternative 4D bridge proposal? Will the future stop light intersection at Glenn Creek and Marine Drive result in increased ground level stop-start noise levels for WR118 then the continuous elevated traffic flow along the viaduct crossing of Marine Drive with the Alternative 4-D proposal?

7) Why do neither the 2008 nor the 2016 noise assessments contain a receptor site in the Wallace Marine Natural Area that will be impacted by the bridge crossing from Pine Street to this Activity Category “A” Willamette Greenway portion of the Wallace Marine Natural Area?

Can these apparent factual noise contradictions, the historical building questions raised by Councilor Kaser, and the social justice issues, etc. 4(f) questions be resolved between now and September 30th?

II. Remand to LUBA

There are land use issues that Council must address which the City Attorney's November memo projected to need six to nine months to complete. Based on the examples offered below I see the process potentially taking more than a year.

1. Population projection.

This is a straight forward action. Staff can secure the appropriate population projections then adopt such findings in less than a month.

2. Zoning: “In regard to the Goal 15 exception, LUBA stated that the City, on remand, must more clearly explain how the zoning for the property limits the uses . . . to those justified in the exception (urban transportation uses).”

Responding to this remand will take several steps. (a) the annexation will need to include a parallel zone change which will potentially require the City to develop a new zone which is limited to transportation facility use or ask Polk County to perform a similar move before the City annexes the land. (b) The City annexes the property, rezones the property upon annexation and stipulates the property identified in the comprehensive plan for transportation uses only. This latter process could well, with public challenges, take over a year.

3. Willamette Greenway Goal Policies: “Review the record to verify there is substantial evidence to show the proposal complies with the Willamette Greenway policies¹ contained in the comp. plan.”

This will be a complex effort. First, the city has conflicting definitions as to what land is within in the Salem Willamette Greenway boundary. Second, preservation of park land, natural and significant ecological areas are

specific Willamette Greenway policy obligations included in the Salem Area Comprehensive Plan. The requirement to confirm the project complies with the comprehensive plan policy to preserve park land within the Willamette Greenway is a major multiple month undertaking.

If the Council chooses to tackle these remand issues, the process is fraught with time consuming procedural obstacles – public hearings, whether LUBA accepts the remand findings adopted by City Council and another LUBA remand. There also remains the multitude of Final EIS questions previously summarized. Whether all these steps can be complied by the end of September remains an open question.

Finally, is this council prepared to fund from the City's limited budget the resources the expense of responding to the LUBA remand and completing the studies and documentation required to affirm the de minimis assumptions contained in the Draft EIS?

Sincerely,

E.M. Easterly

Ward 8

1 Vegetation and Wildlife 2. Riparian vegetation and wildlife within the Greenway Boundary shall be conserved. Conservation shall include protecting and managing riverbanks, sloughs, wildlife, and vegetation.

Public Access 5. Development and redevelopment within the Greenway Boundary should include provisions for public access to and along the river.

Park & Recreation Sites 6. Existing parks within the Greenway Boundary shall be preserved and maintained. Additional sites for recreation and scenic views and access to the Willamette River should be acquired.

Changes of Land Uses 7. New development and changes of land uses which are compatible with the Greenway concept as defined in the State Land Use Goal may be permitted along the Willamette River.

Amy Johnson

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of Justinmcdonald1114@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, February 05, 2019 10:34 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Contact City Council
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Your Name	Justin Mcdonald
Your Email	Justinmcdonald1114@gmail.com
Your Phone	9719837720
Street	2482 Wembley Ct Nw
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97304
Message	I am writing you today to say we need another bridge to connect west salem. Traffic is outrageous. If the bridge connected kiezer and hwy 221 in west salem would make traffic flow much better. This needs to be done now before salem grows bigger and we have a major grid lock.

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 2/5/2019.

Amy Johnson

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of black47@q.com
Sent: Monday, February 04, 2019 10:44 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Contact City Council
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Your Name	Ken Adams
Your Email	black47@q.com
Your Phone	5038512108
Street	1695 Chemeketa St. NE
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97301
Message	During the Work Session I didn't hear anything about what entity would be responsible for maintenance of the Salem River Crossing. How would that be handled if we move forward?

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 2/4/2019.

Amy Johnson

From: Julie Warncke
Sent: Friday, February 01, 2019 8:37 AM
To: Jim Lewis
Cc: CityRecorder
Subject: FW: Contact Julie Warncke
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Councilor Lewis,
See two emails below.

Amy, Can these be attached to the February 11 agenda item?

Your Name	Kay E Kinsley
Your Email	kekinsley@comcast.net
Your Phone	5035851870
Street	1657 Goldcrest Ave. N.W.
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97304
Message	<p>Hi, I see that the Third Bridge discussion is continuing on. I sent a comment and suggestion to route the traffic off of Wallace Road to the north and south of the city in a circle configuration, as other large cities do. Did that suggestion go to my City Counselor, Jim Lewis? This would get the traffic to their I-5 Freeway destinations, and it would save our West Salem community from the Wallace Road "freeway traffic." As a 30-year resident of West Salem, it would be great to be able to once again drive to the gas station or grocery store without having to dodge the commuter traffic racing up and down Wallace Road, or without running into a "parking lot" at the corner of Orchard Heights Road and two or three traffic light cycles before we can move. Let's also save and enjoy our Wallace Riverfront Park, instead of turning it into a highway. Thanks for your service on this important problem. Very truly yours, Kay Kinsley</p>

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 2/1/2019.

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net [mailto:noreply@cityofsalem.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 24, 2019 7:41 AM
To: Julie Warncke <JWarncke@cityofsalem.net>
Subject: Contact Julie Warncke

Your Name	Kay E Kinsley
-----------	---------------

Your Phone	503-585-1870
Street	1657 Goldcrest Ave. N.W.
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97304
Message	<p>Hello, Ms. Warncke, I've either visited family or lived in west Salem for 50 years. I've watched what has happened to this community over that time, including Wallace Road -- once a quiet country road to farmland -- turn into a traffic- jammed, noisy, and air polluting highway. It appears that Wallace Road is becoming a route for commuters to get to the I-5 Freeway. Can we direct this traffic around west Salem? In Washington, D.C., and many other large cities, they have planned a circle highway AROUND the city core with appropriate exits into the city center. Let's find a route that directs the vehicle traffic to the north and south of Wallace Road to the I-5 Freeway. Please don't put a highway through Wallace Marine Park on the Willamette River. Our family bicycles through that park and enjoys the Courthouse Gym next to it. You can't make more riverfront parks once they are gone, but we can plan our roads around them. Thanks for your work on this project. Please let me know how the plans proceed. Very truly yours, Kay Kinsley</p>

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 1/24/2019.

Amy Johnson

From: Linda Bierly <bierlyskl@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 03, 2019 7:21 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: No Build option is the best choice for Salem

Mayor Bennett and Councilors,

I attended the January 30, 2019 work session about the choices available to you regarding the 3rd bridge in Salem. I came away convinced even more than I had been previously that the best choice for Salem is the **No Build** option.

Proponents of this iteration of the preferred alternative claim it as a reduction of congestion yet projections do not verify this claim. ODOT representatives agree that it will not result in decreased congestion.

Proponents also cite redundancy as a reason to proceed yet we have existing redundancy. We already have two bridges, one of which is scheduled to be reinforced to current seismic standards.

Choosing the **No Build** option will mean the opportunity for meaningful work toward:

- Preservation of the very important natural resources of the remaining channel complexity of the Willamette River
- Protection of the Edgewater and Highland neighborhoods and the community of Pioneer Village
- Protection of Wallace Marine Park including the historic landmark of the Union Street Railroad Bridge
- Protection of the Willamette River Greenway

Choosing the **No Build** option will mean that we can put this ill-conceived project behind us and start to focus on

- addressing traffic congestion by the only means that has been shown to work - congestion pricing
- a plan for true regional connectivity - including better options for mass transit
- Salem's needs for pedestrian and bicycling safety, particularly focused on safe routes to schools. In West Salem, we are still lacking sidewalks and crossings for safe routes to schools. I am sure this is true for other parts of Salem.

I want to say how much I appreciate your hard work and due diligence on this very controversial but important issue. Your responsibility is great and I appreciate your thoughtful consideration on behalf of all the citizens of Salem, both now and into the future.

Sincerely,

Linda Bierly

2308 Ptarmigan St. NW

Salem, OR

Amy Johnson

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of mermcc@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 8:06 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Contact City Council
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Your Name	Merrily McCabe
Your Email	mermcc@yahoo.com
Your Phone	9715999724
Street	1007 Parkway Dr. NW
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97304
Message	<p>Thank you for your serious work last night on the question of whether to move forward on the 3rd bridge. I appreciate all the time you devote to doing the work of our city council, with many big issues to deal with. What struck me the strongest from the whole conversation last night is the obvious fix for traffic congestion on our two present bridges: put tolls in place now, and we will have an immediate improvement in the situation. If we don't reduce congestion enough with the first amount of toll, then raise the toll amount until we hit a target goal for congestion. The truth of the matter is, if we want to be responsible about climate change, we have to change our car culture in this city, and tolling would be a very good way to start that change. Use the money to fund alternative transportation.</p>

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 1/31/2019.

Amy Johnson

From: Obery Family <oberyfamily@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, February 02, 2019 2:35 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: No Third Bridge

As a family who lives, works, goes to school, and plays in Salem, we just wanted to let you know that we oppose the building of a third bridge in Salem.

Thank you for your work related to, and in consideration, of this issue.

Respectfully,
Angela & Gary Obery

Amy Johnson

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of rose.treasure@outlook.com
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 4:09 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Contact City Council
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Your Name	Sondra Treasure
Your Email	rose.treasure@outlook.com
Your Phone	9717017926
Street	1131 7th St. NW
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97304
Message	<p>I am very frustrated to hear that you intend to vote down the bridge yet again. It is before you yet again because the people who live on this side of the bridge are sick and tired of this impact on lives, and the ivory towers that all of you live in who will decide the quality of life for all of us doesn't begin to compare. I own my home in West Salem outright, and I refuse to spend the rest of my life scheduling my life around that mess of a bridge because of your personal stubborn refusal to see what is best and to listen to your constituents. I've been an Oregon resident for 40 years and a Salem resident for most of that, and this moronacy has been going on ever since. I personally will see to it that all of you are removed from office on your next election bid if you fail to pass this bridge. I will actively join the campaigns as a volunteer of those who are running against you. I don't care about parties. I don't care about anything else that a person may be running for. If they want the bridge, they get my vote and they get my support to get you out of office. Count on it.</p>

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 1/31/2019.

President
Erik Andersson

2018-2019
Executive Council

Chair
Mark Hoyt
Sherman Sherman
Johnnie & Hoyt, LLP

Secretary/Treasurer
Chair Elect
Daryl Knox
The Aldrich Group

Past Chair
Rich Duncan
Rich Duncan Construction

Members at Large

Kevin Cameron
Marion County
Commissioner

Michael Fowler
Cabinet Door Service

Lesa Goff
Wells Fargo Bank

Nathan Levin
N. Levin Industrial Real
Estate

Steve Powers
City of Salem

Steve VanArsdale
Garmin AT, Inc.

January 31, 2019

Mayor Chuck Bennett
Salem City Council
555 Liberty Street SE, Room 220
Salem, OR 97301

RE: Support for Salem River Crossing

Dear Mayor Bennett and City Council Members:

On behalf of the Strategic Economic Development Corporation (SEDCOR), I am writing to strongly urge the Salem City Council to proceed with the Salem River Crossing and conclude this phase of the project by completing the actions set out in the most recent Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) decision and obtaining a final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). A "No Build" determination will negatively impact our regional competitiveness now and in the future.

SEDCOR focuses on supporting and growing traded sector businesses in the Mid-Willamette Valley Region of Marion, Polk and Yamhill counties. Traded sector industries send product out of the region and bring capital in, providing significant economic impact. The key industries on which we focus, which include advanced manufacturing, agriculture/food processing, wood products, logistics/distribution and aviation, depend on a robust transportation infrastructure to bring raw materials and workforce to their facilities and move production out to their markets.

The freight transportation system is a critical component of the regional economy, the Mid-Willamette Valley and beyond. Using food products as an example, Salem is the hub of an industry that not only grows and processes high value products, but also makes the manufacturing equipment used to process them and provides the warehouse and logistics facilities to store and transport them to market. Traded-sector industries depend on a transportation infrastructure that provides efficient and safe freight mobility to create jobs and provide a high quality of life to their employees, our residents.

As traffic volumes increase and population in the region continues to grow, the demand on the Salem bridges will increasingly impact the ability for raw materials, finished goods and workforce to efficiently get to their intended destinations. We are competing on a global level, and our local industries need to compete with maximum efficiency and expeditiousness.

SEDCOR recognizes that the completion of the final EIS and Record of Decision is only the first step of many. However, it will allow us collectively to move forward with federal and state transportation agencies to take the next steps in a long process. Please consider the importance of the Salem River Crossing for regional freight mobility and competitiveness now and in the future, and support the completion of the final Environmental Impact Study.

Thank you for your careful review of the project and your consideration of SEDCOR's perspective.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Erik Andersson', with a stylized, flowing script.

Erik Andersson
President

Amy Johnson

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of irgemini531@gmail.com
Sent: Sunday, February 03, 2019 3:10 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Contact City Council
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Your Name	TONI R JONES
Your Email	irgemini531@gmail.com
Your Phone	5039107064
Street	1140 VIEW DR NW
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97304
Message	<p>It seems to be obvious that the current city council cares nothing about what the citizens of Salem not only want, but need. Salem is growing by leaps and bounds. The current infrastructure can not support this, let alone what we already have. A third bridge doesn't just benefit the residents of West Salem, but anyone who travels through the downtown core, including transport of goods via truck. Our weather does not agree with bike travel, and our city transit is a joke, so that is also not a viable option for the average citizen. I am lucky enough to be able to adjust my work hours to avoid some of the worst of the traffic, but that is not a guarantee. Most workers are not so fortunate. I still get stuck downtown at least once a week. A 10 minute trip from 25th Street across the bridge can take up to an hour sometimes. God forbid a medical emergency were to occur. When traffic is backed up, there is no place for cars to move over for an emergency vehicle. I challenge any one of you to traverse the bridge, in either direction, for two weeks strait during rush hour traffic. Leave work at 5pm. Imagine you need to pick up your child from daycare by 5:30, or that you or a loved family member has a doctor's appointment you or they can't miss. Or a job interview. Or anything important. Or try commuting through West Salem during the lunch hour. I guarantee you will not make it back to work on time. Any decision to not support a third bridge is selfish and short sighted. Approve the bridge!</p>

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 2/3/2019.