

DOCUMENT FILED

From: Julie Warncke
To: Kathy Hall; Kellie Whiting
Date: 6/13/2007 5:16:37 PM
Subject: Fwd: 23rd Street extension

JUN 14 2007
CITY OF SALEM
CITY RECORDER

Kathy and Kellie -
A communication for the continued public hearing. - Julie

>>> "ken karp" <k.karp@comcast.net> 6/13/2007 4:01 PM >>>
Julie,

I just wanted to say that the letter I sent which was included in last Monday's agenda is misleading. The purpose of this letter is not to correct this, but to offer the following information which might be useful.

Left turn in access to the new development can be withdrawn by ODOT at a future time - Rule 51 provides the authority to do so if it is determined that it is unsafe to continue to allow this movement. Tony Martin can verify that this is the case. I suspect that they would take this action only in response to legal actions by damaged parties - but I think that is a real possibility.

As it became clear that the VHPECU approach (at 21st and Mission Streets) was dangerous (and still is - there was an accident there last Friday), ODOT took incremental steps to gradually discourage left in movements. The 23rd Street situation is different because the VHPECU permit (I have been told) is for right in - right out movements only - but, as I said, ODOT can restrict access to the new development at a later time. I believe that accidents in the area of 23rd Street will be inevitable if left turn in movements are allowed to 23rd Street and/or a private approach to the development (ODOT forced us to restrict left in movements to the coffee shop because of safety concerns and it is clear that left turns to the coffee shop were much safer than left turns to the new development will be). Anyway, I think that the City should be aware that such a restriction is possible.

I believe that it is appropriate for the City to construct a road through the City Shops which would connect 22nd Street and the new development. This would be very useful as far as limiting the effects on the livability of the residential area.

I also hope that you consider the potential impact on pedestrians who may cross Mission Street in order to get to the new development. I realize that ODOT has the final say on Mission Street access, but I feel strongly that the City should join with ODOT in making decisions in this area. From previous experience, it is clear that your input would be carefully considered by ODOT. If for no other reason, expressions of concern by the City about dangerous situations which are about to be allowed might limit the City's liability when accidents occur.

I wish to make clear that I am not opposed to the new development - but I feel strongly that traffic controls, as currently planned, are inadequate. I support the developer's request for a traffic signal. I believe that this is the only good solution. I urge you to consider encouraging ODOT to allow this. I believe that Mr. Scheick's beliefs and the Expressway designation (which I am absolutely convinced is ill advised) are the reasons why a traffic signal is not being allowed.

Ken Karp
June 13, 2007

cc: Peter Fernandez

P.S. - please feel free to include these comments in next week's agenda - if possible.