

## Bryan Colbourne - Fwd: Rebuttal response to third bridge testimony

---

**From:** Amber Mathiesen  
**To:** Bryan Colbourne  
**Date:** 10/26/2016 4:53 PM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Rebuttal response to third bridge testimony

---

Amber Mathiesen  
 City Recorder  
 City of Salem  
 503-588-6097

>>> GARY LINDA WALLMARK <gwallmark@msn.com> 10/26/2016 4:38 PM >>>

Linda (oral) and Gary (written) presented testimony on October 12 in opposition to the proposed Salem River Crossing. That testimony raised a concern, also noted by others, that the proposed third bridge would increase greenhouse gases as compared with the "no build" option since the third bridge would result in increased operational energy consumption. The following response was prepared by Michael Hoffman of CH2M was submitted into the record:

"Response:

As stated in Section 4.2.1 of the draft Energy Final Technical Report Addendum, the preferred alternative would result in a 16.1 percent increase in operational energy consumption in 2040 compared to the No Build Alternative (Section 4.2.3 of the draft report mistakenly noted a "3.9 percent increase..." -- that value should also be "16.1"; this has been corrected in the draft report). However, current and future improvements in non-fossil fuel vehicle technologies as well as coordinated land use and transportation planning efforts may substantially offset these energy usage impacts. Mitigation efforts to offset potential increased energy usage could include increasing non-single-occupancy vehicle mode share across the Willamette River, such as those outlined in the Salem Willamette River Crossing Alternate Modes Study (CH2M, 2010). Encouraging the use of alternatively-fueled vehicles and developing the needed associated infrastructure throughout the study area should also be supported.

Although it is forecasted that there would be more energy usage under the preferred alternative than under the No Build, the regional emissions analysis findings show that vehicle operations of the preferred alternative would contribute fewer overall emissions to the project area than they would under the No Build Alternative (see Table 4.2-1 of the draft Air Quality Final Technical Report Addendum). The reason the No Build Alternative would result in higher criteria pollutant emissions in 2040 than the preferred alternative is because under the No Build there would be a greater amount of delay and a lower average speed compared to the preferred alternative."

This response appears to be contradictory. Increased transportation energy consumption leads to increased greenhouse gases. (The alternative mitigation strategies, such as future technological improvements, will or can be implemented regardless of whether the third bridge is approved.) So how is there both increased energy consumption and decreased "criteria pollutant emissions" for the preferred alternative? Because the term "criteria pollutant emissions" reported in Table 4.2-1 does not include carbon dioxide, the classic greenhouse gas emission. The term of art "criteria air pollutants" comes from the federal Clean Air Act, according to the EPA website. The EPA list does not include greenhouse gases carbon dioxide, methane, and chlorofluorocarbons. Greenhouse gases are a significant environmental concern, and undoubtedly will be the subject of increasingly stringent regulation in the future, but are not "criteria air pollutants". The fact that other pollutants may be decreased under the preferred alternative does not address our concern — that the adoption of the preferred alternative would increase greenhouse gases from increased energy use. This must be avoided.

Linda and Gary Wallmark  
4734 Bradford Lp SE  
Salem, OR 97302  
503.364.7413