

The following emails were submitted between August 8 and October 19, 2016, through the comment function on the [salemrivercrossing.org](http://www.salemrivercrossing.org) web page that is maintained by CH2M on behalf of the Oregon Department of Transportation. These comments were not submitted as directed for the land use process CA16-04, however by their content they may have been intended for the public hearing process. Although not required, they will be incorporated into the record for the land use proceeding.

**Comment from Olson to [www.salemrivercrossing.org](http://www.salemrivercrossing.org) 8/8/2016**

From: Kim Olson <[kim.giusti.olson@gmail.com](mailto:kim.giusti.olson@gmail.com)>  
Subject: [your-subject]  
Date: August 8, 2016

Message Body:

Dear Sir or Madam,

I'd like to inquire about the process for purchasing property if the bridge is built. My home appears to be directly adjacent to the preferred path for the bridge (as does a brand new set of apartments currently under construction) and I wonder how the city of Salem would compensate us for either the purchase and demolition of our houses or the corresponding decrease in our property values.

Thank you,  
Kim Olson

--

This e-mail was sent from a comment form on Salem River Crossing (<http://www.salemrivercrossing.org>)

**Comment from Johnson to [www.salemrivercrossing.org](http://www.salemrivercrossing.org) 8/10/2016**

From: Patrick Johnson <[patricktonkapup@aol.com](mailto:patricktonkapup@aol.com)>  
Subject: [your-subject]  
Date: August 10, 2016

Message Body:

Hi. I have a suggestion for another alternative crossing over the river. Well, It's not actually my suggestion, rather another reader who read and commented on today's statesman journal article, (08/09/16). I know you guys have already selected an alternative bridge crossing @ the end of Pine St. & Hickory St. But what about putting the new bridge at the west end of Chemawa Rd. in Keizer. That way there would be less work to do. Just take out some trees there, extend the road, connect it to a new bridge crossing the river, and build a new road on the other side and connect it to Wallace Rd. You wouldn't have to reroute any other roads, or take out any homes or any businesses. Wouldn't that work out better?

--

This e-mail was sent from a comment form on Salem River Crossing (<http://www.salemrivercrossing.org>)

**Comment from Staehlin to [www.salemrivercrossing.org](http://www.salemrivercrossing.org) 9/12/2016**

From: Sandra Staehlin <[mtnrose46@gmail.com](mailto:mtnrose46@gmail.com)>  
Subject: [your-subject]  
Date: September 12, 2016

Message Body:

Used to live in Salem, but I moved to Idaho so that I don't have to live in the megaquake zone anymore. Plus there is more sunshine, pretty mountains, etc.

That megaquake should be the number one priority for the city right now. Not a bridge.

Why spend any money, even \$1, on a new bridge when there is 1 in 3 chance of the megaquake in the next 50 years? I would not try to second-guess the damage the megaquake might do to a new bridge, even with some earthquake prevention built in.

Instead of a bridge, better to save lives. Propose a tax to fund Salem retrofitting schools and hospitals, and stocking up on water and dehydrated food and medical supplies, tents etc, so that the city can be more prepared for a megaquake.

And invest in some good boats to get across the river.

Or why not retrofit the two existing bridges to withstand a megaquake.

I like to see "bypass" roads and bridges that actually do bypass a city, when you are connecting one highway with another. Like that business highway that is near McMinnville, if I remember right.

Sincerely,  
Sandra Staehlin  
Idaho (formerly Salem, Oregon)

--

This e-mail was sent from a comment form on Salem River Crossing (<http://www.salemrivercrossing.org>)

**Comment from Gaynair to [www.salemrivercrossing.org](http://www.salemrivercrossing.org) 9/17/2016**

From: Leigh and Robert Gaynair <[leigaynair@gmail.com](mailto:leigaynair@gmail.com)>  
Subject: [your-subject]  
Date: September 17, 2016

Message Body:

Hello Julie- We live in NE below Highland and support this effort as necessary and a strong vitalization initiative for an area in need. In this weeks Salem Weekly there is an article stating there is a mtg. On Oct. 12 at the senior center, but in the guest opinion article by Tom Anderson it says the meeting is on the 10th. We would like to attend. Thank you.  
The Gaynairs on Maple Ave NE

--

This e-mail was sent from a comment form on Salem River Crossing (<http://www.salemrivercrossing.org>)

**Comment from Wigg to [www.salemrivercrossing.org](http://www.salemrivercrossing.org) 10/19/2016**

From: mark wigg <[mark\\_wigg@hotmail.com](mailto:mark_wigg@hotmail.com)>  
Subject: [your-subject]  
Date: October 19, 2016

Message Body:

It has been disappointing to see how a process that is supposed to be open and honest has become so distorted with misleading information. The project has money to fund a poll to determine what funding mechanism is viable. The last time citizens were asked how they wanted to pay for the project tolling and taxes were overwhelmingly rejected. This was not a scientific poll, but it gives a good idea of how the public would respond to being taxed or having tolls. Even though FHWA and ODOT said they would fund no more than 10% of the cost, the project team included

estimates of these agencies funding 40% of the cost. Most of the people think only the new bridge would be tolled because they have not been informed that all bridges in Salem would have tolls. The cost estimates for this project are also misleading. FHWA says cost estimates are supposed to be for the costs at the time of construction, they are not. The costs assume construction starts next year which is not possible. Please reject the expansion of the urban growth boundary for this bridge.

--

This e-mail was sent from a comment form on Salem River Crossing (<http://www.salemrivercrossing.org>)