

Dear HB 2974 Committee Member Representatives and House Rules Exhibits,

I used to live on Wallace Rd NW and became very interested in, and very involved in the last several years of the 3rd bridge issue. I don't have much information on the newest 'plan', though I'd think much of the old information would apply in one way or another. Please consider:

A. Studies have shown the real problem with the Center and Marion St bridges is the exit/enter ramps. They need major fixing.

B. Meanwhile, there are at least temporary 'fixes' to downtown and West Salem traffic congestion which have not been tried. Why not?

1. Have a mandatory percentage of drivers who work in government offices stagger their hours - offer incentives;
2. Change a lane on both Center and Marion St bridges to go in the opposite direction in rush hour. It was done years ago one Friday night;
3. Create a usable Park n Ride and free transportation (Buses? Trolley/Rapid Transit?) into and from the city and the Park n Ride.

C. It will compromise farm land - something the original bridge tried to avoid. Why is it all right now?

D. Another bridge cannot be built fast enough to help for years. During that time, plans are to upgrade the Center St bridge, perhaps making it one lane wider and more earthquake viable (Being built in bedrock and not in an earthquake liquefaction zone makes it the most likely bridge to withstand the anticipated 9. Cascadia earthquake).

E. Planning a bridge now, even though two additional counties would help pay for it, will take much if not all of our transportation budget. ODOT spokesman, Sonny Chickering said that there would not be much money coming from state and federal coffers for the '3rd bridge'. Is there a different expectation? Will there be enough from federal and state coffers?

F. It is likely to require a more expensive bridge just because of the length needed to cross the flood plain on the west side, never mind more money needed to make it more earthquake proof. It concerns me to think we'd spend more than half a billion for a bridge if it's built to only the federal standard, knowing it will not stand in the anticipated 9. earthquake.

G. Indeed, I was told at the last stakeholders' meeting that any new bridge not built to withstand at least a 9. earthquake will fall. And the bridge in the last 'study' was not going to be built to a 9. because the cost of building a bridge to withstand at least a 9. earthquake would never justify it ever being built. The over \$400,000,000 needed to build a bridge to meet just the federal standard is much less than the amount that would be

needed to meet today's expectation of the 9. Cascadia earthquake. Is the land on the west side not in an earthquake liquefaction zone? That must be studied/known before anything else is done.

H. Other monies would be needed. Much of the funds would come from home owning drivers. No one at the stakeholders meeting during the last 'study' wanted to see vehicle registration, gasoline or house taxes increase, let alone pay a toll on the bridge(s). Residents were not polled during the last 'explorations/studies' to determine if they'd even vote for such increases. That needs to be done to obtain a realistic expectation of voting tax payers, before dollars are spent on a new plan.

I know your time is valuable; I appreciate your hard work. Please be judicious in doing your 'homework'. Thank you for listening.

Roberta Cade
1321 Chemeketa St NE
Salem OR 97301