

Summary of Project Task Force Alternatives Dismissal

This document is intended to summarize the manner and reasons for which Salem River Crossing DEIS alternatives were dismissed from further discussion by the project Task Force over the course of their three (3) meetings in summer 2012. Greater detail on the Task Force proceedings regarding a recommended preferred alternative can be found in the three (3) respective Task Force meeting summaries and the "Task Force Feedback on Alternatives" Memorandum (provided as a handout at the Oversight Meeting on August 23, 2012). The alternatives which were dismissed from further consideration by the Task Force are addressed below in the chronological order in which they were dropped.

- At the July 11 2012 Task Force meeting, Alternative 2B was dropped during a "pair-wise" comparison¹ with Alternative 2A – a comparison of alternatives that focused on the "existing bridges" crossing location. The reasons for Task Force dismissal of Alternative 2B included:
 - Alternative 2B was the only alternative which had impacts to a Section 4(f) resource (Wallace Marine Park) that would result in a "use" under the Section 4(f) law (all other potential Section 4(f) impacts could be mitigated to below "use" status).
 - Alternative 2B would have the most negative impacts to Salem Urban Renewal Areas plans and acquisitions.
 - The significantly higher cost of Alternative 2B compared to 2A.

There were no Task Force member objections to Alternative 2B being dropped.

- At the July 11 2012 Task Force meeting, Alternative 4E was dropped by the Task Force after it was reiterated by project staff that 4E was developed for consideration early in the conceptual design process to reduce potential impacts to Wallace Marine Park under Alternatives 4C and 4D, but that DEIS analysis revealed that park impacts under Alternatives 4C and 4D were minor. Project staff then recommended, and the Task Force voted in concurrence, to drop Alternative 4E since it would have a greater impact on residences and businesses than Alternative 4C or 4D. There were no Task Force member objections to Alternative 4E being dropped.
- At the July 11 2012 Task Force meeting, Alternative 4C was dropped during a comparison with Alternative 4D after a discussion of the benefits versus impacts of a longer couplet under Alternative 4C than under 4D (the couplet would extend to 5th Street under 4C; only to Liberty Street under 4D). It was reiterated that the extended couplet was the only difference between Alternatives 4C and 4D. Task Force members voted to drop 4C from further consideration due to perceived greater neighborhood

¹ The "pair-wise" comparison process is a method that was utilized with the Task Force to narrow down the alternatives by comparing two alternatives at a time against the criteria established in the Purpose & Need statements and Goals of the project (developed in October 2007 by the Task Force). Looking at two alternatives, the Task Force was asked to decide which alternative best met the Purpose & Need and decide if one alternative could be dropped from consideration.

impacts (from increased traffic) under Alternative 4C than under 4D. There were no Task Force member objections to Alternative 4C being dropped.

- At the July 24 2012 meeting, Alternative 3 was dropped during a “pair-wise” comparison with Alternative 4A – a comparison of alternatives that included a new northerly bridge crossing without any direct connections to either Salem Parkway or OR 22 (as with Alternatives 4C through 4E). The reasons for Task Force dismissal of Alternative 3 included:
 - Greater visual and noise impacts with Alternative 3 than 4A.
 - The higher cost of Alternative 3 compared to 4A.

There were no Task Force member objections to Alternative 3 being dropped.

- At the August 15 2012 Task Force meeting, Alternative 4B was dropped during a comparison with Alternative 4D. There was no distinct reason(s) for Task Force dismissal of Alternative 4B, but it was noted during a roundtable discussion that Alternatives 2A and 4A (the two components of Alternative 4B) would still be “on the table” with regard to the Task Force’s recommendation, so in dropping Alternative 4B, the Task Force would be recommending either building a new bridge or improving the existing bridge, but not doing both. Two Task Force members objected to Alternative 4B being dropped.

* * * * *

Based on the discussion during the July 1, July 24, and August 15 2012 Task Force meetings, the following alternatives were recommended for further consideration by the Salem River Crossing Oversight Team: Alternatives 1 (No Build), 2A, 4A, and 4D.