

AGENDA ADDENDUM



INFRASTRUCTURE BOND ENGAGEMENT STEERING COMMITTEE

DATE: MONDAY MARCH 28, 2022
TIME: 12:00 PM
CHAIRPERSON: Mayor Bennett

PLACE: Virtual Online Meeting

STAFF LIASIONS:
Josh Eggleston, Chief Financial Officer
503-588-6130
jeggleston@cityofsalem.net
Courtney Knox Busch, Strategic Initiatives Mgr.
503-588-6255
cbusch@cityofsalem.net

AGENDA ADDENDUM

3. Public Comment

- a. Correspondence from Katherine Daniels (LAB) regarding branch libraries
- b. Correspondence from Osvaldo Avila regarding branch libraries
- c. Correspondence from Phil Carver (Salem 350) regarding projects
- d. Victor Dodier (SCAN) regarding transportation projects

Re: Testimony for March 28th meeting

March 25, 2022

Dear members of the Infrastructure Bond Steering Committee,

I am encouraged by the Committee's recent discussion of the possibility of securing land through the November bond that could be used to co-locate new branch libraries together with new low-income housing or new fire stations. This makes a lot of sense, considering both the many demands on the available bond monies and the value to communities in locating city services that are walkable from where people live. New branch libraries would surely have scored high support among city residents had they been included in the recent bond measure surveys. The prospect of new branches would surely help in the passage of the ballot come November.

Possible adjustments in funding for such branches could come from the very large proposed dollar allocations for parking improvements at city parks. While parking lots in the past have often been sized for high peak usage, that is no longer the case in many cities. Parking at city parks can in part be accommodated along neighborhood streets, while parking at regional parks can in part be accommodated in unpaved overflow areas. Too much paved parking in parks detracts from the outdoor quality of the park experience.

Some of the hesitancy in advancing the case for branch libraries has no doubt been the need for operating revenues that would accompany the capital outlay for land and buildings. Please know that the in-progress Library Strategic Plan will carefully examine a variety of potential long-term funding sources for the operation of such branches, ideas that have already been in discussion by the Library Advisory Board and library management. City staff estimates for operational funding are greatly inflated and the possible use of greater numbers of library volunteers (used by other libraries in greater numbers) are not considered. In addition, actual construction of new branch libraries could well be towards the end of the 10-year bond cycle, at which time a larger property tax base from a growing number of residents could allow for increased operational funding for branches from the City's general fund.

Sincerely yours,

Katherine Daniels

Vice-chair, Library Advisory Board

From: [Oswaldo Avila](#)
To: [Bond 2022](#)
Subject: Branch libraries
Date: Sunday, March 27, 2022 9:53:16 AM

Dear City Council bond measure subcommittee,

My name is Oswaldo F. Avila. I am writing to you as a father and as a Salem-Keizer School Board member, Zone 1, about including a branch public library in NE and SE/South Salem. An idea that might be catching on is to co-locate the branches with affordable housing. There is a model for that now in Cornelius, OR with 45 units of low income senior housing on top of their new library. Our communities need greater access to libraries. Our city is too large not to have other branch libraries where they are greatly needed to assist in literacy development among our most marginalized communities. We saw the reading challenges our school children, lacking reading ability and confidence. These local library branches can become great local resources for parents and their children in building literacy skills and much more for our communities. It's these types of investments that really bring transformational changes.

Please support branch libraries in NE and SE/South Salem. They need to be accessible to our families and not a privilege to use.

Sincerely,

Oswaldo F. Avila
Director, Salem-Keizer School Board
Zone 1

From: [Phil Carver](#)
To: [Bond 2022](#)
Subject: Comments by 350 Salem for Bond Committee March 28
Date: Sunday, March 27, 2022 8:55:28 PM

350 Salem Oregon Comments to Salem Bond Committee For the March 28 Meeting

Phil Carver, Co-coordinator
March 27, 2022

INTRODUCTION

Salem 350 appreciates the openness of the work of the Bond Committee and the opportunity to provide comments. We are still working to understand the proposals. We will refine our comments as the process proceeds and the proposal evolves. We understand that there is flexibility in design even after the bond passes.

CONTEXT

Overall, we are **very** concerned that the tentative Priority One proposals for the whole bond are inconsistent with the Council's adopted greenhouse gas (GHG) emission goal of a 50 percent reduction for 2035. This bond levy would take the City through at least 2033 perhaps to 2035 itself.

The bond measure is a key opportunity for the city to "walk its talk" by making investments that carry out the city's Climate Action Plan (CAP) and Our Salem. The existing Transportation System Plan is out of date, given the Council's acceptance of the CAP and the imminent acceptance of the Our Salem/comprehensive plan update.

The bond measure should prioritize transportation investments that make city streets safer for walking and cycling, especially along the core transit network, in disadvantaged neighborhoods and in areas planned for mixed use development.

The Community Improvement Bond provides Salem with an opportunity for taking substantial measures to address its two most urgent problems: housing and climate change. Projects must be evaluated using an equity lens and a climate lens, and must be aligned with Salem's greenhouse gas (GHG) emission goals as mandated by City Council and expressed in the CAP and draft Our Salem Plan.

As we have mentioned in previous comments, Salem is in dire need of more housing, particularly for low income people. New housing should be energy efficient, all electric, and primarily located in compact, mixed use neighborhoods near public transit. As well as reducing climate changing emissions, this can reduce household energy and transportation costs.

In order to reduce GHG emissions it is imperative to reduce emissions from transportation, Salem's major source of GHG emissions. In order to reduce vehicle emissions, people need safe and convenient alternatives. This means measures for traffic-calming and improved infrastructure for walking, biking, use of mobility aids, and access to public transit.

It is not sufficient to assign a climate score to individual projects. In reality projects do not stand alone. Urban form and transportation patterns connect and interact to structure the way we live. Can a child safely walk or bike to school or to a nearby park or playground? Can an elderly or disabled person get off a bus for an errand or appointment and cross a busy intersection safely in the time allotted by a traffic signal?

By applying a climate lens, not just a climate score, Salem has an opportunity to make transformative changes that will both benefit the climate and contribute to the overall health, resiliency, and livability of our city.

Our primary concerns are transportation, branch libraries, fire equipment and parks. Transportation accounted for more than half of Salem's GHG emissions in 2017. 350 Salem strongly supports the March 24 proposal for new branch libraries.

We are concerned about the ability of the City to fund necessary projects that are not yet Priority One as the March 24 spreadsheet is already overfilled. In our comments below we make some suggestions for how to rebalance the Priority One list.

TRANSPORTATION

While there may be small reductions in private vehicle GHG emission from more electric vehicles in the short term, it is **highly** unlikely that EVs will dominate the private vehicle fleet by 2035. The car and truck fleet turns over slowly. There are many 25 and even some 40 year old vehicles on Salem's streets today. That will be true in 2035 as well. As discussed in the CAP, Salem needs major reductions in vehicle miles traveled to reach the Council's adopted 50 percent GHG reduction goal by 2035.

Pavement R&R

We are concerned about the proposal for paving R&R without restriping for bike lanes. We are concerned about the label for the Pavement R&R projects as "Pavement Rehabilitation and ADA Improvements" as lacking reference to restriping. Many of these roads are wide enough for bike lanes.

We propose to Increase funding for street repaving (pavement R&R) projects by up to 20 percent (an addition of \$4.8 million) to add serious pedestrian crossings and restripe streets to add or widen bike lanes. The draft bond measure list includes \$24 million to resurface ten city streets, most of which are along the core transit network, near schools,

disadvantaged communities or in areas planned for mixed use development.

Resurfacing is a key opportunity to add pedestrian crossing improvements and, where there is adequate right of way, to restripe streets to add or widen bike lanes. Making such improvements now, as part of resurfacing projects, is a highly cost-effective way to make significant progress to make Salem's streets safer for walking, cycling and transit users because the cost of widening streets to add or widen bike lanes is typically at least 10 times the cost of restriping. And deferring these improvements means it will likely be a decade or more before any improvement is made to the streets in question.

Other Additions to Priority One

We are concerned about the limited funding for sidewalks, pedestrian improvements and bike paths in Priority One projects. The following Priority Two projects should be moved to Priority One:

- **Winter Maple Greenway \$7 m**

- **Cherry Avenue Multi Use Path \$4m**

- **Broadway bike lanes \$11 million**

The Priority One funding for sidewalks and pedestrian safety improvements seems inadequate for completing **ALL appropriate improvements by 2035**. These funds in the bond measure need to be compared to fully completing this work. Absent this comparison we suggest the committee double the funding for city-wide sidewalk infill and safer pedestrian crossing improvements from \$7.5 million each to \$15 million each. These improvements are key to increasing walking and safer access to transit. Such projects cannot be funded using system development charges (SDCs).

Design Issues

We are concerned about whether the road upgrade proposals will add traffic lanes. All road upgrade projects should be limited to two lanes plus turn lanes. Four lane roads with turn lanes are very dangerous for pedestrians to cross. Such a design is inherently inconsistent with the adopted GHG emission goals for 2035.

The McGilcrest urban upgrade might be moved below the line, except that adding sidewalks and bike paths to the Social Security Office should remain Priority One. All the improvements for McGilcrest should be limited to two lanes plus turn lanes. There should be a separated bike lane for the full distance from 12th to 25th.

We are concerned about the details of the so-called "Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements

State Street: 13th St NE to 17th St NE Bike Lanes and Pavement” project. We support this project if it is meant to implement the State St. Corridor Plan. The State St. Corridor Plan adopted by City Council in July 2018 calls for a road diet making this part of State St. one travel lane each way with center turn lane & buffered bike lane & sidewalk improvements (July 16, 2018 Council item

<https://saalem.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4206743&GUID=3C8FC6A8-99A6-4E61-9AD8-9D935EEC40DA&Options=&Search=>

and here p.33

<https://www.cityofsaalem.net/citydocuments/state-street-corridor-plan.pdf>

p 33)

Other Funding Sources for Road upgrades

We are concerned there is no discussion in the proposal for the use of system development charges for roadway improvements (see the March 18 comments by Bob Cortright, which 350 Salem endorses). Many of the street widening projects proposed for the bond measure - including Marine Drive and McGilchrist, and Fisher Road - are eligible for 80-100% funding using SDCs because they are needed to serve new development. It is our understanding that the City is proposing to seek federal funding for part of the McGilcrest project through SKATS.

Most notably Marine Drive is eligible for 100 percent SDC funding. This project allows the development of all the areas along it. These are the areas that should primarily pay for this project that serves **only** West Salem. All urban upgrades should be at least 50 percent funded by SDCs. Also we question whether this project needs to be completed in the next ten years or so.

The Pringle Creek bikeway from Civic Center is clearly desirable but seems very expensive (\$7.15 million) for such a short distance. Part of this project should be paid for with urban development funds for the downtown area.

PARKS

350 Salem is **very** concerned about the emphasis on paving parking lots in parks and regional sports facilities. Funding for Parks System-wide Park Paths and Trails in Priority One should be doubled from \$4 to \$8 million (moving the Priority Two element to Priority One).

The Minto-Brown Island Park - Path and Trail Paving (Priority Two project \$1.49 million) should be moved to Priority One.

We recommend taking out all paving of parking lots in parks (\$9.2 million). The committee should consider whether replacing the existing restrooms at Wallace Marine Park or Cascade Gateway rise to the level of Priority One. Similarly, a shelter for Bush Park would

be nice but is not necessary as there are plenty of picnic areas covered by trees. Bush Park area residents are already overserved by this park.

We **strongly** recommend removing the Sport Fields Geer Park for \$ 2.28 million. This area already has very adequate soccer and baseball fields. As mentioned in comments on March 18 by Matthew Hatler, MD, Salem parks need to move away from “pay-to-play” activities to fields and courts that primarily serve nearby homes. Large fancy regional fields encourage long drives for regional sporting events that are inconsistent with major reductions in transportation emissions. This is especially inappropriate for regional events for children who should mostly play in local events.

SEISMIC UPGRADE FOR THE CIVIC CENTER

350 Salem is disturbed by the idea of eliminating seismic upgrades for the Civic Center. We support the project to Reinforce Civic Center structure (all 3 building wings) to life-safety standards.

We feel it would be highly irresponsible to gamble on the odds of a Cascadia earthquake not happening in the next 10-15 years. This work needs to be done and should be included in the bond measure. We also support energy efficiency upgrades for the Civic Center.

Due to the binding limit of \$300 million we recommend taking out Peace Plaza Renovation (\$2.0 million and the Interior Renovation Interior (tenant improvements including Council Chambers \$29.5)

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES (IT)

350 Salem supports IT investments in general software and cloud backup for security. We question the need for both a second data center (to reduce the time required to become fully operational) and completing a redundant fiber ring (to reduce the risk of service interruption, \$5.1 and \$2.0 million, respectively). We look forward to hearing more about the need for these projects.

FIRE EQUIPMENT AND STATIONS

We also have concerns about the fire investments, their financial costs and GHG implications. We feel it's inappropriate to use large diesel fire equipment for every health emergency. In 2020 only two percent of Salem Fire calls were for actual fires according to data provided to the State Fire Marshal's Office.

We believe that a more intensive ambulance network is a cost-effective alternative to more fire stations. A comprehensive performance audit and a comparison study of more ambulances is needed before any new fire stations are built. Currently, many times a large fire truck and the ambulance show up at nearly the same time. If fire stations are kept as a principal dispatch location, every station should have a small EV car or electric motorcycle as a backup to the ambulance which has to be dispatched anyway to transport the person

to an emergency health facility. Therefore, we recommend reducing the cost for new fire stations by half. See also our comments of March 18 on this issue.

BRANCH LIBRARIES

As discussed in our March 18 comments 350 Salem **strongly** supports two branch libraries for this bond measure. See also the comments by Jim Schepke for all dates.

OVERALL

350 Salem's above additional Priority One requests total to just over \$55 million. Our suggested Priority One removals total far more than \$110 million. We understand there are difficult trade offs. A \$300 million levy falls far short of the investment needs for the City.

Still, this is a one-time opportunity to make significant progress in meeting the City's GHG reduction goal for 2035 and address housing needs. The TSP is outdated. Significant reshuffling of the priorities is absolutely called for given the nature of the climate and housing emergencies. Now is the time for the City to get its priority right, even if the committee takes more time.

This process should not be rushed. The committee should not make any final decisions at this meeting, but could begin to tentatively move projects between the Priority One and Priority Two lists and request public comments.

Thanks again for the opportunity to participate in this important process.

From: [Victor Dodier](#)
To: [Bond 2022](#)
Cc: scan-transportation@googlegroups.com
Subject: Comments on Transportation Projects Proposed for Bond Funding
Date: Sunday, March 27, 2022 10:52:09 PM

March 26, 2022

Infrastructure Bond Engagement Steering Committee:

The South Central Association of Neighbors (SCAN) Transportation Committee reviewed the project list proposed for funding in the next infrastructure bond.

Members of the committee wish that there was more information available about the proposed projects. Our comments about the proposed transportation projects are based on the limited information that is available:

Pringle Creek Path - Civic Center to Riverfront Park. The project connects the City Hall / Library complex with Riverfront Park, the bicycle / pedestrian bridge over the Willamette River and to West Salem generally. SCAN supported the City's application to the Oregon Department of Transportation for a Community Path grant last year for this or a similar improvement.

However, we believe that the City should continue to pursue grant funds for the Pringle Creek Path improvement.

A smaller amount of bond funds should be set aside in a bucket, similar to the bucket for Sidewalks, to implement Tier 1 bicycle projects identified in the Salem Transportation System Plan. The Tier 1 bicycle projects have the potential of developing a network of connected bicycle paths. The Tier 1 bicycle projects, especially those that are not on high speed arterials, will encourage bicycling to and from Salem's downtown area.

River Road S Slide Mitigation - Fairmount Ave S to Minto Island Park. We wish that more information was available for this project. We can recall two instances when large boulders fell onto River Road S. The road was closed for a few days in both instances; longer the first time when vegetation was removed from the hillside. We hope that staff can explain to Steering Committee members the nature of the hazard to be mitigated by the project and whether the expenditure of such a large sum will, in fact, mitigate the hazard.

Pringle Road SE: McGilchrist St SE to Georgia St SE. Pringle Road currently has sidewalk segments in some areas but deep ditches in others. People must walk at the side of the road to the bus stops on Pringle Road. As we understand it, Pringle Road is a minor arterial. It should be improved, especially with increased traffic heading to the new Costco. We understand that the City's standard for minor arterials is three lanes (two travel lanes with a continuous left turn lane) with boulevard strips between the street and the sidewalk.

However, we suggest that Pringle Road should remain as a two lane street. The continuous left turn lane should not be built; rather left turn pockets could be placed at intersections.

Whatever is done to improve this segment of Pringle Road, it should not follow the pattern set by Pringle Road south of Madrona Street; that is, three wide lanes with sidewalks immediately adjacent to the travel lanes.

McGilchrist Street SE: 12th St SE to 25th St SE. The McGilchrist Urban Renewal District was established in 2006 to fund improvement of McGilchrist Street SE and intersecting streets using tax increment financing. The improvements remain undone; the tax increment financing process has been too slow. Nevertheless, the money accumulated in the URD to-date plus anticipated SDCs from developments in the industrial area should be used to reduce the amount of bond funds allocated to the project.

Please dissolve the McGilchrist Urban Renewal District when the project is done; it has accomplished its purpose.

State Street: 13th St NE to 17th St NE Bike Lanes and Pavement. This project is identified as a Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvement. If the City proposes to rebuild this segment of State Street, it should be identified as Pavement R&R. We understand that bike lanes, sidewalk repairs and ADA curb cuts come along with Pavement R&R. If it is indeed a Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvement, it will share a problem common to many bicycle projects – it will be a stand-alone four block improvement that does not connect to another bicycle path.

Marine Drive NW. Steering Committee members expressed a strong interest in moving the Marine Drive NW project into the list of funded projects during the March 18th meeting. Its \$47.5 million project estimate may displace many other projects funding and unbalance the distribution of bond funds among City wards.

We suggest that the Steering Committee explore the possibility of scaling the project back so as to build a functional segment of Marine Drive with bond funds, but rely on SDC revenue to fund the balance of Marine Drive's construction. Further, it is not clear whether the new Marine Drive NW as shown on the project map developed for the Steering Committee's March 28 meeting is located within the city limits. All the land served by the new street should be within the City. The property owners of this land should pay toward the cost of the new street since it will greatly enhance the value of their property.

Thank you.

Victor Dodier

Chair, SCAN Transportation Committee