

From: Mike Vargo <mvargo63@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 7, 2022 9:44 AM
To: Heather Dimke <HDimke@cityofsalem.net>
Subject: Climate action plan

Dear CAP Subcommittee - I'm writing to express my support for the development of a series of non-motorized pathways through Salem that will facilitate the accomplishment of our climate action goals, and encourage the health and well-being of our citizenry by making nonmotorized transport safer, and more convenient and appealing. I have reviewed the latest developments in the planning for the upcoming bond initiative, and appreciate the good work reflected there.

That said, I am pretty concerned that the emphasis outlined will not remotely get us close to the goal of significantly reducing vehicle emissions by 2035. That we continue to prioritize motor vehicle transportation, essentially leaving its capacity untouched, at the expense of developing nonmotorized transportation supports, will perpetually leave us well short of meeting this essential goal. I have lived in many cities across this country and Canada, and have found Salem to be the least bicycle and non-motorized transportation friendly city of this group.

It is my hope that continued attention to these plans particularly as we strategize for our community in the next decade and beyond, will begin to address some of these insufficiencies in our infrastructure planning.

Thank you sincerely for your work and attention. I would be very happy to serve as a community member resource for this committee if that would be helpful in any way.

Best to you,

Michael Vargo
3377 13th street SE
Salem, OR

From: Debbie Miller <dlmillerbiz@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 7, 2022 10:52 AM
To: Heather Dimke <HDimke@cityofsalem.net>
Subject: Climate action plan committee meeting July 11th

I am writing because I strongly feel we are dropping the ball at a time when we need quick and bold action. Salem needs to lead in this, not follow. I see Climate Plan concepts in Salem taking a backseat to concepts in Our Salem and other plans. It is past time to make this a priority.

I just got back from Paris where the Mayor there made a decision that things had to change, and change fast, for Climate change. She made reducing cars in Paris a priority and is reducing the ability of cars to drive and park in Paris, while supporting bike lanes, bike racks, electric bikes, pedestrians, public

transportation in every way and as quickly as she can. People are upset anytime there's a change. What she's doing is not perfect, but it's working. And it's turning into an asset for Paris. It's drawing more people to live and work there and to visit as well. This could happen in Salem too.

In Amsterdam in the 1970's they made a similar commitment and it was very controversial and initially unpopular, but look at what they have become today. This is what leaders do, keep their eye on the ball and don't try and just fit in and not make waves.

We need to stop making it easy to drive and start making it easy to get places without driving. This requires making bold decisions that are not popular immediately, but have long lasting benefits and can be marketed in a way to help people to see their value. We need to support movements like Salem Bike vision even if it seems like it's too big of a change for us now.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Debbie Miller
3855 Aberdeen St S
Salem OR, 97302

503-931-8414

From: Glen Bledsoe <glenbledsoe@mac.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 7, 2022 11:38 AM
To: Heather Dimke <HDimke@cityofsalem.net>
Subject: Support for a Comprehensive Network of Protected Bike Lanes

To All Concerned:

I am 71 years old and I ride an ebike as my primary source of transportation. Since the beginning of the pandemic I've ridden over 4,000 miles in the streets and parks of Salem. I meet people every day, and without exception they say, "I'd love to ride an ebike, too, but I don't feel safe riding in the streets of Salem." I want to emphasize that I hear that from EVERYONE. I tell them that honestly automobile drivers in Salem are especially courteous and that a protected bike path throughout Salem would be a signal to everyone that the leadership of Salem understands that bike lanes are one thread of a solution to a long list of transportation issues: energy use, traffic congestion, parking, equitable mobility, and public health. Bikes were originally hailed as a means to improve public health in the late 19th century, not just because a wheelman got exercise, but because bikes replaced horses whose waste products

filled the streets. The same is true today except substitute cars and pickup trucks whose waste products fill our atmosphere, threaten our climate, and pose an existential threat to the survival of humanity.

On a related issue: I notice that there are parking meters where there once was 2 hour free parking. I'm okay with that. The city wants to discourage people from driving their cars downtown. I feel the same way. At the same time, however, you need to make access to downtown safe and accessible to bike riders and other modes of micromobility. You can't have it both ways and expect downtown businesses to survive.

So I encourage you to support any and all measures for a comprehensive network of protected bike lanes.

Cheers!

Glen

From: Phil Carver <philiphcarver@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, July 10, 2022 11:02 PM

To: Heather Dimke <HDimke@cityofsalem.net>; citycouncil <citycouncil@cityofsalem.net>

Cc: Janet Lorenzen <jlorenze@willamette.edu>; Clair Clark <clairclark86@gmail.com>; Laurie Dougherty <lauriedougherty@gmail.com>

Subject: Comments to CAP Committee and City Council from 350 Salem

To Mayor Bennett, City Councilors, and Staff,
Comments by 350 Salem Oregon
For the CAP Committee and City Council meetings of July 11
Achieving the Council's Adopted GHG Goal for 2035
Phil Carver and Laurie Dougherty, Co-coordinators
July 10, 2022

350 Salem is very disappointed with the agenda for the July 11 meeting of the Salem Climate Action Committee and its plan for 2022.

There is apparently no plan to provide a reaction or discussion of our comments provided to the CAP and the City Council on June 5. Instead, the July 11 agenda is an informational session on activities already underway by the City and the State.

Having one hour monthly informational meetings will not help the Council achieve its adopted greenhouse goal of a 50 percent reduction by 2035.

On June 5 we outlined the following key strategies that need to be added to the short term agenda for the CAP Committee:

- TL42 Reform SDCs [system development charges]
- EN09 Design a Community Green Power Rate (also EN 30)
- EN18 Incentivize construction of smaller more energy efficient homes

- EN31 Implement policies to reduce natural gas usage

- NR06 Create an Urban Tree Commission
- CM37 Public education on reducing GHG emissions (also CM39, EN14 and EN15)

- MW08 City-wide ban on non-essential single use plastics and polystyrene
- MW21 Pay structure for solid waste with lower cost for lower waste
- MW22 Explore sending all Salem's waste to a landfill instead of to Covanta Marion

Of these, only MW21 (Pay-As-You-Throw) has received any discussion. That discussion was by the City Council. The CAP Committee provided no guidance on this issue.

An example of inaction is EN09 (also EN30), the community green power rate. This action is actually on the list of 50 or so short term items proposed by City staff. There is no indication that staff have reached out to PGE to explore this issue or plan to discuss it with the CAP Committee. This action and the others on our list above qualify under the City's criteria for being on the short term list. Staff should begin implementation of all actions on the list above and have discussions with the CAP Committee at the remaining meetings of 2022.

As we pointed out on June 5, reforming system development charges is completely consistent with the staff's criteria for being on the short term list:

This strategy [SDC reform] meets all of the City's criteria for short term implementation:

The City's criteria for short term actions - highlighted in italic - prioritize strategies that:

- *Have high potential for reducing GHG emissions* – Encouraging development in close-in areas builds in permanent VMT [vehicle miles traveled] reductions. Close-in areas have much lower rates of VMT per capita than outlying areas
- *The City is the lead agency* – SDCs are at the city's discretion with State rules.
- *The cost to the City is considered low* – The cost to adopt an ordinance allowing exemptions is minimal. While the exemption reduces revenue, these costs are offset because close-in development has much lower infrastructure costs relative to outlying areas. Close-in areas have adequate existing public facilities. This nets the City money because SDCs cover only 20-30% of cost of facilities needed to serve growth. Over time this shift yields major reductions in maintenance costs.
- *There are community equity co-benefits* – Development in close-in areas also reduces personal transportation costs, reduces traffic congestion, expands transportation choices and improves public health outcomes by encouraging walking and cycling.

- *The initiation of the strategy could occur in the next two years.* As described below, the SDC exemption could be incorporated in the city's code almost immediately.

SDC exemptions near the core transit network can be implemented within the next 6 to 12 months. Reforming the inequitable structure of uniform SDCs will take several years so it should begin now.

In contrast, the discussion items on the July 11 CAP agenda do not meet the City's criteria for short term implementation. Most are already underway or the City is not the lead agency.

The most egregious example on the agenda is TL 15: Supporting Super-Transit Network.

The agenda packet for this item focuses almost exclusively on commuter-rail service between Salem and Portland. This issue is entirely under state and federal control and funding. Even if implemented, it would not significantly reduce commuter traffic into and out of Salem. Most of the single-occupancy commuter traffic is from nearby cities and towns. Of these, only Albany is served by rail. There are zero indications that the state is moving forward on this rail strategy, so there is nothing to coordinate with. Yet, it is on the agenda for the July 11 CAP meeting.

350 Salem also reiterates its concerns about the structure of the CAP Committee. Having four voting members on a decision-making body is almost unworkable. In my professional career I cannot think of a single example. To get a majority vote requires $\frac{3}{4}$ of the voting members to agree if all are present. Needing such a supermajority for any action is unheard of in decision-making bodies. Further, Virginia Stapleton should be a full member. She has passion for this issue and should be fully included, not left half in, half out. Five members is the right number for this committee.

In accepting the Climate Action Plan, we understood the Council was committing the City to undertake serious, effective and immediate efforts to change city plans, policies and practices to prioritize reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Work by the CAP Committee to date falls well short of the kind of changes that are needed to fulfill the adopted greenhouse gas reduction goals and called for in the CAP.

We ask that the CAP Committee renew a focus on the key short term strategies, including the ones we have recommended, that will get us to the Council goal of a 50% reduction of emissions 13 short years from now. There is no time to waste.