

Amy Johnson

From: Legal
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2019 8:49 AM
To: Amy Johnson
Subject: RE: Payroll Tax question

From: mark akimoff [<mailto:makimoff76@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2019 11:01 AM
To: SALEM Manager <MANAGER@cityofsalem.net>
Subject: Payroll Tax question

Hello,

I am strongly opposed to the creation of a payroll tax without the public voting on it. I understand the need for more money for Fire and Parks and am sympathetic to those needs, (the police already got the money they took from tax payers for the new building), but you have to ask the public before you take money from them.

Is it possible to have your legal counsel lay out the legality of this for me? I work in the city limits but I live in rural marion county, so I have no say over the elected public officials serving in City Hall. If this payroll tax is pushed through it's clearly taxation without representation for me and thousands of other residents who have no say in the elections of city council. I would love to hear the legal means by which you can push through a tax on the unrepresented?

Families in Salem are having a hard enough time making ends meet, you can't just push through more taxes. It's breaking the backs of the working class in this town.

Also, can I get the email addresses for all the city councilors so I can write them directly?

Thank you,

Mark Akimoff
A very concerned worker.

Kelli Blechschmidt

From: Jackie Leung
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2019 6:34 AM
To: Amy Johnson
Subject: Fwd: Concerns on City "Revenue to Fund Essential City Services" Options Being Considered

Hello,

I believe the revenue ordinances are on the agenda in August? If so, will you please include this?

Thank you,

Jackie

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: "Hale, Matthew" <MatthewHale@corban.edu>
Date: 7/28/19 12:58 PM (GMT-08:00)
To: Jackie Leung <JLeung@cityofsalem.net>
Subject: Concerns on City "Revenue to Fund Essential City Services" Options Being Considered

Dear City Councilor Leung,

I have some concerns about the proposed operating fee being considered by the City of Salem. This revenue is stated as "\$7.1 million in 2020 at \$8/month on single family residences, \$6.40/month for multi-family residential units, and \$38.56/month for public, commercial and institutional accounts".

After reviewing the proposed budget for FY 2020, specifically page #270, I notice that our city since FY 2017 has had more expenditures than revenue, yet our property taxes and associated City fees on our utility bills continue to rise every year. In fact, all residents experienced a huge property tax increase last November, with the Statesman Journal reporting an 11% property tax increase on average.

While I'm all for supporting essential city services, I'm concerned that the messaging to the public is that "An \$8 million reduction to services in the General Fund would be the equivalent of decreasing services by 65 police officers, or five fire stations, or all park maintenance and all the Library services" rather than providing us additional options to consider as the City Council debates this proposal.

I would rather see a more detailed debate on maintaining essential city services that includes options to reduce spending in other areas, or at least an option that all city departments share a reduction in spending so that revenue equals expenditures. Our City should seek to live within it's budget, rather than passing on tax increases to taxpayers without seeking voter approval.

Page #281 of the FY 2020 proposed budget assumes an increase in wages of 6.4%, an increase in PERS contributions of 33.6%, and an increase in employer provided health insurance of 9.9%.

Increases like these, amounting to \$8,045,656, can't be sustained by taxpayers, when our incomes are not rising this fast, and cost of living increases never match these large increases in government spending.

I ask that the City carefully consider their spending, and consider other options (e.g. employees contributing to their health insurance, across the board reductions in all city departments, a hiring freeze, etc.) rather than another tax increase passed along to taxpayers already burdened by a deluge of tax increases over the past year - 11% property tax increase, state gasoline tax increase due to clean fuels legislation, increased food and medical costs due to inflation, and many others.

Thank you for listening and taking time to consider other options.

Sincerely,

Matt Hale

Kelli Blechschmidt

From: Ann <twofivestars@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2019 11:32 AM
To: Chuck Bennett; SALEM Manager; citycouncil
Subject: Re: City Council moves ahead with operating fee, payroll tax to bolster General Fund. Put before the voters. Take a pay cut all of you until decided! Ann In Salem

I know you do not or the city council..The public workers , city workers need to get their pay frozen..make up the difference! Ann

Ann Watters RPE,BCPP
Polarity Center of Salem
503-581-6512
twofivestars@comcast.net

On Jul 26, 2019, at 11:19 AM, Chuck Bennett <CBennett@cityofsalem.net> wrote:

We don't get any pay but I still agree it ought to go to the voters and won't support any increase unless they do.

Chuck

Sent from my iPad

On Jul 26, 2019, at 11:15 AM, Ann <twofivestars@comcast.net> wrote:

Ann Watters RPE,BCPP
Polarity Center of Salem
503-581-6512
twofivestars@comcast.net

Begin forwarded message:

From: Ann Watters <ann.sue@icloud.com>
Date: July 26, 2019 at 7:19:39 AM PDT
Subject: **City Council moves ahead with operating fee, payroll tax to bolster General Fund. Put before the voters. Take a pay cut all of you until decided! Ann In Salem**

<https://www.statesmanjournal.com/story/news/2019/07/08/city-council-moves-ahead-operating-fee-payroll-tax-bolster-general-fund/1661222001/>

Ann Watters RPE,BCPP

Polarity Center of Salem
503-581-6512
twofivestars@comcast.net