

From: [Amy Johnson](#)
To: [Rachael Gangelhoff](#)
Subject: FW: Testimony regarding the draft housing production strategy
Date: Thursday, May 22, 2025 7:55:16 AM
Attachments: [Testimony for City Council Hearing Re Housing Production Strategy 5-26-25.docx](#)

From: Eunice Kim <EKim@cityofsalem.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2025 7:41 AM
To: Amy Johnson <AJohnson@cityofsalem.net>
Subject: FW: Testimony regarding the draft housing production strategy

Hi Amy,

This is for the public hearing on the housing production strategy on Tuesday's Council meeting.

Eunice

-Eunice Kim | 503-540-2308
City of Salem | Community Planning and Development Department | Planning

From: Bill Dixon <bill.r.dixon@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2025 7:28 AM
To: Eunice Kim <EKim@cityofsalem.net>
Cc: Vanessa Nordyke <VNordyke@cityofsalem.net>
Subject: Testimony regarding the draft housing production strategy

Dear Ms. Kim,
Please include the attached file in testimony for the City Council's public hearing regarding the draft housing production strategy. Thank you for your assistance.

--

Bill Dixon
bill.r.dixon@gmail.com
503-602-1708

To: Members of the City Council
From: Bill Dixon, 608 Salem Heights Ave. S., Salem, 97302, Ward 7
Subject: Testimony Opposing Adoption of the Draft Housing Production Strategy
Date: May 27, 2025

I urge City Council to follow the lead of the Planning Commission, reject the draft housing production strategy and send it back to staff for revision.

My concerns with the draft strategy center on money and focus.

Regarding money, the city doesn't have enough to continue current operations let alone take on additional obligations in the name of housing production.

The draft strategy recommends four high cost and five medium cost actions out of a total of 17. Every one of the high-medium-cost actions would represent a potentially significant (but undefined) drain on revenue as homes are added to the existing housing stock.

This at a time when the city lacks the money to operate its library and to maintain its parks and roadways. At a time when the general fund is forecast to run out of money in 2030 and the transportation services fund even earlier, in 2029. At a time when the Legislature shows no sign of reducing the burden of its unfunded mandates on communities. At a time when the amount that new homes pay to the city in property taxes and operations fees falls far short of the value of the general fund services that the city provides.

Committing the city to a strategy that leans on public subsidies to fund new housing creates financial commitments that the city cannot keep. In addition, the presence of unachievable commitments in the strategy risks diverting capacity away from strategies which do not depend on money that does not exist.

Regarding focus, the draft strategy never says what benefits the taxpayers of Salem could expect if it was implemented. Would it just mean more housing? If so, why do it? Would it mean a reduction in the share of residents struggling to pay for housing? If so how much? Would it mean a net gain in revenue for the city or a further drain on limited resources? Again, how much?

These are not inconsequential questions. Sending the draft strategy back to staff for revision would provide an opportunity to learn the answers, which both the City Council and the taxpayers deserve to have.