

CITY OF SALEM

Written Testimony

City Council

555 Liberty St SE
Salem, OR 97301

Tuesday, November 13, 2018 6:00 PM Council Chambers

- 3.3e.** [18-501](#) State of Oregon Rural Oregon Airport Relief (ROAR) Grant Application
for Commercial Air Service Development

Ward(s): 2
Councilor(s): Andersen
Neighborhood(s): SEMCA

Recommendation: Authorize the City Manager to consent to the Salem Area Chamber of Commerce's application for Rural Oregon Airport Relief (ROAR) grant funds to be used for commercial air service development at the Salem Municipal Airport.

Attachments: [Airport Advisory Commission Letter of Support](#)
[Written Testimony 1](#)

Add - Written Testimony.

- 4.a.** [18-510](#) Establishing New Solid Waste Management Service Rates

Ward(s): All Wards
Councilor(s): All Councilors
Neighborhood(s): All Neighborhoods

Recommendation: Adopt Resolution No. 2018-81 establishing new solid waste management service rates effective January 1, 2019, and rescinding Resolution No. 2017-45.

Attachments: [Resolution No. 2018-81](#)
[Resolution No. 2018-81 Exhibit A - Schedule of Solid Waste Management Service Rate](#)
[Letter from Bell & Associates, Inc., Solid Waste Cost of Service Analysis](#)
[Mid-Valley Comparative Rate Summary - Monthly Rates for Solid Waste Service](#)
[Comparison of Current and Proposed Solid Waste Collections Rates Effective January 1](#)
[Mid-Valley Comparative Rate Summary - Medical Waste Disposal](#)
[Written Testimony 1](#)

Add - Written Testimony.

- 6.b.** [18-520](#) The application for the Kuebler Gateway Shopping Center (Costco) has been appealed and will be heard by the Hearings Officer on December 12, 2018, unless called-up by City Council.

Planning Administrator Decision - Class 3 Site Plan Review / Class 2
Driveway Approach Permit Case No. 18-15 - 2500-2600 Block of Boone
Road SE - M&T Partners & Pacific Realty Associates - APPROVED - An

application for development of the Kuebler Gateway Shopping Center, including Costco, a retail fueling station, and four new retail shell buildings.

The decision was appealed by the South Gateway Neighborhood Association and by a group of neighbors.

Ward(s): 4
Councilor(s): McCoid
Neighborhood(s): SGNA

Recommendation: Information Only.

Attachments: [SPR-DAP18-15 Decision](#)
[SNGA Appeal Letter](#)
[Anuta Appeal Letter](#)
[Written Testimony 1](#)

Add - Written Testimony.

7.2a. [18-508](#) Ordinance Bill No. 20-18, restricting use of plastic carryout bags

Ward(s): All Wards
Councilor(s): All Councilors
Neighborhood(s): All Neighborhoods

Recommendation: Conduct second reading for enactment of engrossed Ordinance Bill No. 20-18, restricting use of plastic carryout bags.

Attachments: [Engrossed Ordinance Bill No. 20-18](#)
[Engrossed Ordinance Bill No. 20-18, Exhibit A](#)
[Public Comment Received through September 10](#)
[Public Comment Received Before the Public Hearing on October 22](#)
[Public Comment Received After the Public Hearing on October 22](#)
[Additional Public Comment 1](#)

Add- Written Testimony.

The following testimony relates to agenda item 3.3e:

Amy Johnson

From: Kim Allain <birdkim89@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2018 5:34 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Airline service

Hello,

I support the effort to get airline service back in Salem. I am a frequent flyer, and home owner in Marion County..

Kim Allain

503-559-1145

Sent from my iPad

Amy Johnson

From: Curt Arthur <curt.arthur@svn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2018 6:51 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Support Air Service

Councilors

Tonight you will be asked to support the work of volunteers throughout SALEM/KEIZER who have been diligently working to bring commercial air service back to Salem. I urge you to support those efforts by approving the motion before you this evening.

My thanks.

--



Curt Arthur, SIOR | Managing Director

A licensed Principal Broker in the State of Oregon

SVN Commercial Advisors, LLC

1665 Liberty St. SE, Suite 200

Salem, OR 97302

Direct 503.588.4146 | Office 503.588.0400 | Cell 503.559.7990

curt.arthur@svn.com | www.svnca.com

Team Members:

Heather Miller, Administrative Assistant (Heather.Miller@svn.com)

Tom Hendrie, Associate Advisor (Tom.Hendrie@svn.com)

Amy Johnson

From: Doug Brenizer <av8rdeb@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 07, 2018 8:28 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Commercial Air Service at the Salem Airport

Dear Council Members:

Please support the effort to bring Commercial Air Service to the Salem Airport. As congestion in Wilsonville and Portland continues to grow, Portland International Airport is becoming less and less accessible and commercial air service at KSLE would also serve to enhance tourism and other industries in our community.

Thank You.

Best Regards,

Doug Brenizer
AV8RDEB@comcast.net
Mobile: (541) 905 4189



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Amy Johnson

From: Chad Casady <casadyc@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 12, 2018 1:03 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: In support of commercial air service in Salem

Dear Mayor Bennett and City Councilors,

I've lived in the Salem area for 25 years, and currently work at Performance Health Technology (PH TECH) in Salem, not far from the airport. As an air traveler both for business and pleasure, I am writing to you to express my enthusiastic support in the council's efforts to bring commercial air service back to Salem and McNary Field.

With the increase in PDX parking rates this summer, I calculate that I spend at least \$100 in addition to airfare, just to fly out of the Portland Airport -- that's mileage plus parking. In addition to spending that extra \$100, I'm also adding an additional 200 minutes of drive, parking, and shuttle time.

This past summer, my family of 4 went on an international vacation, and returned to the country by way of a 15-hour flight to Sea-Tac. After navigating customs, we boarded another 52-minute flight to Portland, where my in-laws were waiting with our car. We drove 40 minutes to their home in Tigard to drop them off, then another 55 minutes back to Salem -- this, after a 24-hour travel day. If someone had told me that for another \$400 or so, we could have just landed in Salem after that long trip, I would not have hesitated to spend that money.

Salem is the second largest city in the state of Oregon, and yet the two nearest commercial airports are both ~65 miles away. With the continued onslaught of rush-hour traffic and drive times within the Portland metro area, it is becoming increasingly inconvenient to "Fly PDX."

Our community needs a better option.

I know that not everyone will agree with me, but if my opinion is representative of just 10% of the ~3500 daily flyers from the Salem area, that's potentially 350 daily flyers that could be utilizing air service at McNary Field -- enough to sustain commercial air service.

Thank you for taking the time to listen, and for your service and continued efforts toward improving our community. Now let's "Fly Salem!"

Sincerely,
Chad Casady

Amy Johnson

From: bcegon <bcegon@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 12, 2018 5:39 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Commercial air service

Please support the effort to bring commercial air service to Salem. I believe it will help our tourism and help attract more employers. Please apply for any available grants to help fund it.

Sent from my iPhone

Bob Cegon

Amy Johnson

From: Adrienne Christian <luv2b362436@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2018 11:25 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Airline Service

Good day,

I cannot attend the city council meeting on the 13th but I wanted to let you know that I definitely support the efforts to bring commercial air service to Salem!

Thank you,

Adrienne Christian
503-930-5580

Amy Johnson

From: Cowles, Phillip <PCowles@addus.com>
Sent: Monday, November 12, 2018 6:20 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Commercial Airlines

Dear Council:

I recently moved to Salem in June 2018, as my wife works for Columbia Bank.

I fly out every week from PDX. I can't begin to tell you how much I would enjoy flying out of Salem and skipping that hour plus commute.

Please support the community effort to get commercial flights back to Salem.

Phil Cowles, VP Regional Development
Addus HomeCare
Pcowles@addus.com
(503) 545-7308

Sent from my iPhone. Please forgive typos

NOTICE: This email may contain PRIVILEGED and CONFIDENTIAL information and is intended only for the use of the specific individual(s) to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you are hereby notified that any unauthorized use, dissemination or copying of this email or the information contained in it or attached to it is strictly prohibited. You may be subject to penalties under law for any improper use or further disclosure of any Protected Health Information in this email. If you have received this email in error, please delete it and immediately notify the sender of this email by reply mail. Thank you.

Amy Johnson

From: Carl D Crowell <carl@crowell-law.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 08, 2018 8:26 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Salem Passenger Air Service

Over 90 percent of my work is out of state and requires regular travel. I am in the process of selling my S. Liberty office building and relocating my practice. Two major considerations driving my relocation are the continuing harassment and problems with homeless around my building, and the distance to the nearest airport for travel.

A return of twice daily air service to a local hub, such as Seattle, would not keep me from moving from my current location, but would influence a decision to stay in Salem.

I am a small business, but I have no doubt others far more significant than myself feel the same.

-carl d. crowell

--

Carl D. Crowell
Attorney at Law
P.O. Box 923
Salem, OR 97308-0923
USA
Tel: 503.581.1240
www.crowell-law.com

Note: If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately.

Amy Johnson

From: Guy Culbertson <guy@culbertsons.net>
Sent: Monday, November 12, 2018 9:12 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: I support a regional airline for Salem Oregon.

Please show me as a yes to support a regional airline for Salem. As an owner of several commercial buildings in Salem it would be of great benefit to myself and other business owners in Salem.

Thank you

Guy Culbertson

Amy Johnson

From: Susan Dillard <dockstdillard@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2018 9:33 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Passenger air service

To the members of the Salem City Council, I am writing in support of passenger air service to Salem OR. I travel to your beautiful city from Wilmington NC to visit my sister Chane Griggs. Wilmington sits on the east coast of NC. Flying to Portland after at least one layover makes for a long day. Then I usually have to wait an hour or more for the shuttle and the ensuing hour plus drive to Salem. As your state capital and with all the wonderful things Salem has to offer it makes sense to make travel to your city much more accommodating.

Sincerely,
Susan Dillard
504 Dock St
Wilmington NC 28401

Sent from my iPhone

Amy Johnson

From: andrew isaksen <andrewisaksen@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 12, 2018 11:34 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Commercial air service at the Salem Airport

Dear Salem Counselors,

I want to thank you for your dedicated service to our community, being an elected official is never easy. I know the counsel will be discussing a couple of items regarding commercial air service at the Salem airport. I urge you to do whatever you can to help this happen. I fly a few times a year and the time it takes to travel to PDX is more than cumbersome, not to mention the environmental impact of so many people traveling (vehicle exhaust, wear and tear on I-5, etc). Thank you for taking my opinion into consideration,

Andrew Isaksen
Salem resident

Amy Johnson

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of arkaye2@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, November 12, 2018 9:36 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Contact City Council
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Your Name	Aileen P. Kaye
Your Email	arkaye2@gmail.com
Your Phone	5037434567
Street	PO Box 1113
City	Turner
State	OR
Zip	97392
Message	Regards: SCC agenda item regarding the Salem Chamber of Commerce Grant application regarding an airport and rural land. What is this about?

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 11/12/2018.

Amy Johnson

From: Tawni Kelly <inwatk@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 12, 2018 4:33 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Grants

Please consider voting to fund the grant to bring commercial flights to Salem. We need this. Thanks. Kellys

Amy Johnson

From: Syndy King <syndy.king.wxgl@statefarm.com>
Sent: Monday, November 12, 2018 9:39 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Commercial airline service to Salem

I support commercial airline service to KSLE

Amy Johnson

From: John Kirk <john@tomsonburnham.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2018 12:05 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Commercial Air Service

Please support the return of commercial air service to Salem!

Thanks!

--

John Kirk
Principal Broker, State of Oregon
Tomson Burnham L.L.C.
Direct: 503-871-3300
Fax: 503-427-9539
john@tomsonburnham.com
www.salembroker.com
[Click Here To View Recent Client Reviews on Zillow](#)
Oregon Initial Agency Disclosures: <http://tomsonburnham.com/rea-disclosure/>

Amy Johnson

From: Stacy Langford <stacy.langford.w95v@statefarm.com>
Sent: Monday, November 12, 2018 8:35 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: FW: Commercial Service

I support the efforts to bring commercial airline service to KSLE.

Thank you,

Stacy Langford

Account Manager

Jose Vargas State Farm

1297 Wallace Rd NW

Salem, OR 97304

503-399-1081 Office

503-370-4384 Fax

[Stacy.langford.w95v@statefarm.com](mailto:stacy.langford.w95v@statefarm.com)

**My job is to ask you about “life insurance.”
Please don’t make it my job to tell your family you didn’t
have any.**



[Register With Us Online](#)

Amy Johnson

From: Mary Annie <redwhiteblonde@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 08, 2018 5:13 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Scheduled Air Service for Salem

I urge you to support the return of scheduled air service to Salem.

Scheduled air service is a convenience the citizens of Salem should enjoy!

Mary Ann Lebold

Amy Johnson

From: Melissa Netland <melissanetland@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 12, 2018 1:36 PM
To: citycouncil

We would love commercial flights back in salem as a service. Portland traffic is becoming unbearable and unpredictable for pdx use. Salem, the State Capital deserves better!

Cordially,
Jamie and Melissa Netland

Amy Johnson

From: Gina Ott <ginahomestar@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 12, 2018 1:07 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Commercial flights to Salem

Dear City Council,

I'm writing to ask you to please support the community effort and vote to apply for the grants to bring commercial flights back to Salem.

Many people within the community would prefer not driving up to Portland in order to catch a commercial flight. As a real estate broker, I am often asked by clients looking to move to Salem, why the city doesn't utilize its airport this way. It would be great for our local economy, help reduce traffic on the freeways, and possibly boost tourism to Salem's capital city!

Please vote in favor of this initiative!!

Thank you,
Gina

Gina Ott
Licensed Oregon Real Estate Broker
503-851-9608
Ginahomestar@gmail.com



Amy Johnson

From: Bryce Petersen <bryce@petersenappraisals.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2018 7:57 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Salem Airport

Hi There,

I'm writing proudly today as a small business owner and someone who frequents the Portland Airport. I'm asking that you take the time to apply for the grants and revitalize our local airport. This is one of those easy wins for the entire community.

Thanks for all you do to serve our community!

Best Regards,
Bryce

Bryce Petersen
Petersen Auto Appraisals, LLC.
971.599.1226

Oregon Appraising License #: V36-035



Amy Johnson

From: Adam Reed <Adam.Reed@adamshillhess.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 07, 2018 5:39 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Commercial air service in Salem

City Counsel,

Commercial air service in Salem is extremely important to myself and my family. I was born and raised in Salem and have seen the community grow in both population and commercial activity over the decades. Though there have been several unsuccessful commercial air service ventures in the past, our community has matured to a point where commercial air service is now a necessity. Indeed, it is embarrassing that our state's capitol city, with area population of several hundred thousand people, doesn't already have such service. Not only is commercial air service necessary to serve the members of our community, but it is also vital to drawing new businesses into our community as well as to promoting tourism in our area.

Over the last year alone, I have picked up/dropped off numerous family members at the Salem Airport for them to simply ride the HUT bus up to PDX. Each of those family members would have happily used commercial air service in and out of Salem had it been an option. I respectfully ask that you take the necessary steps to secure commercial air service in Salem, OR.

Thanks,

Adam D. Reed
Attorney at Law
ADAMS, HILL & HESS
339 Washington St. SE
Salem, OR 97302
(503) 399-2667 – phone
(503) 399-1758 – fax
adam.reed@adamshillhess.com

Amy Johnson

From: Mark Renaud <markrins@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2018 9:21 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: commercial air service in Salem

Ladies and Gentlemen:

As a former Salem Airport Advisory Committee member, I would encourage the Council to do everything possible to bring Commercial air service back to Salem!

It is important to Salem's traveling citizens to get us off I-5 as it is becoming ever more congested and dangerous.

Also, as the Capital city of Oregon, I feel it is important that we offer Commercial air service.

Sincerely

Mark Renaud

4676 Commercial St. SE # 196

Salem, Or. 97302

Amy Johnson

From: Ron Sterba <ronsrv9a@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2018 9:27 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Bring airline service to Salem! Numbers for you.

Good morning Mayor C Bennett and Salem city Councilors.

We need to do our part to clear the air that is to get those cars off Interstate Five & 205. After hearing that 1.1 million passengers travel through PDX from Marion, Polk, Linn & Benton counties each year we need to stop and change how we ALL get to PDX. The West Salem bridge traffic from the two south western counties could divert to I-5 in Albany then to exit at Mission st to the airport. Salem travelers stay in Portland hotels the night before so they don't miss their flight out of PDX because of highway traffic congestion. Now that the city of Brooks Oregon is to have a Interpol (RXR) train to semi truck depot built, that's HUNDREDS of semi trucks arriving and departing at the I-5 exist. Traffic will be Insane!

As a truck driver for 38 years (30 years in Salem) a member of our Salem community since 1978 and a active pilot based here in Salem, I have seen it ALL. TWO ROADS THAT SALEM BUILT with the anticipation of more traffic in the FUTURE were SALEM PARKWAY & KUBLER ROAD se.. Both VISIONS of traffic engineering were great for OUR COMMUNITY. As a pilot and plane/hangar owner here at Salem Airport I have seen the engineering VISIONS of our Salem Airport Administration to make our airport a GREAT DESTINATION AIRPORT! In the Salem airport construction projects (last 8 years) ALL NEW BRIGHT LED runway and taxiway LIGHTING. Asphalt ramp and taxiways REHABILITATION. Just completed this year was a TOTAL RESURFACING of Runway 31&13. Approximate 3.2 \$ Million dollars, 3 \$Million (90%) paid by FAA and the last (10%) split 60% paid by Oregon Department of Aviation and the other 40% by Salem Airport Administration. THATS A WONDERFUL CONTRIBUTION TO THE VISIONS OF A GROWING COMMUNITY! SALEM AIRPORT SHOULD HAVE AIRLINE SERVICE AGAIN. The foundation is there, the improvements COMPLETE and a community ready to TRAVEL.!!

Best Regards
Ronald Sterba

Amy Johnson

From: Chris Stewart, SRES <chrisstewart35@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 08, 2018 4:53 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Salem Airport

I highly support a fully operational commercial airport in Salem.
As a frequently traveler, I have noticed the increased traffic congestion traveling through Portland to get to the airport.

Commute time has doubled.

I spend money on parking and now overnighting in Portland due to the traffic and instability of being able to predict commute time to the airport.

I'd rather keep my money in Salem.

Parking, Uber and food vending at the Salem Airport will bring work and revenue in. The commercial airlines and their employees will bring revenue in from gate fees to over nighting crew which leads to hotels, restaurants gaining revenue.

~Chris Stewart, Principal Broker, SRES, CRA

~Proactive, Trusted Advisor~ ~ Information is free, knowledge is priceless~

Windermere Pacific West Properties
4285 Commercial St SE #100
Salem, OR 97302
503-391-1350
Licensed in OR & CA

[Our Website](#) [Oregon Initial Agency Disclosure Pamphlet](#)

Need paperwork for a transaction? Please check with Windermere Staff: 503-391-1350 or salem@windermere.com

This e-mail and all files transmitted with it contains privileged and confidential information and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed.



The following testimony relates to agenda item 4.a:

Amy Johnson

From: Roberta A <robertaanne1@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 08, 2018 11:27 AM
To: CityRecorder
Subject: rate increase garbage...

Please wait until you can hold a work session on whether to raise garbage rates - we pay higher than many other places already. Thank you.

Roberta Cade

Amy Johnson

From: Sarah Deumling <sdeumling@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 10, 2018 7:25 PM
To: CityRecorder; 350-salem-or@googlegroups.com
Subject: Increase in garbage collection rates

My name is Sarah Deumling and my house is located at 2667 Orchard Heights Rd. NW.

I have no problem with an increase in our rates for garbage collection, in fact I think it is a fine idea if it is used strategically to encourage folks to throw away less. Perhaps the first very small container free and steep incremental increases for ever larger quantities. Being very concerned about our rapid depletion of many of the earths resources and the impending serious consequences of climate change on our communities I have worked hard to purchase very carefully and have just one brown paper bag of "impossible" (not compostable or recyclable) garbage every 3 months with no negative impact on my life style. I realize this is not possible for everyone but we can all cut back.

My biggest concern, however, is that we send our east side garbage to an incinerator which emits more greenhouse gases than any other enterprise in Marion County along with other toxic pollutants and this in a low socio-economic part of the county. Before rushing to raise rates please consider seriously other alternatives for waste removal and all possible incentives to reduce amounts of residential, commercial and industrial waste in our area. The latter will be good for our pocketbooks and good for the planet.

I have one serious suggestion for alternatives to Covanta which you might want to look into at the following website:

<https://www.concordblueenergy.com/>

Sincerely,
Sarah Deumling

Amy Johnson

From: Thomas Ellis <tiellis@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 11, 2018 7:50 AM
To: Sarah Deumling
Cc: CityRecorder; 350-salem-or@googlegroups.com
Subject: Re: [350-salem-or] Increase in garbage collection rates

Good letter, Sarah! I especially liked your suggested alternative for them to consider. And I'm impressed by your reductions in household non-recyclable waste!

On Sat, Nov 10, 2018 at 7:25 PM Sarah Deumling <sdeumling@gmail.com> wrote:

My name is Sarah Deumling and my house is located at 2667 Orchard Heights Rd. NW.

I have no problem with an increase in our rates for garbage collection, in fact I think it is a fine idea if it is used strategically to encourage folks to throw away less. Perhaps the first very small container free and steep incremental increases for ever larger quantities. Being very concerned about our rapid depletion of many of the earths resources and the impending serious consequences of climate change on our communities I have worked hard to purchase very carefully and have just one brown paper bag of "impossible" (not compostable or recyclable) garbage every 3 months with no negative impact on my life style. I realize this is not possible for everyone but we can all cut back.

My biggest concern, however, is that we send our east side garbage to an incinerator which emits more greenhouse gases than any other enterprise in Marion County along with other toxic pollutants and this in a low socio-economic part of the county. Before rushing to raise rates please consider seriously other alternatives for waste removal and all possible incentives to reduce amounts of residential, commercial and industrial waste in our area. The latter will be good for our pocketbooks and good for the planet.

I have one serious suggestion for alternatives to Covanta which you might want to look into at the following website:

<https://www.concordblueenergy.com/>

Sincerely,
Sarah Deumling

1.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "350 Salem OR" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to 350-salem-or+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To post to this group, send email to 350-salem-or@googlegroups.com.

For more options, visit <https://groups.google.com/d/optout>.

Amy Johnson

From: Thomas Ellis <tiellis@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 10, 2018 8:19 AM
To: CityRecorder
Subject: Proposed increase in garbage collection rates

My name is Thomas Ellis, and I live at 4553 Fir Dell Dr SE, Salem, OR 97302. I am unable to attend the City Council meeting next week, so I am submitting this written comment instead.

As a relative newcomer to this area, I was appalled to learn that the City of Salem ships our garbage to the Covanta Marion Incinerator, which emits over 160,000 metric tons of greenhouse gases each year. Conversely, West Salem ships its garbage to the Coffin Butte Landfill near Corvallis, which is cheaper to operate, and whose annual carbon emissions are only about 28,000 metric tons a year.

I can understand the need to raise disposal rates, given the unfortunate changes in the global recycling market. But

since we live in a time when climate change is already having drastic consequences throughout the world, we cannot be content with business as usual in the matter of waste disposal. As a citizen and property owner, I would be happy to pay higher rates for garbage disposal--but only if the City Council convenes a work session to carefully consider ALL options before agreeing to raise rates in order to continue to do business with a highly polluting enterprise such as the Covanta Marion Incinerator.

This is, after all, the only life-sustaining planet we will ever know, and if we do not assume responsibility for our wasteful, ecologically destructive lifestyles, we will doom our children and grandchildren to a horrific future.

So please--take the time, in a work session, to explore innovative alternative approaches to this systemic crisis before you make your decision about raising our rates to continue such a clearly destructive practice.

Sincerely,

Thomas I. Ellis, Ph.D.
(971) 701-6965

Amy Johnson

From: Linda Gray <lindaanddoug@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2018 9:15 AM
To: CityRecorder
Subject: Garbage collection rate increase

The garbage collection rates do not need to be increased. Since our "acceptable" recycling is now very limited, and some residents continue to place trash in the recycle bin, stop the recycling program until such time as a less costly solution can be found. Newspaper could be placed in with the yard debris, as it decomposes and becomes mulch just like grass clippings. Continue the yard debris and regular trash collection at the current rate. The rate increases are too high and those of us on fixed incomes struggle to pay. Find another solution, such as the one I have suggested, before raising the rates yet again.

Linda Gray
Salem, Oregon

Amy Johnson

From: Susann Kaltwasser <susann@kaltwasser.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2018 6:21 AM
To: citycouncil; CityRecorder
Subject: Testimony regarding garbage rate increase
Attachments: Testimony on Garbage Rate Increase.pdf

Please accept this as my testimony on the proposed garbage rate increase Item #4.a. on tonight's agenda.

Susann

November 13, 2018

To: Salem City Council and Mayor Bennett
From: Susann Kaltwasser
RE: Garbage Rate Increase, Agenda Item #4.a

As the City Council considers raising the garbage rates yet again, I urge you to stop and seek more information on why this is happening again.

The rationale provided by the Staff Report is that the loss of revenue from recycling and additional operating costs is making it so the haulers are not making enough money, but no where in the report did I see them dig deeper than the surface. True costs are going up and revenue is impacted, but why?

It is true that for too long the United States has expected foreign countries to take our recyclables without understanding the pollution that goes along with processing it. But a lack of revenue from recyclable materials is not the only reason for raising rates.

A major problem is that in Marion County we burn our garbage in an expensive, aging incinerator. Something that at first seemed like a good idea is now becoming a burden on our community.

Marion County entered into a long-term contract that was not favorable to us. If you looked at the contract you would see that it binds the County to a very large amount of garbage each day. If they do not meet that amount, they have to pay a fine. With more recycling of course more garbage is going to the incinerator, but it also is a disincentive to try and find other places to sell recyclables. Also, the vast majority of the revenue from the incinerator actually goes out of state to Covanta. At first most of the revenue went to pay for the incinerator, but it has been paid off for years now. No major upgrades or repairs have been done on the incinerator either. So, the majority of the tipping fees charged to the haulers, goes to either Covanta as profit, or to Marion County's General Fund. How much is not disclosed.

While it is true that the incinerator produces energy. However, that comes at a price. The incinerator produces CO2 (a green house gas). The amount is self-reported to Oregon DEQ is equal to an estimated 30,000 vehicles. It also reports that it emits pollutants like lead, cadmium,

mercury, phthalates and dioxin that persist in our air, water and soil for decades. Basically we end up eating and breathing our garbage....and paying a high price for it!

Now the County is poised to sign another long-term contract that will mean that millions of our dollars paid for garbage service will go out of the state to a large corporation. A small amount will stay with Marion County. And customers will continue to subsidize this service.

As the incinerator ages there is pressure to expand it and to make it last even longer. But an expansion not only means more money, it means more pollution. Covanta and Marion County claim that they meet all DEQ and EPA standards. And while this is true, it does not mean that it does not produce significant damage to us. Ask any physician how much lead is safe to ingest and they will say zero. Yet the current standards allow Covanta to release pounds of lead each year. We ban BPA in some of our plastics like food and baby toys, but that does not mean that it is not in other plastics that the incinerator burns and then releases. These by-products are persistent in our water, soil and get into the plants that we eat. While the incinerator is not within our UGB, the pollution drifts into the Salem area, especially the hills of south Salem. Global Warming is increasing. Technology is changing. The recycling industry is changing. The Legislature is working on increasing air quality standards. Is it a good idea for Marion County to be signing a 20-year contract with Covanta? Is it wise to tie us this way of disposing of garbage?

Salem is producing more garbage even before the China ban on recycling. Why are we not working on alternative methods? Why are we not working on zero waste where we produce less garbage?

True this is under the Marion County Commissioners control, but Salem is the largest producer of the waste. Salem residents are the main customers of the incinerator. Salem City Council has a right...I think a responsibility to take a direct interest in the situation.

Before the City Council even considers raising the garbage fees some very serious questions need to be asked by the City Council and they need to get some much needed honest answers from Marion County.

- 1) Why are our rates in Marion County among the highest in the state?
- 2) What does the requirement imposed by the Marion County Commission that we burn our garbage in the Covanta owned incinerator do to our rates?
- 3) What is the impact of a rate increase on the low-income residents of Salem who are already struggling to pay their bills? What percent will stop having service and what will that do to issues of litter and dumping in rural areas?
- 4) What will happen to rates if the Legislature passes a Clean Energy Jobs Bill as the Governor and Senate President promised if Covanta/Marion will need to pay for their 160,000 metric tons of CO2 pollution every year?
- 5) Why did Metro in 2017 decide not to send their garbage to Covanta/Marion incinerator? Their findings pointed to concerns about environmental issues and cost!

Before there is another rate increase the Council needs to have a work session with Marion County and get some real answers. Please do not continue to ignore the real reason why we keep having to raise the garbage fees.

November 13, 2018

To: Salem City Council and Mayor Bennett
From: Susann Kaltwasser
RE: Garbage Rate Increase, Agenda Item #4.a

As the City Council considers raising the garbage rates yet again, I urge you to stop and seek more information on why this is happening again.

The rationale provided by the Staff Report is that the loss of revenue from recycling and additional operating costs is making it so the haulers are not making enough money, but no where in the report did I see them dig deeper than the surface. True costs are going up and revenue is impacted, but why?

It is true that for too long the United States has expected foreign countries to take our recyclables without understanding the pollution that goes along with processing it. But a lack of revenue from recyclable materials is not the only reason for raising rates.

A major problem is that in Marion County we burn our garbage in an expensive, aging incinerator. Something that at first seemed like a good idea is now becoming a burden on our community.

Marion County entered into a long-term contract that was not favorable to us. If you looked at the contract you would see that it binds the County to a very large amount of garbage each day. If they do not meet that amount, they have to pay a fine. With more recycling of course more garbage is going to the incinerator, but it also is a disincentive to try and find other places to sell recyclables. Also, the vast majority of the revenue from the incinerator actually goes out of state to Covanta. At first most of the revenue went to pay for the incinerator, but it has been paid off for years now. No major upgrades or repairs have been done on the incinerator either. So, the majority of the tipping fees charged to the haulers, goes to either Covanta as profit, or to Marion County's General Fund. How much is not disclosed.

While it is true that the incinerator produces energy. However, that comes at a price. The incinerator produces CO₂ (a green house gas). The amount is self-reported to Oregon DEQ is equal to an estimated 30,000 vehicles. It also reports that it emits pollutants like lead, cadmium, mercury, phthalates and dioxin that persist in our air, water and soil for decades. Basically we end up eating and breathing our garbage....and paying a high price for it!

Now the County is poised to sign another long-term contract that will mean that millions of our dollars paid for garbage service will go out of the state to a large corporation. A small amount will stay with Marion County. And customers will continue to subsidize this service.

As the incinerator ages there is pressure to expand it and to make it last even longer. But an expansion not only means more money, it means more pollution. Covanta and Marion County claim that they meet all DEQ and EPA standards. And while this is true, it does not mean that it does not produce significant damage to us. Ask any physician how much lead is safe to ingest and they will say zero. Yet the current standards allow Covanta to release pounds of lead each year. We ban BPA in some of our plastics like food and baby toys, but that does not mean that it is not in other plastics that the incinerator burns and then releases. These by-products are persistent in our water, soil and get into the plants that we eat. While the incinerator is not within our UGB, the pollution drifts into the Salem area, especially the hills of south Salem.

Global Warming is increasing. Technology is changing. The recycling industry is changing. The Legislature is working on increasing air quality standards. Is it a good idea for Marion County to be signing a 20-year contract with Covanta? Is it wise to tie us this way of disposing of garbage?

Salem is producing more garbage even before the China ban on recycling. Why are we not working on alternative methods? Why are we not working on zero waste where we produce less garbage?

True this is under the Marion County Commissioners control, but Salem is the largest producer of the waste. Salem residents are the main customers of the incinerator. Salem City Council has a right...I think a responsibility to take a direct interest in the situation.

Before the City Council even considers raising the garbage fees some very serious questions need to be asked by the City Council and they need to get some much needed honest answers from Marion County.

- 1) Why are our rates in Marion County among the highest in the state?
- 2) What does the requirement imposed by the Marion County Commission that we burn our garbage in the Covanta owned incinerator do to our rates?
- 3) What is the impact of a rate increase on the low-income residents of Salem who are already struggling to pay their bills? What percent will stop having service and what will that do to issues of litter and dumping in rural areas?
- 4) What will happen to rates if the Legislature passes a Clean Energy Jobs Bill as the Governor and Senate President promised if Covanta/Marion will need to pay for their 160,000 metric tons of CO2 pollution every year?
- 5) Why did Metro in 2017 decide not to send their garbage to Covanta/Marion incinerator? Their findings pointed to concerns about environmental issues and cost!

Before there is another rate increase the Council needs to have a work session with Marion County and get some real answers. Please do not continue to ignore the real reason why we keep having to raise the garbage fees.

Amy Johnson

From: Joan Lloyd <jello879@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 12, 2018 11:09 AM
To: citycouncil; CityRecorder; Chuck Bennett
Subject: Solid waste collection rates

In Marion County the rate for a 20 gallon bin would be \$2.75 and for a 35 gallon bin, the rate would be \$2.85. That's only

10 cents more for 3/4 more solid waste. The folks who throw away less are being punished. If the point of the increase is that people will dispose of more solid waste, the smaller containers should be charged much less.

Joan Lloyd
1577 Court St NE
Salem, OR 97301

Amy Johnson

From: Caroline OBrien <mygardenshoes@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 10, 2018 10:51 AM
To: CityRecorder
Subject: sanitation rate hikes

To whom it may concern,

Until the City Council has held a work session or work sessions to explore all the alternatives to burning our garbage in a costly incinerator that pollutes our air with 160,000 metric tons of greenhouse gases annually, all to benefit a multinational corporation, I absolutely and unequivocally OPPOSE any rate hike.

Thank you,
Caroline O'Brien
1692 Carilor Court NE
Salem/Keizer

Amy Johnson

From: Nancy Pfeiler <nancypfeiler6@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2018 8:03 AM
To: CityRecorder
Subject: Garbage Rate Increase

Good morning. I am sending my second to a comment you received from Sarah Deumling:
Nancy Pfeiler
448 Sunwood Dr NW, Salem, OR 97304

My name is Sarah Deumling and my house is located at 2667 Orchard Heights Rd. NW.

I have no problem with an increase in our rates for garbage collection, in fact I think it is a fine idea if it is used strategically to encourage folks to throw away less. Perhaps the first very small container free and steep incremental increases for ever larger quantities. Being very concerned about our rapid depletion of many of the earths resources and the impending serious consequences of climate change on our communities I have worked hard to purchase very carefully and have just one brown paper bag of "impossible" (not compostable or recyclable) garbage every 3 months with no negative impact on my life style. I realize this is not possible for everyone but we can all cut back.

My biggest concern, however, is that we send our east side garbage to an incinerator which emits more greenhouse gases than any other enterprise in Marion County along with other toxic pollutants and this in a low socio-economic part of the county. Before rushing to raise rates please consider seriously other alternatives for waste removal and all possible incentives to reduce amounts of residential, commercial and industrial waste in our area. The latter will be good for our pocketbooks and good for the planet.

I have one serious suggestion for alternatives to Covanta which you might want to look into at the following website:
<https://www.concordblueenergy.com/>

Margaret Mead, ***“Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it’s the only thing that ever has.”***

Amy Johnson

From: Jim Scheppke <jscheppke@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, November 11, 2018 9:13 AM
To: CityRecorder
Subject: Testimony on Agenda Item 4a for the November 13th Council Meeting
Attachments: Testimony of Jim Scheppke on Agenda Item 4a.docx

Dear City Recorder:

Please accept my testimony for the public hearing on solid waste management rate increases, Item 4a.

Thank you,

Jim Scheppke
1840 E Nob Hill SE, Salem
jscheppke@comcast.net
503-269-1559

TESTIMONY OF JIM SCHEPPKE FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING ON AGENDA ITEM 4A, ESTABLISHING NEW SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICE RATES

November 11, 2018

To the Salem City Council:

I respectfully ask that you delay any action on rate increases for solid waste management services until you are able to hold a work session to gather more information about this matter. The portion of Salem in Marion County already has among the highest rates in the entire state. Many Salem citizens struggle to pay their garbage bill. Why is this the case? You owe it to your constituents to find out before raising rates any further.

Here are three specific concerns about the staff report I wish to bring to your attention:

1) EOW 20-GALLON SERVICE

I dispute the account of the roll out of this service in the staff report. I am apparently the one person in Salem who now receives this service at a reduced cost, but it was not the result of any "outreach" from my service provider, Republic. After waiting patiently for this service to be available I called Republic in June, 2018, to ask about this. The service representative I talked to had no knowledge of it and did not offer to inquire about it and get back to me. It took an email from me to Ryan Zink of the City staff to finally get a call from Julie Jackson, a manager at Republic, who offered me the service which began in June. She told me that I would be the "pilot test" which I found to be very peculiar! I still get the service for \$40.70 for two months, a savings of only \$6.40, but I'll take it. I want this service because my wife and I work hard to reduce our garbage and we cannot fill a 20-gallon container every week. I think if EOW garbage service were promoted in Salem there would be many smaller households like ours that would take advantage of it. We all need incentives to live a less wasteful lifestyle, which anyone can do if they work at it.

2) APPLES TO ORANGES COMPARISONS

I wanted to comment that I found the bar charts in the staff report comparing Salem's residential rates to other cities to be very misleading. It seems to suggest that Salem/Marion has the third highest rates and that Wilsonville and Gresham have higher rates. And yet the "Comparative Rate Summary" Gresham and Wilsonville both have weekly recyclables service, making this an "apples to oranges" comparison. What the "Comparative Rate Summary" shows is that Salem/Marion now has the *highest* rate for weekly garbage and yard waste service and EOW recyclable service.

3) "SUBSIDIZATION"?

While Salem has among the highest residential garbage rates in the state, we apparently have the lowest commercial rates, according to the bar chart in the staff report. The staff report explains that "other jurisdictions allow subsidization," presumably of residential ratepayers by commercial ratepayers. That is an interesting way to frame it. Do we really know the true cost of service for commercial ratepayers vs. residential ratepayers? I think it more likely that business-friendly Salem City Councils in the recent past endeavored to give commercial ratepayers a break, just like they did with the streetlight fees. Maybe I am wrong about that, but until the current City Council can answer the question of why we (in Marion County) have the highest residential rates and the lowest commercial rates, rates for residential ratepayers should not be increased.

Thank you for your service.

Jim Scheppke
1840 E. Nob Hill SE
Salem

Amy Johnson

From: Alicia Wilson <alicia.wilson03@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 08, 2018 3:55 PM
To: CityRecorder
Subject: Opposition to garbage fee increase

I sincerely oppose an increase in garbage rates. Every other month Suburban Garbage Company charges a \$15.00 "contamination" fee, they charged me for this fee on a date that they did not even pick up my trash, and I called and had to fight to get them to refund me. They are fraudulent in their billing methods, and take advantage of consumers. If I am charged anymore for this horrible service, I will cancel my services and will promote the fact of my cancellation to persuade my peers in the community to do so also. It makes absolutely no sense for this company to pick up less recycling, yet charge us more. Also, because my bill was so high (\$82.00), I asked for a smaller trashcan to make my charges more manageable, then I was charged an \$18.00 fee to do so. This is the worst trash company I have ever encountered. This message is not out of resent, it is sincere in opposing the unnecessary increase.

Also, they had a rate increase last year. It is not necessary to charge more. I assume that the real reason behind wanting an increase is because people may be cancelling services from all of the fraudulent contamination fees being charged.

They should not be permitted to provide less, negative, and unprofessional services, and be able to charge more for it. Listen to the consumers voices. These are the highest charges in the state.

Additionally, the city should request a justification from Marion County that may provide a detailed cost of services analysis that is charged at the incinerator and maybe DECREASE the fees.

I OPPOSE THE RATE INCREASE.

Alicia Wilson
SE Salem Resident

The following testimony relates to agenda item 6.b:

Amy Johnson

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of paiyellow@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2018 8:15 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Contact City Council
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Your Name	Patrice Aiello
Your Email	paiyellow@gmail.com
Your Phone	503-302-1073
Street	6067 PikesPass St SE
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97306
Message	Re: Costco My previous letter of protest is part of the documentation for the decision on October 23rd that I received from the office of Aaron Panko. So , I am not restating that. However I have just learned from a posting on Next Door that further action is possible. I urge you to introduce and pass a motion to assume jurisdiction over any appeals to the City Staff's decision (Case# SPR DAP18-15).

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 11/9/2018.

Amy Johnson

From: Massimo A Battistini <sixfive@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 08, 2018 4:10 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: SPR-DAP18-15

- 1) IF Costco is allowed to move to Kuebler Blvd it will be the first of three potential developments in the I-5 and Kuebler Blvd vicinity totally 82.6 acres of commercial development—more than TWICE the size of the Woodburn Premium Outlets.
- 2) The three projects could include more than 3,000 parking spaces—Costco development has 1,000 parking spaces alone. These developments will draw dense traffic 7 days a week. Originally, PacTrust indicated that there would be no gas stations, now they are proposing over 30 pumps. Adding pollution to our streams.
- 3) Surrounding streets and I-5 interchange will be overwhelmed. Kuebler is already at 85% of its capacity, Costco and the other developments would exceed the parkway's and interchange's capacity.
- 4) The traffic study done by the developers is flawed and inadequate.
- 5) The massive Costco warehouse will impact flooding in local creeks and destroy a grove of more than 80 trees including a white oaks and majestic conifers
- 6) Originally the developer promised the city that this development would be a neighborhood commercial center—NOT a regional commercial center such as Costco that will attract regional traffic from all of Marion and Polk counties.

Massimo Battistini
sixfive@me.com
503.510.1551

Amy Johnson

From: Darla Bell <dancedrill@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 08, 2018 12:33 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: SPR-DAP18-15

Categories: Follow-up

Dear city council,

As a member of this community, homeowner and parent of two children, I urge you to consider moving Costco to another area. The Kuebler road was just widened due to heavy traffic. With all the fires in California and the influx of even more Californians congesting our roads due to them moving here Costco addition will be a nightmare.

The city council is giving the homeowners in the immediate area a sign they don't care about civilians just business. There are plenty of building opportunities on Kuebler on the east side of I-5, move Costco over there.

The current Costco isn't near homes, so why build the new one near them?

IF Costco is allowed to move to Kuebler Blvd it will be the first of three potential developments in the I-5 and Kuebler Blvd vicinity totally 82.6 acres of commercial development—more than TWICE the size of the Woodburn Premium Outlets. 2) The three projects could include more than 3,000 parking spaces—Costco development has 1,000 parking spaces alone. These developments will draw dense traffic 7 days a week. Originally, PacTrust indicated that there would be no gas stations, now they are proposing over 30 pumps. Adding pollution to our streams. 3) Surrounding streets and I-5 interchange will be overwhelmed. Kuebler is already at 85% of its capacity, Costco and the other developments would exceed the parkway's and interchange's capacity. 4) The traffic study done by the developers is flawed and inadequate. 5) The massive Costco warehouse will impact flooding in local creeks and destroy a grove of more than 80 trees including a white oaks and majestic conifers 6) Originally the developer promised the city that this development would be a neighborhood commercial center—NOT a regional commercial center such as Costco that will attract regional traffic from all of Marion and Polk counties.

Thank you,

Darla Bell

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

Amy Johnson

From: Jerry Bennett <outlook_F904C483A15776D3@outlook.com> on behalf of Jerry Bennett <jbestg@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2018 1:55 PM
To: Chuck Bennett; Steve McCoid; citycouncil
Cc: Jackie Leung; Glenn Baly; Tj Sullivan
Subject: FW: Notice of Decision - Case No. SPR-DAP18-15 PART 2 for 2500-2600Block of Boone Rd SE (Costco)

Subject: RE: Info SGNA: Notice of Decision - Case No. SPR-DAP18-15 PART 2 for 2500-2600Block of Boone Rd SE (Costco)

SGNA board members and residents received a condensed summary of issues that may not be sufficiently addressed in the COSTCO developmental plan, with emphasis on Storm Water detention for a Gasoline Station facility. and the required underground storage tankage to support the facility. It appears that sufficient risk exists to warrant the City requiring the developer to perform a downstream capacity analysis of the existing public stormwater system. The consequences of a systems failure in this domaine are so great to pubic safety and area habitat that the matter must be addressed on a timely basis. The liability of likely error would undoubtedly be extremely costly to all parties of interest.

Excerpts from the summary: Review of Site Plan Approval, Applicant fails to identify meeting the standards of Storm Water detention required for a Gasoline Station facility of 32 pumps and the required underground storage tankage to support the facility as located on the submitted plan.

Best Management Practices - Current approaches to treating runoff from Retail Gasoline Outlets (RGO) include isolation of the fuel servicing area to treat VOCs, petroleum hydrocarbons, and oil and grease. The area should not be connected to an infiltration type of BMP because of the potential for soil and groundwater contamination from gasoline.

The plans showing the design of Costco RGO has the Gasoline Station facility integrated with the underground storm water detention system. The underground system creates a potential methodology for Pringle Creek contamination in a fuel spill and a high storm water event.

Detention of Large Project - storm water. The storm water detention requirement:

Stormwater Design Handbook for Developers and Large Projects

Downstream Capacity Analysis

If the receiving public stormwater system has known or suspected flooding or capacity issues, the City may require the developer to perform a downstream capacity analysis of the existing public stormwater system (SAR Chapter 109-004.2(k) and SRC 71). Downstream capacity issues are identified through operational knowledge, flood complaint calls, or the Stormwater Master Plan. The need for downstream capacity analysis will be determined by the City during site plan review process.

Not included in Application: Pringle Creek has shown repeated flooding issues due to upstream development. Downstream analysis would be recommended. This analysis has not been provided.

On site detention and flow control is specified. The proposed application design fails to meet the flow control requirements specified in PWDS 2014 as required. Specifically:

(p) Stormwater Treatment and Flow Control Design Storm Events

(3). Flow Control

A. One -half of the post -development peak runoff rate of the two-year storm must be equal to or less than one-half of the peak runoff rate of the predeveloped two-year, 24-

hour storm; and the peak runoff rate of the post development ten-year, 24-hour storm must be equal to or less than the peak runoff rate of the pre-developed ten-year, 24-hour storm event.

B. All volume-based facilities shall be sized to detain the post-developed 100-year design storm with a release rate no greater than the pre-developed, 100-year design storm.

Applicants innovative underground detention appears to be calculated to detain up to a single 24 hour design storm of 1.38 in of rainfall based upon published data. This is the smallest identified design storm standard by Salem Code standards. As such a 2 or 3 day rainfall event will either backfill the proposed parking lot causing unknown damage to the surrounding residents or flood Pringle Creek with new unknown volumes of water causing damage to down stream residents and businesses.

In addition to the above excerpts, attendees at SGNA meetings continue to express strong concerns about traffic and safety. Have the developers adequately addressed all of the Planning Department's demands? Will residents, customers, and visitors have reasonable and timely access and departure from the area. And, have all of the known developers, present and future, been part of the traffic analysis plan? I have yet to observe any assurances that school bus routes will not be unduly impacted once all of the construction in that congested area is completed. Has the Salem School District advanced its plans for the next elementary and/or secondary school building(s) that will be needed in that area in the near future?

The "Catch 22" for that area is that SE Salem residents appreciate COSTCO (and business, housing, recreational development, etc.) , but the question persists: "Is that the best location for development that far exceeds the initial "Neighborhood Shopping Outlet(s)" presentations?

SGNA sincerely hopes that the City Council will give considerable thought to such matters throughout the pending appeal process(es). Thank you for your time and interest.

Gerald J. Bennett

Jerry Bennett, SGNA board member; resident of Creekside Estates
804 Creekside Drive SE, Salem, OR, 97306
(503) 589 9669; E-Mail: jbestg@comcast.net

Amy Johnson

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of kathleenbuzz@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2018 7:05 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Contact City Council
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Your Name	Kathleen BUSWELL
Your Email	kathleenbuzz@gmail.com
Your Phone	503-910-8079
Street	5226 Snowflake St Se
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97306
Message	<p>Regarding SPR-DAP18-15. PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THIS DEVELOPMENT TO GO THROUGH. There are better places more suitable. 1) IF Costco is allowed to move to Kuebler Blvd it will be the first of three potential developments in the I-5 and Kuebler Blvd vicinity totally 82.6 acres of commercial development—more than TWICE the size of the Woodburn Premium Outlets. 2) The three projects could include more than 3,000 parking spaces—Costco development has 1,000 parking spaces alone. These developments will draw dense traffic 7 days a week. Originally, PacTrust indicated that there would be no gas stations, now they are proposing over 30 pumps. Adding pollution to our streams. 3) Surrounding streets and I-5 interchange will be overwhelmed. Kuebler is already at 85% of its capacity, Costco and the other developments would exceed the parkway's and interchange's capacity. 4) The traffic study done by the developers is flawed and inadequate. 5) The massive Costco warehouse will impact flooding in local creeks and destroy a grove of more than 80 trees including a white oaks and majestic conifers 6) Originally the developer promised the city that this development would be a neighborhood commercial center—NOT a regional commercial center such as Costco that will attract regional traffic from all of Marion and Polk counties.</p>

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 11/9/2018.

Amy Johnson

From: ROGER COAKLEY <COAKTEK2@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2018 9:44 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Costco relocation

Rather than having the appeal heard before a hearings officer, I am asking the City Council to be the final arbiter for this case. So please introduce and pass a motion to assume jurisdiction over any appeals to the City Staff's decision (Case# SPR DAP18-15)

I am against the proposed relocation for the following reasons:

- 1) IF Costco is allowed to move to Kuebler Blvd it will be the first of three potential developments in the I-5 and Kuebler Blvd vicinity totally 82.6 acres of commercial development—more than TWICE the size of the Woodburn Premium Outlets.
- 2) The three projects could include more than 3,000 parking spaces—Costco development has 1,000 parking spaces alone. These developments will draw dense traffic 7 days a week. Originally, PacTrust indicated that there would be no gas stations, now they are proposing over 30 pumps. Adding pollution to our streams.
- 3) Surrounding streets and I-5 interchange will be overwhelmed. Kuebler is already at 85% of its capacity, Costco and the other developments would exceed the parkway's and interchange's capacity.
- 4) The traffic study done by the developers is flawed and inadequate.
- 5) The massive Costco warehouse will impact flooding in local creeks and destroy a grove of more than 80 trees including a white oaks and majestic conifers
- 6) Originally the developer promised the city that this development would be a neighborhood commercial center—NOT a regional commercial center such as Costco that will attract regional traffic from all of Marion and Polk counties.

Amy Johnson

From: Shari Coon <skroetts@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2018 7:12 AM
To: citycouncil; Tom Andersen; Brad Nanke
Cc: Shari Coon
Subject: Object to Costco move to Kuebler Blvd.

Dear Salem City Council,

I am writing to let you know that I am against the proposed development planned for Kuebler and I-5. This includes allowing Costco to move their location to this piece of property.

We have reviewed the traffic study, which is not accurate for including the massive amount of increased car and truck traffic to this planned development. We understand that this zoning change to allow commercial development was made years before we bought our home. We also understand that the approval for this zoning change did not factor in a Costco nor gas pumps. In addition, there will be a loss of old oak trees, flooding in local creeks, and other environmental losses. I am so disturbed that this "plan" has even went this far.

Again, we are not in support of the planned development. I recommend getting feedback like the City of Salem did for the Riverfront Park development, downtown landscape changes, etc. Why can't this be done?

Shari Coon

Amy Johnson

From: Veronica Cramer <veronica17cramer@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 10, 2018 7:54 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: SPR-DAP18-15

To our city council,

My family is writing you to plead with you to pass a motion to assume jurisdiction over any appeals to the City Staff's decision.

Surrounding streets and I-5 interchange will be overwhelmed. Kuebler is already at 85% of its capacity, Costco and the other developments would exceed the parkway's and interchange's capacity.

We live in the Cambridge neighborhood and already experience people who drive through our neighborhood to avoid the backup on Kuebler during peak traffic and even just to bypass the light so they can get to Battlecreek faster. Drivers don't follow the speed limit even with all our kids outside playing. It's already stressful as it is without stop signs. We have a beautiful neighborhood with big driveways and front yards but we can't let the children play because of the cars that go flying through here. What more if Costco comes into Kuebler. It's not a good idea. It's not good for South Salem. Costco needs to stay where they are or find another location.

Please listen to our local community here.

Thank you,
Cramer Family

Amy Johnson

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of Anaid1105@gmail.com
Sent: Sunday, November 11, 2018 11:39 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Contact City Council
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Your Name	Diana Lynn Phillips
Your Email	Anaid1105@gmail.com
Street	1884 Skyline Ct S
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97306
Message	Please stop Costco from destroying our south salem area. Traffic is already congested, trying to get from our homes to the freeway is at a stand still now. Costco is a mega shopping center. Putting in 35 gas pumps, estimated 3000 parking spots will flood our community. We have Costco already at hawthorne, Albany and Wilsonville. We dont need more Costco. Please we live near the freeway. There is no way we can handle this traffic. It will be unlivable on our streets Thank you for stopping this development.

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 11/11/2018.

Amy Johnson

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of dmdobay@gmail.com
Sent: Saturday, November 10, 2018 6:00 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Contact City Council
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Your Name	Dianna Dobay
Your Email	dmdobay@gmail.com
Your Phone	5034094193
Street	2245 Songbird Ct SE
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97306
Message	<p>Re: New Costco Site (Case# SPR DAP18-15) Jurisdiction over the appeals for the above mentioned case needs to be moved to the council! This case will have such a large impact on the community surrounding this proposed site. Within a mile and a half of the site is at least 3 schools, two of which are elementary. There are also many parks that families and children frequent, as well as countless lovely bike and walking routes. The additional traffic this new proposal will bring will annihilate the beauty of these attractions and squander the community. Additionally, my neighbors have brought up the following points on our community website: Here are some points you can use in an email: • IF Costco is allowed to move to Kuebler Blvd it will be the first of three potential developments in the I-5 and Kuebler Blvd vicinity totally 82.6 acres of commercial development—more than TWICE the size of the Woodburn Premium Outlets. • The three projects could include more than 3,000 parking spaces—Costco development has 1,000 parking spaces alone. These developments will draw dense traffic 7 days a week. Originally, Pactrust indicated that there would be no gas stations, now they are proposing over 30 pumps. Adding pollution to our streams. • Surrounding streets and I-5 interchange will be overwhelmed. Kuebler is already at 85% of its capacity, Costco and the other developments would exceed the parkway's and interchange's capacity. • The traffic study done by the developers has been declared flawed by ODOT and City needs to require a new traffic study taking into account all proposed developments in the area. • The massive Costco warehouse will impact flooding in local creeks and destroy a grove of more than 80 trees including a white oaks and majestic conifers. • Originally the developer promised the city that this development would be a neighborhood commercial center—NOT a regional commercial center such as Costco that will attract regional traffic from all of Marion and Polk counties. Please hear our pleas to stop this new development that will ruin our neighborhoods. Dianna Dobay</p>

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 11/10/2018.

Amy Johnson

From: Joanne Domogalla <jdomo@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2018 2:52 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Case#SPR DAP18-15

Dear City Council,

Please stop Costco from destroying our South Salem area. Traffic is already congested, trying to get from our homes to the freeway is at a standstill now. Costco is a mega shopping center. Putting in 35 gas pumps, estimated 3000 parking spots will flood our community. We have Costco already at Hawthorne, Albany and Wilsonville. We don't need more Costco's.

We live near Sumter School/ Sprague out South, and our only way to the freeway will be right by Costco. There is no way Kuebler and our other arteries will be able to handle this traffic. This will bring so much congestion.

It also seems that there will be 3 other potential developments in this area covering 82.6 acres. Which brings up the removal of an oak stand and the impact on the environment to that area.

The developer originally said that the development would be a neighborhood commercial center, not a mega regional center.

We are asking that the city council do something to stop this development. We do not want Costco here.

Thank you for time and listening.

Best regards,

Joanne & Steve Domogalla

Amy Johnson

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of bndeaquinto@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, November 08, 2018 11:03 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Contact City Council
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Categories: Follow-up

Your Name	Bill Eaquinto
Your Email	bndeaquinto@gmail.com
Your Phone	5034806980
Street	1865 Wickshire Ave S E
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97302
Message	<p>Request to introduce and pass a motion to assume jurisdiction over any appeals to the City Staff's decision (Case# SPR DAP18-15) I would like to ask that Costco development be denied due to the following reasons: 1) IF Costco is allowed to move to Kuebler Blvd it will be the first of three potential developments in the I-5 and Kuebler Blvd vicinity totally 82.6 acres of commercial development—more than TWICE the size of the Woodburn Premium Outlets. 2) The three projects could include more than 3,000 parking spaces—Costco development has 1,000 parking spaces alone. These developments will draw dense traffic 7 days a week. Originally, PacTrust indicated that there would be no gas stations, now they are proposing over 30 pumps. Adding pollution to our streams. 3) Surrounding streets and I-5 interchange will be overwhelmed. Kuebler is already at 85% of its capacity, Costco and the other developments would exceed the parkway's and interchange's capacity creating gridlock and congestion that is unreasonable. Also additional traffic will flow through the surrounding subdivisions like Cambridge and others creating a safety risk to our children. 4) The traffic study done by the developers is flawed, inadequate, outdated and does not take into account the impacts on neighborhoods in the South Salem area. 5) The massive Costco warehouse will impact flooding in local creeks and destroy a grove of more than 80 trees including a white oaks and majestic conifers. 6) Originally the developer promised the city that this development would be a neighborhood commercial center—NOT a regional commercial center such as Costco that will attract regional traffic from all of Marion and Polk counties.</p>

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 11/8/2018.

Amy Johnson

From: hiddencreek3 <hiddencreek3@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2018 2:33 PM
To: Steve McCoid
Cc: citycouncil
Subject: Proposed Costco Construction in SE Salem off Kuebler

We have been out of town and understand that this is the last day to send comments on to you about the Costco proposed construction off Kuebler in SE Salem. We have voiced our opinion to others; but, we feel it is important to contact you, also—Steve as the Ward 4 representative and the Council as a body. The Salem Planning Commission did not seem to take all of our concerns seriously, so we are asking you, Steve, or any member of the Council to introduce and get passed a motion to assume jurisdiction over any appeals to the City Staff's decision (case # SPR-DAP18-15). We would like the City Council to be the final arbiter in this matter; and, we would hope that you would look into the proposal in more depth than the Salem Planning Commission did. The quality of life of your constituents must count for something. We live in a series of neighborhoods surrounding the proposed site for Costco. On that property now is a medical clinic and a couple of other small businesses. The remaining parcels were to be for other small businesses that would fit into our whole area. There was no mention of a Costco type development when the whole development of the parcel was proposed. We already have very heavy traffic on Kuebler during commute times—the main way off of I-5 that our many hundreds of people take going and coming from work each day. Whomever did the traffic survey and indicated Kuebler could accommodate the additional Costco traffic was wrong—there will be deadlock and extreme noise in our neighborhoods all of the time. It is not just the Costco traffic—there are 2 other huge projects going on now off Kuebler, right by the proposed Costco site—a 3 story assisted care facility and a large plot of new homes—add that traffic into the total. The total number of parking spaces (and thus cars) will exceed Woodburn Mall (in a quiet, peaceful neighborhood, no less). Has anyone even driven around our area to see what it is like? We, for example, live in a very peaceful development within the neighborhood called Woodscape Glen. It is a wooded, garden community located just off Boone and Battlecreek (across the street from the parcel that Costco would go in). We have native plants and huge trees and chipmunks, squirrels, birds, and a deer once in a while—our streets are really narrow paved paths. Does this sound like the type of place that should be next to Costco? The houses directly across from the Costco site would have constant noise; and, like us, would find it about impossible to get out from their streets to go toward Kuebler or Commercial. We are not against having a Costco at this end of town; but, there is no need to ruin our neighborhood to do that. There are many parcels of land on the other side of I-5 off Kuebler, which would be much better suited to that type of project. If you drove out this way and went just past Bonaventure on the east side of I-5, you would be able to see a number of parcels of land which would be appropriate (and which would be easy access for customers coming off I-5). We would appreciate you looking into this in depth and taking the time to really assess the impact on our whole SE area. As we said, quality of life for your citizens has to be a priority; and, there certainly are other options. Thank you for your consideration!

Jackie Rice and Karen Eason
2411 Wintercreek Way SE
Salem, OR 97306
Hiddencreek3@gmail.com

Amy Johnson

From: DOUGLAS A FARRIS <DBFARRIS62@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2018 2:57 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Appealing Costco Development

Dear City Council,

We are writing in regard to Case# SPR DAP 18-15 and the proposed Costco Development. We are very much opposed to the proposed Costco development and the possible additional development right next door to it. We have lived in South Salem for 20 years, at 5046 Riley Ct., a nice quiet neighborhood which would have the huge Costco building backed up to our street. People in our neighborhood do not want a huge commercial center at this location! The Salem Clinic has a low profile quiet office at the corner of Boone and BattleCreek. They are great neighbors! Couldn't something similar be considered for this location? When we moved to Riley Court our understanding was this land would be residential. I think that was before PacTrust bought the land.

There are several reasons that this is not a well-thought out plan:

1. The traffic on Kuebler, 27th, Boone Rd and BattleCreek. We know what it is like to use the I-5/Kuebler interchange. How could the additional traffic on all of these streets be managed?
2. The huge trucks delivering daily every kind of goods to supply such a huge retail store will be noisy and bothersome to all who live nearby.
3. The Gas station that is proposed is huge (as is the gas station at the Costco on Mission) and would have a constant flow of traffic. Sorry, that is not a good idea!
4. The many acres of paved parking will create drainage issues. In addition we would be losing several big oak trees and fir trees. Also, we would have a huge amount of lighting day and night!
5. Across the freeway at the Mill Creek land there is lots of room and no residential area to consider. Wouldn't that be a good option?

We ask, is it worth it to OK an enormous development at the entrance to a quiet, desirable South Salem residential area, where most people are not in favor of having it? We believe the answer is "NO."

Thank you for considering our perspective.

Sincerely,
Doug and Beverly Farris

Amy Johnson

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of tlkeuler@msn.com
Sent: Thursday, November 08, 2018 6:45 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Contact City Council
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Your Name	Tracy Keuler
Your Email	tlkeuler@msn.com
Your Phone	503-391-7777
Street	Rees hill rd se
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97306
Message	I'm excited to have Costco come to South Salem! I totally support it!

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 11/8/2018.

Amy Johnson

From: Kathleen Kolman <kathleenkolman@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 07, 2018 11:24 AM
To: Aaron Panko; Chuck Bennett; citycouncil
Subject: Costco

Categories: Follow-up

To all decision-making parties,

The decision to approve the move of Costco is an extremely poor one for Salem. It is so disappointing that the many dissenting voices of the concerned neighborhoods were essentially ignored. The conditions proposed to solve problems are ludicrous, and I implore you to reconsider them.

#1 - replacing magnificent hundred year old oaks with tiny twigs that will take a hundred years to reach the same size is laughable, though it actually makes me want to cry.

#2 - putting in bike racks to make the area appear bike friendly is also laughable. When is the last time you saw someone leaving Costco with items that would fit on a bike? No one wants to ride their bike to Costco. People want to ride their bikes from the south Salem neighborhoods north into town, and the increased traffic will make that hazardous.

#3 - a landscape berm to hide the monstrosity of a Costco wall from the homes across the street. Really? How would you like a Costco across the street from your home?

#4 - traffic engineers stating that traffic will not be impacted is preposterous. Why do people hate to go to Costco now? Because cars are unable to move since there are way too many of them. It is utterly unfair for our neighborhood to be burdened with clogged traffic every day, all day. Leaving and returning to our homes will be a nightmare.

#5 - quality of life - no neighborhood should have a big box store, not to mention a huge gas station, bringing noise and pollution right next door.

#6 - the current Costco will be yet another abandoned eyesore on Mission Street.

I could go on. This space could be so well used. The businesses that have already gone in are an asset to the neighborhood. A restaurant, small grocery store, other small retail stores, and more would be similar assets. They could be situated in a way that the existing trees would be an asset, and the neighborhood would not be negatively impacted.

We implore you to reconsider this terrible decision!

Rick and Kathleen Kercheski

Amy Johnson

From: Adele Koltun <akoltun64@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2018 9:44 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Costco in a Residential Area

I am astounded you would approve the location of a huge regional box store and gas station in my neighborhood. I could not believe you had the audacity to say there would be no traffic impact on this area. Certainly you've all gone to the current Costco which is always a traffic nightmare... both the store and gas station are packed with cars all day. The proposed store and gas are much larger. They're open seven days a week...I suggest you live across a two lane road from this proposed store and consider the endless traffic, noise etc.of land plummeting value of your home. To say thousands of cars will not negatively impact our area is not only untrue but says you don't care about the people you are supposed to represent. Corporations should not be your priority.
Thank you for your consideration.

Adele Koltun

Sent from my iPhone

Amy Johnson

From: judi morris <morris_judi@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2018 7:11 AM
To: citycouncil
Cc: glennbaly12345@gmail.com
Subject: Costco Project DAP 18-15

Please introduce and pass a motion to assume jurisdiction over any appeals to the City Staff's decision (Case #SPR DAP18-15).

Please consider these issues:

- If Costco is allowed to move to Kuebler Blvd, it will be the first of three potential developments in the I-5 and Kuebler Blvd vicinity, totaling 82.6 acres of commercial development—more than twice the size of the Woodburn Premium Outlets.
- The three projects could include more than 3,000 parking spaces—Costco has 1,000 spaces alone. These developments will draw dense traffic 7 days a week. Originally, Pactrust indicated that there would be no gas station. Now they are proposing over 30 pumps. All of these would increase the potential for pollution to our streams.
- Surrounding streets and the I-5 interchange will be overwhelmed. Kuebler is already at 85% of its capacity. Costco and the other developments would exceed the capacity of the parkway and the interchange.
- The traffic study done by the developers has been determined flawed by ODOT, and the City needs to require a new traffic study taking into account all proposed developments in the area.
- The massive Costco warehouse will impact flooding in local creeks and destroy a grove of more than 80 trees including white oaks and majestic conifers.
- Originally the developer promised the city that this development would be a neighborhood commercial center—NOT a regional commercial center such as Costco that will attract regional traffic from all of Marion and Polk counties.

Thank you,
Judi Morris
Ward 4
5213 9th CT SE
503 931-1329

Amy Johnson

From: Michelle Phillips <michellemalloryphillips@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2018 8:12 PM
To: citycouncil; Brad Nanke
Subject: Case# SPR DAP18-15

I'm writing to request the City Council introduce and pass a motion to assume jurisdiction over any appeals to to the City Staff's decision regarding Case# SPR DAP18-15. We live in the Cambridge Neighborhood (Ward 3) and our entire neighborhood is very concerned about this development. We were hoping to have a nice neighborhood shopping area, not a regional commercial center such as Costco. A development this large needs to be decided by the Mayor and City Council.

Thank you,
Michelle Phillips
4915 Chauncey Ct SE, Salem, OR 97302

Amy Johnson

From: Nathaniel Price <nprice@earthlink.net>
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2018 10:10 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Costco in South Salem SPR-DAP18-15

To whom it may concern

Re: SPR-DAP18-15

I'm writing to request the City Council file a motion to assume jurisdiction over the appeals regarding Costco moving to south Salem. A decision this big needs to be decided by residents of Salem and not someone from Portland.

There are many flaws with locating the Costco in South Salem. To start with, you are putting a warehouse in a residential neighborhood. There is plenty of warehouse space east of I-5 where it is more appropriate. The addition of Costco in this location will also significantly disrupt traffic flow into the immediate neighborhoods as well as access to neighborhoods further along Kuebler. Traffic is already a mess during peak time, it will be even worse and Kuebler will fail daily. Significant public funds were spent to improve the mobility on Kuebler. Placing Costco in this location will make that public investment meaningless.

Please consider the impact on the surrounding residential neighborhood when you consider placing a warehouse right next door. The added traffic from Costco into the surrounding neighborhoods will make the livability that we enjoy disappear.

Think about it...would you really want to live right next to a Costco. Development in this neighborhood shopping and commercial development should be consistent with the surrounding residential neighborhoods.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Nathaniel Price

Sent from my iPhone

Amy Johnson

From: Julie Reis <reis7911@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 08, 2018 7:54 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Case# SPR DAP18-15

Dear City Council,

I plead with you to read this email with an understanding this is coming from a person who vote regularly and I do not agree with the idea of having Costco being located in south Salem. Here are the reasons below. Thank you.

Julie Reis

Case# SPR DAP18-15

- 1) IF Costco is allowed to move to Kuebler Blvd it will be the first of three potential developments in the I-5 and Kuebler Blvd vicinity totally 82.6 acres of commercial development—more than TWICE the size of the Woodburn Premium Outlets.
- 2) The three projects could include more than 3,000 parking spaces—Costco development has 1,000 parking spaces alone. These developments will draw dense traffic 7 days a week. Originally, PacTrust indicated that there would be no gas stations, now they are proposing over 30 pumps. Adding pollution to our streams.
- 3) Surrounding streets and I-5 interchange will be overwhelmed. Kuebler is already at 85% of its capacity, Costco and the other developments would exceed the parkway's and interchange's capacity.
- 4) The traffic study done by the developers is flawed and inadequate.
- 5) The massive Costco warehouse will impact flooding in local creeks and destroy a grove of more than 80 trees including a white oaks and majestic conifers
- 6) Originally the developer promised the city that this development would be a neighborhood commercial center—NOT a regional commercial center such as Costco that will attract regional traffic from all of Marion and Polk counties.

Amy Johnson

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of papolee@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2018 2:25 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Contact City Council
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Your Name	Lee Rosen
Your Email	papolee@comcast.net
Your Phone	3609511371
Street	4990 Albion CT SE
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97302
Message	Many of my neighbors are not happy with the proposed move by Costco. I do not agree. I see this as a positive for the area. Thank you, Lee Rosen

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 11/9/2018.

Amy Johnson

From: Carolyn Schleufer <all.i.am.is.yours@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2018 3:37 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: SPR DAP18-15 SUPPORTING COSTCO

Thank you so much for listening to those of us that live in South Salem and will face the changes directly... We WANT Costco to move to the new location! What a blessing and great impact for our community as a whole! I couldn't be more supportive of this wonderful change!

As many know, those in opposition tend to be the noisiest about their opinion, but I truly believe, based on everyone that I've talked to and all the posts and comments in reply to opposition, that the majority is most certainly FOR Costco moving in to our neighborhood.

What a fantastic opportunity to create work, bring needed shopping and fuel as well as improvements to the area.

Please, support and allow Costco to transition to the proposed new location.

Thank you,
Carolyn Schleufer

Amy Johnson

From: A S <heedthefool@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 08, 2018 9:07 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: SPR-DAP18-15

Hello,

I am writing to urge the city council to to introduce and pass a motion to assume jurisdiction over any appeals to the City Staff's decision in Case# SPR DAP18-15. A development this large with a huge impact on South Salem needs to be decided by the Mayor and City Council.

The points no doubt being made by many of my neighbors, I am in full agreement with, including:

- 1) IF Costco is allowed to move to Kuebler Blvd it will be the first of three potential developments in the I-5 and Kuebler Blvd vicinity totally 82.6 acres of commercial development—more than TWICE the size of the Woodburn Premium Outlets.
- 2) The three projects could include more than 3,000 parking spaces—Costco development has 1,000 parking spaces alone. These developments will draw dense traffic 7 days a week. Originally, PacTrust indicated that there would be no gas stations, now they are proposing over 30 pumps. Adding pollution to our streams.
- 3) Surrounding streets and I-5 interchange will be overwhelmed. Kuebler is already at 85% of its capacity, Costco and the other developments would exceed the parkway's and interchange's capacity.
- 4) The traffic study done by the developers is flawed and inadequate.
- 5) The massive Costco warehouse will impact flooding in local creeks and destroy a grove of more than 80 trees including a white oaks and majestic conifers
- 6) Originally the developer promised the city that this development would be a neighborhood commercial center—NOT a regional commercial center such as Costco that will attract regional traffic from all of Marion and Polk counties.

Thank you,

Alison Shields
Salem Resident
Southampton Dr. SE

Amy Johnson

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of sheribear@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, November 07, 2018 9:38 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Contact City Council
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Your Name	Sheri Siddall
Your Email	sheribear@comcast.net
Your Phone	503-585-3433
Street	2784 Cindercone Ct SE
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97306
Message	<p>Re: Case# SPR DAP18-15 Good evening, I am writing to let you know that not all neighbors of the Kuebler development with Costco as the anchor are opposed to it. I live very close to this property and don't feel that we have been misled or that the developer has gone outside of the original scope of the project that was approved many years ago. We have lived in our house for 24 years and have seen lots of changes to south Salem, lots of the people that are opposed are in newer developments that weren't even thought of when we moved here. The building of their homes was just as "invasive" to the pristine area that was once just Boone Rd east/west. Kuebler was built with the plan to grow the south area into a vibrant part of town with its own business base. Now that that is happening there is an outcry. Please consider carefully what south Salem is going to be if we don't bring in a support base of businesses and just keep building more houses. Thank you, Sheri Siddall</p>

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 11/7/2018.

Amy Johnson

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of jlwhome18@msn.com
Sent: Thursday, November 08, 2018 7:04 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Contact City Council
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Your Name	Jennifer Watkins
Your Email	jlwhome18@msn.com
Your Phone	9712186044
Street	5166 Cultus Ct SE
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97306
Message	<p>Dear City Council member, I'm writing to ask you to introduce and pass a motion to assume jurisdiction over any appeals to the City Staff's decision (Case# SPR DAP18-15) in regards to the development on Kuebler and 27th. I use the intersection at Kuebler and 27th on a daily basis. Even with Kuebler road widening, there are times of the day when traffic is backed up on Kuebler from the I-5 interchange, beyond the 27th Street intersection. Currently we have a neighborhood development and a retirement center going in. Neither project is currently finished and this intersection is already overwhelmed during busy times of the day. I understand Kuebler is already at 85% of its capacity, Costco and the other developments would exceed the parkway's and interchange's capacity. I have heard the traffic study done by the developers is flawed and inadequate. Our current traffic problem can attest to that. Originally the developer promised the city that this development would be a neighborhood commercial center—NOT a regional commercial center such as Costco that will attract regional traffic from all of Marion and Polk counties. This is NOT what we agreed to! Finally, part of the reason we love South Salem so much is the proximity to I-5 and other businesses, yet it keeps its rural feel. A massive Costco warehouse will impact flooding in local creeks and destroy a grove of more than 80 trees including a white oaks and majestic conifers. Please. We need your help to save the integrity of our local community. Thank you Jennifer Watkins South Salem Foxhaven area neighbor</p>

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 11/8/2018.

Amy Johnson

From: WD Smith <wdsmith39@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2018 11:01 AM
To: citycouncil; Chuck Bennett
Subject: Case# SPR DAP18-15

The Mayor and the City Council must intervene on this decision. The Planning Department Staff can look at the technical issues but they do not make judgments related to the impact this decision will have on the residents of South Salem.

Mr. Mayor and City Council Members we need your help to stop this.

The one million square foot Amazon Fulfillment Center on Kuebler Blvd and Lancaster Drive is scheduled to open this Fall. Several hundred more cars will traverse Kuebler Blvd and the Interstate 5 Interchange onto Kuebler. Additionally, several hundred more trucks will be delivering and picking up Amazon goods every day. Read about the effect an Amazon Fulfillment Center had on Robbinsville New Jersey. We can do nothing about the Amazon effect on Kuebler Blvd and the surrounding roads and neighborhoods. We can do something about the proposed Costco facility on Kuebler Blvd.

Amazon's mega warehouse gridlocks traffic in N.J. towns

Updated December 2, 2015 at 12:36 PM; Posted December 1, 2015 at 6:08 PM

By [Cristina Rojas](#)
crojas@njadvancemedia.com,
For NJ.com

UPDATE: N.J. mayor vows to sue Amazon over warehouse traffic gridlock

ROBBINSVILLE -- The holiday rush is underway at Amazon's 1.2 million-square-foot fulfillment center in Robbinsville.

Bins full of orders move along 14 miles of conveyor belts, but outside, traffic grinds to a halt for miles when more than 4,000 employees are going in and out during rush hour.

"Since this holiday season, it's gotten horrendous," said Debbie Lange, whose Lynwood Estates neighborhood in Upper Freehold bears the brunt of the traffic gridlock. "It's really bad."

School buses get caught up in the traffic, kids who drive to school arrive late and it has become nearly impossible to get in and out of the neighborhood that sits across the street from the Gordon Road entrance.

Lange said the drive to Allentown High School would normally take four minutes but is now a half-hour.

Another resident, Robert Lerman, said it can take as long as 40 minutes to move three-quarters of a mile. When his wife drops off their sons at sports practice, a 10-minute round trip has now become a 35- to 40-minute drive.

"This could be solved if they would move the shifts, but they've got it right in the middle of rush hour when people are trying to go to work or come home," he said.

"The quality of life has been destroyed."

The proposed Costco Facility on Kuebler Blvd and Battle Creek Road and adjacent commercial development will move the traffic from Hawthorne Avenue SE, SR 22 and I-5 to Battle Creek Road, Kuebler Blvd and I-5 on top of the hundreds of Amazon cars and hundreds of trucks servicing the Amazon Facility. Do we want the "quality of our lives" destroyed? Contact the City Planning Office and the City Council to register your concerns. Costco on Kuebler is not a done deal in spite of what Costco Management might think.

SAY NO TO COSTCO ON KUEBLER BLVD!

Amy Johnson

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of song1mom@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2018 7:47 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Contact City Council
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Your Name	Linda Wheeler
Your Email	song1mom@yahoo.com
Your Phone	5039997842
Street	5466 Sugar Plum St SE
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97306
Message	<p>Please introduce and pass a motion to assume jurisdiction over any appeals to the City Staff's decision (Case# SPR DAP18-15) Pertaining to the relocation of Costco store to 27th and Kuebler:</p> <p>1) IF Costco is allowed to move to Kuebler Blvd it will be the first of three potential developments in the I-5 and Kuebler Blvd vicinity totally 82.6 acres of commercial development—more than TWICE the size of the Woodburn Premium Outlets. 2) The three projects could include more than 3,000 parking spaces—Costco development has 1,000 parking spaces alone. These developments will draw dense traffic 7 days a week. Originally, PacTrust indicated that there would be no gas stations, now they are proposing over 30 pumps. Adding pollution to our streams. 3) Surrounding streets and I-5 interchange will be overwhelmed. Kuebler is already at 85% of its capacity, Costco and the other developments would exceed the parkway's and interchange's capacity. 4) The traffic study done by the developers is flawed and inadequate. 5) The massive Costco warehouse will impact flooding in local creeks and destroy a grove of more than 80 trees including a white oaks and majestic conifers 6) Originally the developer promised the city that this development would be a neighborhood commercial center—NOT a regional commercial center such as Costco that will attract regional traffic from all of Marion and Polk counties. Thanks for your help.</p>

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 11/9/2018.

Amy Johnson

From: Bill <willisw2001@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2018 4:30 PM
To: citycouncil; Aaron Panko; Glenn Baly
Subject: Costco (case SPR DAP 18)
Attachments: Panko.ltr.docx; Costco trip comparison2.xlsx

Mayor Bennett and Councilors,

In support of the appeal to the Costco relocation being filed by the South Gateway Neighborhood Association, I am attaching my Sept. 12 letter to Aaron Panko and accompanying spreadsheet. I believe that the traffic engineers, Kittelson and Assoc., have seriously underestimated the traffic impacts of this large development to Kuebler Blvd., I-5, and neighborhood streets. Thank you for your consideration.

Bill Worcester
1935 Wickshire Ave. SE

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

September 12, 2018

Aaron Panko, Case Manager

City of Salem

Subj: Proposed Costco Relocation (Case# SPR DAP 18-15)

Dear Mr. Panko:

In light of the proposed location of a new 168,550-square-foot Costco, along with other retail developments, near the intersection of 27th and Kuebler, my wife and I attended the open house held near the site on June 19. I was subsequently able to obtain a copy of the Kittelson & Assoc. traffic impact analysis (TIA).

I am not a traffic engineer, but I am a retired Marion County engineer and public works director with 30 years of experience dealing with land use and traffic issues. My impression from a conversation with the Kittelson representative at the open house, reinforced by reviewing the TIA, is that Kittelson's analysis seriously underestimates the new trips to be attracted by this large-scale project. Google helped me to find five other Costco TIA's, three done by Kittelson and two by other consultants. Boiling the typically massive document down to some basic numbers, I believe Kittelson is underestimating trip generation by 33% to 50%. The attached spreadsheet shows how I reached this conclusion.

1. The TIA estimates new Costco net daily trips ("net" excludes pass-by and intra-site trips) at 7,210 and weekday pm peak hour trips at 1,198. Daily trips thus equal 6 times peak hour trips. However, in the other five studies, daily trips average 12.1 x peak hour trips. Applying that ratio to the Costco TIA, net daily trips should be $12.1 \times 1,198 = 14,496$ trips, DOUBLE Kittelson's estimate.
2. From another angle, the TIA estimates net daily trips at 43 per 1,000 square feet (ksf) of building area. The other five studies average 64 trips per ksf. Applying that ratio to the Costco TIA, net daily trips should be $168.55 \text{ ksf} \times 64 = 10,787$, an increase of 3,577 trips over Kittelson's estimate. Kittelson's number is 33% low by this measure.

Other concerns include the narrow focus of the TIA to the immediate area of the Costco site. It ignores additional cut-through traffic in the south end of the Morningside neighborhood where we live, and possibly the South Gateway neighborhood as well, when Kuebler Blvd.

and/or Battlecreek Rd. inevitably become more congested, especially at morning and evening commute hours. Our personal interest is the already high volume of cut-through traffic using the Boone/Kinsington/Wickshire/Southampton corridor as an alternate to Kuebler between Commercial St. and Battlecreek Rd. The Boone/Kinsington/Wickshire/Chauncey/Webster corridor is also the only route for much of Morningside neighborhood traffic to access Kuebler and Commercial. Look at a map and you can see why I refer to this as a 'funnel' route to our neighbors to the north of Wickshire.

The TIA takes a piecemeal approach, looking at Costco in isolation. It ignores the cumulative impact of Costco plus two adjacent regional shopping centers, plus the existing and future businesses on the site, plus the million-square-foot Amazon distribution center off Aumsville Highway, plus the huge retirement facility under construction to the south of the Costco site, and hundreds of new and proposed apartments and subdivisions now in the development process. All this combined portends gridlock on Battlecreek and Kuebler, and unacceptable cut-through traffic on our neighborhood streets.

The TIA does not address the increased difficulty south Morningside residents will face in accessing Battlecreek Rd. when it becomes a major thoroughfare leading to Costco and the adjacent shopping centers. The intersections with Sunland, Gladmar, Independence, Southampton, and Forsythe all have limited sight distance looking north and south along Battlecreek, due to hills and curves. It is already a challenge to enter Battlecreek safely, due to steadily increasing traffic and excessive speeds many vehicles travel on Battlecreek. We may need a signal at one of these intersections (Independence?) by build-out of the proposed developments to make access onto Battlecreek reasonably convenient and safe.

While the TIA touches on the functionality of the I-5/Kuebler interchange, it is clearly Costco's intent to draw shoppers from the region, not just Salem. The two adjacent shopping centers are also labeled "regional." The regional traffic impacts on the interchange and Kuebler itself need further analysis and probably additional mitigating measures to insure an acceptable level of service in this already busy locale.

To sum up, I submit there is a solid case for requiring Kittelson to revisit their trip generation numbers for Costco and all affected mitigation measures. Understating new daily trips by 33% to 50% is a serious flaw with implications for many other assumptions and findings throughout the study, and therefore undercuts the scope of mitigation measures that should be

required in the immediate Costco vicinity, along Kuebler and Battlecreek within a reasonable radius. It also downplays impacts of spill-over traffic using neighborhood streets to avoid congested arterials that should provide efficient access to the proposed regional shopping developments. Any TIA produced by professional traffic engineers should be based on realistic assumptions for the type and size of the development, and accurately project its true impacts on the surrounding area and existing infrastructure.

While it's probably safe to assume the Costco relocation is a done deal at this point, the residents of our impacted neighborhoods deserve a TIA that objectively addresses issues that directly affect our quality of life, and proposes mitigations sufficient to limit impacts as much as possible. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions, and thank you for your attention to this matter of great concern to us and our neighbors here in south Morningside.

Respectfully,
Bill Worcester
1935 Wickshire Ave SE
503-371-9293
willisw2001@aol.com

Attach: Trip Comparison Spreadsheet

C: Mayor Chuck Bennett
City Council Members
Pamela Schmidling, Chair, Morningside Neighborhood
Glenn Baly, Chair, South Gateway Neighborhood
Dan & Kathy Reid

COSTCO TRIP GENERATION COMPARISON 2										
					Weekday					
<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>TIA Consultant</u>	<u>TIA date</u>	<u>Store Size (SF)</u>	<u>PM Peak hour trips</u>	<u>PM peak hr trips/kSF</u>	<u>Daily net new trips</u>	<u>Daily net trips/ peak hr trips</u>	<u>New daily trips/kSF</u>	<u>Pass-by trips</u>
Salem Costco + gas	27th/Kuepbler	Kittelson & Assoc	5/31/2018	168,550	1,198	7.1	7,210	6.0	43	30-34%
Costco + gas	Elk Grove CA	Kittelson & Assoc	2/2016	150,548	1,076	7.1	10,978	10.2	73	Excluded
Costco + 24 gas pumps	Central Point OR	Kittelson & Assoc	10/2015	160,000	900	5.6	10,670	11.9	67	7-15%*
Costco + gas	E Vancouver WA	Kittelson & Assoc	10/2009	154,700	417	2.7	6,158	14.8	40	34-35%
Costco +12 gas pumps	Ukiah CA	W-Trans	6/2012	148,000	700	4.7	11,204	16.0	76	37%
Costco + gas	San Marcos CA	RBF Consulting	9/2009	<u>148,200</u>	<u>1,186</u>	<u>8.0</u>	<u>9,248</u>	<u>7.8</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>22%</u>
			Averages for 5 TIAs	152,290	856	5.6	9,652	12.1	64	25-27%
									*30-35% typical for Costco	
CONCLUSIONS:	1) Kittelson underestimates new Costco daily trips by 33% to 50% (3,577 to 7,286 trips). Understating new trips makes it easy to downplay/ignore traffic impacts on surrounding neighborhoods and existing infrastructure (eg. I-5/Kuebler interchange), and minimizes improvements required to maintain acceptable levels of service.									
	>The TIA estimates new Costco net daily trips at 6.0 x weekday pm peak hour trips ; the average of 5 other studies is 12.1 x weekday pm peak hour trips. By this measure, new Costco net daily trips should be 1,198 x 12.1 = 14,496 = 7,286 more than Kittelson's 7,210 estimate.									
	>The TIA estimates new Costco net daily trips at 43 per 1,000 square feet (kSF) ; the average of 5 other studies is 64 trips per kSF.									
	By this measure, new Costco net daily trips should be 168.55 kSF x 64 trips/kSF = 10,787 = 3,577 more than Kittelson's 7,210 estimate.									
	2) The TIA does not address increased cut-through traffic in the South Gateway and Morningside neighborhoods when Kuebler and/or Battle Creek inevitably back up more at peak hours than they do already.									
	3) The TIA does not address increased difficulty of south Morningside residents in accessing Battle Creek Rd. when it becomes a main thoroughfare to Costco. The intersections with Sunland, Gladmar, Independence, Southampton, and Forsythe all have reduced sight distance north and south along Battle Creek, due to hills and curves, exacerbated by excessive speeds many vehicles travel on Battle Creek. We may need a signal at one of the intersections (Independence?) to make access onto Battle Creek by south Morningside residents reasonably convenient and safe.									
	4) The TIA takes a piecemeal approach to traffic impacts , addressing Costco in isolation and not the cumulative impact of Costco + two adjacent regional shopping centers + the existing businesses on site + the million SF Amazon distribution center + the retirement facility now under construction + hundreds of apartment units and single-family residences now in the land use approval/development process.									

The following testimony relates to agenda item 7.2a:

Amy Johnson

From: Dennis A. Brown <dbrown@capitolcitydoorinc.com>
Sent: Monday, November 12, 2018 10:46 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Paper versus plastic bags

I am opposed to the City of Salem council mandating to Salem merchants that the merchants must use paper bags in lieu of plastic bags and am even more opposed that the council has the audacity to determine the price of the paper bags. The government should not be mandating to the citizens the type of bags the citizens must use. This is leading to a form of government that is not "the land of the free".

Dennis A. Brown, citizen and merchant.

Amy Johnson

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of larryrgeorge@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, November 12, 2018 8:47 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Contact City Council
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Your Name	Larry R. George
Your Email	larryrgeorge@gmail.com
Your Phone	503-362-2230
Street	1285 Centennial Ct. S.E.
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97302
Message	<p>Dear Mayor and City Council, I want to go on record that I am opposed to the plastic bag ban. Even though my wife and I always take canvas bags to the grocery store, this move by the City of Salem is far too complex to be decided by the City Council. There are so many plastic bags used by retailers, I don't see how a simple plastic bag ban will cover them all. What about the bags us in grocery stores to keep meat products from dripping on your other foods? What about the plastic sleeve used to keep our newspaper from getting wet. What about the countless other retailers that use plastic bags for your purchases? What about plastic garden waste bags? What about plastic kitchen waste liners for your kitchen waste containers under your sink? Ask yourself where you will draw the line on this proposal by a couple of councilors who want to legislate their liberal agenda on the rest of us. I submit that this is a knee jerk move by people who have not thought it out.</p> <p>Sincerely, Larry R. George 1285 Centennial Ct. S.E. Salem, OR 97302</p>

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 11/12/2018.