

# CITY OF SALEM

## Written Testimony

### City Council

555 Liberty St SE  
Salem, OR 97301

---

**Tuesday, November 12, 2019      6:00 PM      Council Chambers**

---

**4.a.      [19-515](#)**      Establishing New Solid Waste Management Service Rates

Ward(s): All Wards

Councilor(s): All Councilors

Neighborhood(s): All Neighborhoods

Result Area(s): Good Governance; Natural Environment Stewardship;  
Safe Community; Safe, Reliable and Efficient Infrastructure; Strong and  
Diverse Economy; Welcoming and Livable Community.

**Recommendation:**      Adopt Resolution No. 2019-82 establishing new solid waste management service rates effective January 1, 2020 and January 1, 2021, and rescinding Resolution No. 2018-81.

**Attachments:**      [Resolution No. 2019-82](#)  
[Resolution Exhibit A - Schedule of Monthly Solid Waste Management Service Rates Eff](#)  
[Resolution Exhibit B - Schedule of Monthly Solid Waste Management Service Rates Eff](#)  
[Letter from Bell & Associates, Inc., Solid Waste Cost of Service Analysis](#)  
[Comparison of Current and Proposed Solid Waste Collection Rates Effective January 1,](#)  
[Mid-Valley Comparative Rate Summary - Monthly Rates for Solid Waste Service](#)  
[Additional Information and Frequently Asked Questions](#)  
[Public Comment received by 11-6-19](#)  
[Public Comments received by 3:30 p.m. 11-12-19](#)

*Add - Written Testimony.*

**7.2c.      [19-526](#)**      Second reading of Ordinance Bill 12-19, creating a City Operations Fee to fund City services

Ward(s): All Wards

Councilor(s): All Councilors

Neighborhood(s): All Neighborhoods

Result Area(s): Good Governance; Natural Environment Stewardship;  
Safe Community; Safe, Reliable and Efficient Infrastructure; Strong and  
Diverse Economy; Welcoming and Livable Community.

**Recommendation:**      Conduct second reading of Ordinance Bill No. 12-19, creating a City Operations Fee to fund City services.

**Attachments:** [Ordinance Bill No. 12-19](#)

[Exhibit A to Ordinance Bill No. 12-19](#)

[Utility Rate Relief Program Status Report](#)

[Public Comments received by 3:30 p.m., 10-23-19](#)

[Public Comments recieved by 3:30 p.m., 10-28-19](#)

[Public Comments received by 11-6-19](#)

[Public Comments received by 3:30 p.m. 11-12-19](#)

*Add- Written Testimony.*

## Amy Johnson

---

**From:** Kim Davis <k.mdavis@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 09, 2019 2:14 PM  
**To:** citycouncil  
**Cc:** CityRecorder  
**Subject:** Testimony re Establishing New Solid Waste Management Service Rates

Dear City Council,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed rate increase for trash collection. As a single person who lives in a duplex, I have been paying ridiculously high and unfair rates ever since moving to Salem. Every other town in Oregon I have lived in provided superior service with greater choices regarding services. I have been conscientiously striving to reduce my waste, as should all citizens. However, because our trash is hauled to the Covanta Marion incinerator, which profits from more, not less trash, there are no incentives offered to citizens of Salem to do the same.

I am writing this in my second week of suffering the consequences of an 'air stagnation' weather condition which is limiting my ability to be outdoors. Knowing that the toxic pollution generated by that incinerator is being trapped in the air causes me great alarm. Knowing that money is being made to do this, by both Marion County and Covanta Marion, is disturbing to say the least.

In communities that rely on landfill management, I witnessed firsthand excellent collaboration between hauling companies and citizens in efforts to reduce waste, not generate more for profit. It is illusionary to think all that trash in Salem just disappears at the incinerator -- it is transformed, into toxic air pollution and ash.

Global waste reduction programs and zero waste communities have found the most transformative approach to change waste production is by charging customers per pound rates, not a flat fee. In these successful communities, individuals are able to enjoy having their food waste collected weekly and distributed to composting programs (and/or biofuel production industries). Non recyclable garbage production shrinks considerably when individuals are charged per pound and requires less frequent collection. This reduces the costs and greenhouse gas emissions associated with all those trash trucks running up and down the streets. And folks like me, who really do care about reducing waste, benefit from lower monthly costs, because they produce so little trash.

Additional hikes in our solid waste management service rates is another example of business as usual. I believe the City of Salem can start doing better than that.

Thank you.  
Kim M. Davis

## Amy Johnson

---

**From:** Jim Scheppke <[jscheppke@comcast.net](mailto:jscheppke@comcast.net)>  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 09, 2019 3:01 AM  
**To:** citycouncil  
**Cc:** CityRecorder  
**Subject:** Testimony on Agenda Item 4a

Dear Salem City Council:

The "Comparative Rate Analysis" that is included in your Council packet shows that if you approve the proposed garbage rates for 2020, Salem will likely have the highest rates of any of the cities shown except for Silverton. This can't go on. Garbage rates are regressive. A wealthy resident of Salem pays as much as a poor family or a senior on a fixed income. Paying \$30.75 a month for garbage service many not seem like a lot to some, but for a poor household struggling to pay their bills it is a hardship. You can no longer ignore this.

You should ask yourself why people in Albany, just down the road, pay \$22.56 cents for garbage service, including *every week* recycling service! The haulers there are dealing with the same issues around recycling that our haulers are. One thing that makes a big difference, I suspect, is that they are able to take their garbage to a state-of-the-art landfill, the Coffin Butte landfill near Corvallis that charges lower tipping fees. We in Salem/Marion County are forced to haul our garbage to an aging incinerator that is polluting our water and our air with greenhouse gases and toxic chemicals like lead, mercury, cadmium, and dioxin, all to profit a giant multinational corporation. Out of all the greenhouse gas emitting facilities in the state, our garbage burner ranks 20th in the entire state and 1st in Marion County, according to the DEQ.

This can't go on. The Salem City Council cannot simply rubber-stamp every rate increase that comes before you. You must act to try to protect the struggling ratepayers and end the pollution of our air and water. At a minimum you should only approve one year of the two year rate proposal, and then spend the next year seriously looking at alternatives that will freeze or even reduce our rates to be comparable to those of other cities.

At present garbage rate-payers in Salem/Marion County are being victimized by our County Commissioners and by a multinational corporation. I implore you to begin to put a stop to this.

Sincerely,

Jim Scheppke  
1840 E. Nob Hill SE Salem  
[jscheppke@comcast.net](mailto:jscheppke@comcast.net)  
503-269-1559

Page  
Break

**Amy Johnson**

---

**From:** Susann Kaltwasser <susann@kaltwasser.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 12, 2019 7:07 AM  
**To:** CityRecorder  
**Cc:** Irma Dowd  
**Subject:** Testimony for City Council tonight  
**Attachments:** ELNA testimony on Service fee 111219.pdf

Please find attached testimony from the East Lancaster Neighborhood Association for tonight's City Council meeting regarding the proposed service fee.

Susann Kaltwasser  
Co-president



## **EAST LANCASTER NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION (ELNA)**

November 12, 2019

To: Salem City Council and Mayor Bennett  
From: Susann Kaltwasser, co-president  
RE: 7.2 c Second reading of Ordinance Bill 12-19, creating a City Operations  
Fee to fund City services

On November 7 at their regular meeting the East Lancaster Neighborhood Association heard a presentation by Community Development Director, Norm Wright on the need for additional operating funds by the City.

He explained in detail the need to generate additional funds through two fees, an operating fee and an employee fee. Many people had questions about the proposals.

After a good discussion the members by vote authorized this letter stating their concerns. The main concern is that water is an essential service and putting this fee on that bill, creates an additional burden on low income households. They feel that the increases in water service fees on an annual basis, plus already existing additional fees such as the sidewalk and streetlight fee is becoming a problem. As one person pointed out, their water bill has quadrupled in the recent years. The reality of going from \$35 for 2 months to \$60 a month now is upsetting.

The Utility Relief Fund was discussed, but it was pointed out that most people do not qualify and even those that might often do not know about the program. There was a worry that the amount set aside is not adequate and wonder if the City is keeping records. But they also would like to see more advertisement about the program. Put it right on the bill each month who qualifies and how to apply.

Tin general they would like to see some other method for collecting necessary funds that would allow people to have more control over their budgets. Perhaps a vote of the people is better.

They also would like the city to join with other cities in Oregon to lobby the Legislature for a long-term fix to the impacts of Measures 5 and 50. If this is going to be a short

term problem, then another source of income should be sought, but if it is long-term there needs to be a more comprehensive solution that is more equitable for those on fixed incomes, or who are poor. Some people would not have a problem with paying an additional \$96 a year, but for others even \$8 a month is too much. It is regressive.

Also, adding the fee for each rental unit creates an incentive for landlords to charge extra to their rents. How can a renter know that their landlord is not assessing them more than the \$6.50 a month?

Thank you for consideration of our comments.