

CITY OF SALEM

Written Testimony #1

City Council

555 Liberty St SE
Salem, OR 97301

Monday, February 22, 2021

6:00 PM

Virtual Meeting

3.3d. [21-54](#)

Priority bills for 2021 Oregon Legislative Session

Ward(s): All Wards

Councilor(s): All Councilors

Neighborhood(s): All Neighborhoods

Recommendation:

Approve the City of Salem's positions on legislative bills in the 2021 Oregon Legislative Session.

Attachments:

[Bills Reviewed by Legislative Committee - February 19, 2021](#)

[Public Comments from J. Schepke.pdf](#)

Add - Written Testimony.

5.b. [21-17](#)

Increasing patron access to the library with new parking policies

Ward(s): All Wards

Councilor(s): All Councilors

Neighborhood(s): All Neighborhoods

Result Area(s): Welcoming and Livable Community

Recommendation:

Direct Staff to prepare for Council's consideration a resolution to adopt a Council Policy establishing that parking at the Main Library Parkade be provided at no cost to the public for a certain period of time while retaining the City Manager's authority to establish additional free parking events and future parking fees?

Attachments:

[Attachment 1 - Council Policy L-2 Ninety-Minute Option.pdf](#)

[Attachment 2 - Council Policy L-2 Three-Hour Option.pdf](#)

[Comments received from D. Duren](#)

[Comments received from A. Scheppke.pdf](#)

Add - Written Testimony.

5.c. [21-52](#)

Our Salem Vision.

Ward(s): All Wards

Councilor(s): All Councilors

Neighborhood(s): All Neighborhoods

Result Area(s): Natural Environment Stewardship; Safe Community;

Safe, Reliable and Efficient Infrastructure; Strong and Diverse

Economy; Welcoming and Livable Community; Good Governance.

Recommendation:

Accept the Our Salem Vision

Attachments: [Our Salem Vision](#)

[Cherriots Core Network Map](#)

[Sensitivity Test](#)

[Public Comments received by 3:00 p.m. 2-22-21.pdf](#)

Add- Written Testimony.

From: [Jim Scheppke](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Cc: [citycouncil](#)
Subject: Testimony on Agenda Item 3.3d
Date: Monday, February 22, 2021 12:03:15 PM

Dear Mayor and City Council:

As a citizen of Salem I am very interested in the bills before the Legislature that my city is supporting and opposing. That being the case, I am not satisfied with the way this is being handled by the City Council.

For example, tonight it appears that you will only be dealing with a small number of bills that were reviewed by the Legislative Committee last Friday. What about all the other bills that have been reviewed to date? As I citizen, I would like to see an attachment to the Council Agenda that includes all the bills that have been reviewed so far and the positions that have been taken.

I also believe that at every Council meeting there should be a full discussion of the bills that are under review and the reasons for the positions that are being taken. This should never be on the Consent Calendar. We need full transparency with the public whose voices are being represented in the Legislature by our city leaders.

Thank you for your service,

Jim

Jim Scheppke, Ward 2
jscheppke@comcast.net
503-269-1559

From: [Ann Scheppke](#)
To: [citycouncil](#); [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Testimony on Agenda Item 5b.
Date: Sunday, February 21, 2021 7:45:04 PM

In September 2018, I retired after 30 years of service at Salem Public Library. As an Adult Services Librarian, my job duties were varied, but one of my most fulfilling and simultaneously most frustrating challenges was planning and implementing programs for adults.

Why fulfilling? Salem Public Library is fortunate to have spaces for programs that are the envy of many libraries. The meeting rooms and Loucks Auditorium provide venues for everything from cooking demonstrations, writing workshops, and book groups, to concerts, movies, and lectures. In addition to space, Library programming benefits from the financial support of the Salem Public Library Foundation and funds administered through the Library Advisory Board.

Why frustrating? Parking. Many patrons expressed interest in attending programs but told staff they were unable or unwilling to participate because of the cost of parking. Or they would show up for a program, then leave before it was over to feed the meter. Or gleefully tell us how they had found a distant "secret spot" where parking was unmetered, only to endure a slog through weather and over busy intersections, often laden with library materials, to attend an event.

Saturday afternoon programs were especially problematic. For example, Loucks Auditorium is the perfect venue for film screenings, but most movies clock in at two hours or more. Collaborations with the Oregon Arts Council for their annual day-long [Poetry Out Loud](#) competition and with the Salem Poetry Project for their [Salem Poetry Festival](#) were successful, but also fraught with worries about parking; and even a [Hamilton themed event](#) was enthusiastically anticipated, immensely enjoyed, but under-attended.

Libraries strive to provide opportunities for people to gather to exchange ideas, learn new things, and to simply be in the company of fellow humans. It serves as a "[third place](#)", that non-home, non-work locale where one can safely pursue interests and fulfill needs. The seismic retrofit project gives the City an opportunity to examine how the Library's goals jibe with parking needs. On the one hand, some limits are necessary, otherwise downtown and government employees might come to regard the Library structure as their own "secret spot". On the other, it's important that the Library be used for its best purpose. What's the point of building anything while simultaneously erecting barriers to its use?

I would enthusiastically support providing 90 minutes of free parking for Library patrons 8am-6pm Monday-Friday, with free parking on **evenings, Saturdays, and Sundays**. This would make enforcement of parking structure meters and nearby street meters consistent, and give staff the capacity to plan programs without time constraints. If free parking cannot be extended to Saturdays, I recommend the 3-hour option endorsed by the Library Advisory Board and the Library Seismic Retrofit

Project Committee.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ann Scheppke
1840 E Nob Hill SE
Salem, OR 97302
503-585-1463

From: [Phil Carver](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#); [Bob Cortright](#); [Laurie Dougherty](#); [Janet Lorenzen](#); [Clair Clark](#); [Roberta A](#); [Scheppke Jim](#)
Subject: Comments on Our Salem plan by 350 Salem
Date: Monday, February 22, 2021 11:23:35 AM

Below are the official comments of 350 Salem Oregon

February 22, 2021

Mayor Bennett and councillors

Thank you for the opportunity to comment

Overall:

- Vision takes us in the right direction - by significantly expanding opportunities for development in mixed use neighborhoods along the core transit network
- We know this is critical to reducing VMT and meeting GHG reduction goals - the region's travel models and sensitivity analysis show some benefit - even though they are poorly suited for this kind of analysis (state plans and national studies show much more benefit)
- Additional direction from the Council is needed because realizing the vision will more than just zoning that allows mixed use development: creating successful walkable mixed use places requires a major shift in city plans and standards and investments, especially to create walkable streets that support and reinforce mixed use development.

We support and encourage the Council to accept the revised Our Salem Vision that emphasizes accommodating most new growth in mixed use areas with following additional directions for Next Steps.

We support the staff's six options for zoning changes that would reduce GHG emissions by allowing or requiring higher densities and mixed use development. At the same time, the Council should acknowledge that simply changing zoning to allow more mixed use development will not be enough to make it happen. Creating successful mixed use neighborhoods, like downtown or the North Broadway district, requires supporting public plans and investments. In short, the City has a key role to play - by updating, redirecting and aligning other city plans and programs to support development of walkable mixed use neighborhoods.

We have three specific suggestions for additional direction that the Council should provide:

Direct staff to develop a better definition of compact mixed use development to guide the comprehensive plan update and implementation. The term "complete neighborhoods" used in the staff Vision is confusingly similar to other definitions but includes lots of areas that are only marginally "walkable." DLCDS definition of compact mixed use and transit oriented development areas are good starting points.

- Direct staff to prepare specific numerical goals or targets for employment and housing in walkable mixed use areas and along the core transit network to guide subsequent city planning efforts. This should include numeric goals for housing and employment in individual mixed use areas, like downtown, to help guide plan implementation by City departments as they plan and prioritize other city efforts, programs and investments.
- Direct other departments to identify other city plans and programs that need to be updated or revised to implement the comprehensive plan's vision and goals for walkable mixed use development. This should include:
 - Revising the TSP and short-term capital spending plans to plan for and prioritize funding for local street and pedestrian connections within areas planned for mixed use development
 - Adopting new design standards for streets in mixed use areas to include features that prioritize walking and support mixed use development: including wider sidewalks, street trees, curb extensions, mid-block crossings, on-street parking and street designs that reinforce slow travel speeds by cars.
 - Working with Cherriots to develop a corridor plan for one or more of Core Transit Routes that identifies street improvements to improve pedestrian access and circulation and support mixed use development, such as sidewalk and street crossing improvements.
 - Putting road capacity expansion projects on hold until the TSP is updated to meet state GHG reduction targets - because according to ODOT meeting GHG reduction goals will require reducing vehicle miles travelled (VMT) by 20% per capita - (a reduction that approximates expected population growth) and because roadway expansion projects are well known to induce additional travel that works against GHG reduction goals.

- Updating the parks master plan and development code to include small pocket parks, plazas, playgrounds or open spaces appropriate for walkable neighborhoods.

Phil Carver, Co-coordinator 350 Salem Oregon

From: [Nick Fortey](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#); [citycouncil](#)
Subject: City council written comments Item 5(c) 21-52 Our Salem
Date: Monday, February 22, 2021 2:02:29 PM

Dear Mayor and City Councilors,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the “Our Salem” report. Establishing a strategy for our comprehensive plan for the future is a complex effort and substantial work has been done by the City in formulating the plan. My comments as Transportation Chair for the West Salem Neighborhood Association bear on the importance of creating an integrated transportation land use and transportation plan given the close connection between how land is developed and used and the transportation demand and satisfaction of that demand. As a general comment I would encourage our ability to meaningfully evaluate and shape the plan in close coordination with our neighbors.

We know that the more detailed Transportation System will follow but we want to ensure the transportation strategies embodied in the Our Salem report will match our needs. We think those transportation strategies deserve more scrutiny (more emphasis on safety, emphasis on creating networks for all, emphasis on accessibility, and mobility on key corridors). We are also concerned that some of the assumptions made which may impact transportation as evidenced in the Sensitivity Testing report also need more work: specifically Test 1 (on household composition) and Test 2 (on income size) where results apparently cannot be used even though the tests would impact the transportation system. Finally, Test 6 (which evaluated telework and teleshopping) were not a broad enough test to let us see the full potential to reduce trips on the transportation system – a key goal for us to improve operations on our key corridors in West Salem.

Thank you

Nick Fortey

West Salem Neighborhood Association

Transportation Chair

From: [Jennifer Martin](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: City Council Pubic Comment Testimony for 2/22/2021
Date: Monday, February 22, 2021 2:28:03 PM

Mayor Bennett and Members of City Council,

Thank you for the opportunity to present some information regarding the presentation you will hear in a bit regarding the Our Salem Comprehensive Plan project. The current draft of the plan vision and goals is peppered with the words “Encourage”, “Support”, “Promote”, “Opportunity” and “Flexibility”, and paints and overall vision for the kind of community anyone would be proud to live in and support. Once that is inclusive, with an abundance of living wage jobs, parks, pedestrian-friendly connectivity, a mix of housing types, and support for the environment. This is very exciting for our community.

The city staff, in an effort to support and implement the city’s new goal of being carbon neutral by 2050, suggested in the most recent Planning Commission meeting, six potential ideas to help with this GHG goal. I would like to call your attention to some concerns I have from a commercial development perspective based on my experience in this industry and my conversations with others involved in this realm of work.

1. “**Eliminate** parking requirements for all users near the Core Network”. The core network is defined mostly as the following corridors: Commercial, Liberty, Portland Road, Lancaster, Market/State/Center. I realize that a reduction in reliance on single-occupancy vehicles is a trend we should be supporting, but the elimination of required parking along these major arterials is not likely to reduce automobile traffic—only force it into the adjacent neighborhoods for parking, or onto the lots of existing large users in the corridors which may encourage people to make unsafe crossings along those wide (five lanes in some cases) roads to reach their destination. I appreciate the attention to lowering the on-site parking, and look forward to helping ensure the code does not have unintended consequences.
2. “**Require** multi-family housing in mixed-use zones”. According to a recent national Urban Land Institute survey, Construction Costs, Construction Labor Costs, Land Costs and State/Local Regulations are four of the top seven concerns of real estate specialists for 2021 regarding Real Estate/Development. I caution ANY policy that dictates how development should occur. Our city has a number of failed attempts at driving development—Vision 2020 is a great example. Another is the implementation of the NCMU (Neighborhood Commercial Mixed Use) zone about 15 years ago. To date, NO property in the city of Salem has been developed using this zone as it is too specific about what it REQUIRES. Requiring multi-family in a mixed-use project could kill commercial redevelopment in those areas in which we are working to encourage it, especially since there is such a large amount of land proposed to change to mixed-use (growing from 500 acres to 1,700 acres). I would recommend establishing incentives for adding multi-family to a project (lower parking requirements, SDC credits, for example) rather than mandating it.

I would like to encourage city staff and council to be mindful that NONE of us have the ability to control market forces or what future demand would exist for a certain type of development. I would like to see a culture implemented in our new comprehensive plan and supporting zone

codes of rewarding the type of development the city would like to encourage, rather than mandating it. I don't think we will see the type of development and redevelopment we seek if we do not allow the market to dictate the mix of uses that is feasible—from both a demand and cost standpoint. Too many requirements and restrictions will squelch redevelopment and dissuade investors looking to make a difference by developing in our city.

Thank you for the opportunity to share today.

Jennifer Martin, CCIM



Principal Broker

Oregon Real Estate Licensee – 200303194

PO Box 3001, Salem, OR 97302

503.339.7400

From: [Roz Shirack](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Feb 22 Agenda Item 5.c
Date: Saturday, February 20, 2021 7:08:06 AM
Attachments: [Position Statement Readoption 21921.docx](#)

Attached is a statement from South Central Association of Neighbors for the Feb 22 Council agenda item 5. c. Our Salem Vision.

Thank you,
Roz Shirack for
Lorrie Walker, President SCAN Board



February 20, 2021

SCAN Position Statement on Our Salem Goals and Comprehensive Plan Map

On February 19, 2021, the South Central Association of Neighbors adopted the following addition to its previously adopted position statement by a vote of 10 to 5:

Neighborhood Hub at Fairview Ave and Summer St SE

SCAN requests the Neighborhood Hub designation of properties at Fairview Ave and Summer St SE be removed and the existing single family designation be retained.

SCAN supports the theory of Neighborhood Hubs to bring small-scale commercial uses within walking distance of residential areas. However, we think the theory needs to be tested before designating a large number of Neighborhood Hubs.

The Fairview Ave & Summer St. area is already a "complete neighborhood" that encourages walking and bicycling, anchored by affordable housing close to commercial corridors. This intersection is .25 mile from 12th St. (a 5-minute walk); and .5 mile from Commercial St. (a 10-minute walk). Commercial uses are not needed at this location. If a Neighborhood Hub draws vehicle traffic from area residents or from passing traffic on Fairview Ave, it could undermine the safety of pedestrians and upset the balance of vehicle traffic on the Fairview Ave and Vista Ave couplet. SCAN has worked with the City for decades to try to equalize traffic on this couplet that runs between Commercial St. and 12th St. We do not want this stable neighborhood undermined by unintended consequences of a Neighborhood Hub.

Salem will experience a number of land use changes proposed in the updated comprehensive plan, from increased housing density to more permissive use of work/live, multi-use, and Neighborhood Hubs. All of these could help achieve the Our Salem Vision. However, the cumulative impact is unknown and will, in any case, require an adjustment by Salem residents.

SCAN asks Council to test these concepts with incremental changes to the plan map before widespread changes are made. Please remove the Neighborhood Hub designation from the Fairview Ave & Summer St. intersection.

The South Central Association of Neighbors adopted the following position statement at its January 13, 2021, meeting by a vote of 13 yes to 1 no:

The SCAN Board generally supports the draft Our Salem Goals and Comprehensive Plan Map, specifically:

- Locate additional multi-family housing near major and minor arterials and transit routes throughout Salem.
- Keep Downtown the major commercial center in Salem, but cluster smaller commercial and mixed-use nodes on major arterials around Salem; and small-scale commercial uses in Neighborhood Hub zones.
- Provide a balance of residential, employment centers, and public services (police, fire, library, parks, transit) in West Salem to allow it to be more self-sufficient to reduce vehicle miles and trips across the Willamette River. SCAN does not support a 3rd bridge across the Willamette River. Instead, SCAN supports efforts to reduce projected traffic loads and congestion on the existing bridges.
- Provide a narrow linear park along the Willamette River bank north of the Union St Pedestrian Bridge, but not the proposed “Park” designation for the larger area between Front St. and the River. We recommend the existing plan designation of River Oriented Mixed Use (that allows residential and commercial uses) be retained for that area. Future mixed uses in this area would already be within walking distance of the existing Riverfront, Wallace Marine, and Minto-Brown Parks. The marginal benefit of more park acres in this location is less than the benefit of more park acres located in other areas around Salem that have a deficit of park acres.

SCAN has some requested changes to the draft comprehensive plan map that are specific to the SCAN neighborhood:

Commercial St. SE Mixed Use Designation

We support the proposed mixed use plan designation for Commercial St. SE that runs through SCAN from Mission St. SE to Vista Ave SE. We recommend the mixed use plan designation be implemented by the Mixed Use-II zone, which has a 55-ft maximum height. We oppose the proposed new Mixed Use-III zone that allows more intensive commercial retail uses with no height restriction.

On the west side of Commercial St. SE mixed uses would be separated from the existing residential zoned properties by only a narrow alley between Commercial St. and Saginaw St. that runs from Mission St to Pioneer Cemetery. Therefore, the lower intensity Mixed Use-II zone is the best fit for this area.

On the east side of Commercial St. SE mixed uses would be adjacent to Commercial Office zoned properties that front onto Liberty St. SE, so either the Mixed Use-I or II zones (or the proposed Mixed Use-III zone) may be appropriate in this area north of Superior. However, south of Superior St, the mixed uses would be adjacent to residential zoned properties where only the Mixed Use-II zone should be used.

For decades existing residential uses, both single family and multi-family, have been buffered from adjacent commercial uses along Commercial St SE by a series of overlay zones. The purpose of these overlay zones is to “minimize the impacts of nonresidential development on existing residential uses.” These overlay zones include Saginaw St Overlay Zone (SRC 625), Superior/Rural Overlay Zone (SRC 621), Oxford/West Nob Hill Overlay Zone (SRC 622), Oxford/Hoyt Overlay Zone (SRC 623), and Hoyt/McGilchrist Overlay Zone (SRC 624). See Map attached.

These are stable, well maintained residential neighborhoods that we want to see buffered from nonresidential uses into the future. They help achieve Our Salem goals of complete neighborhoods and walkable neighborhoods, because they are near commercial retail and office uses, parks, and schools. The Mixed Use-II zone will complement the purpose of these existing overlay zones better than the Mixed Use-I or III zones.

SCAN Neighborhood Parks

Neighborhood parks in SCAN, including Fairmount Park, Gilmore Field Park, and McKinley School Park are designated as single family, multi family, or CSG for a portion of Fairmount Park on the current comprehensive plan map. We request these parks be designated as “Park” on the draft plan map (except the CSG designation for the Fairmount reservoir).


Lorrie Walker, President
SCAN Board

See Attachment below

Attachment

SCAN Overlay Zones Along Commercial St. SE

Saginaw St Overlay Zone (SRC 625)
Superior/Rural Overlay Zone (SRC 621)
Oxford/West Nob Hill Overlay Zone (SRC 622)
Oxford/Hoyt Overlay Zone (SRC 623)
Hoyt/McGilchrist Overlay Zone (SRC 624)



From: [Brian Sund](#)
To: [Roz Shirack](#)
Cc: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Re: Feb 22 Agenda Item 5.c
Date: Saturday, February 20, 2021 7:24:07 AM

Roz, first... power back on?? (I can say, now, how grateful I will be for what we have over time taken for granted... until I once again take it for granted. Dreading the impending Cascadia Subduction...)

Second, thank you for all your efforts on judiciously moving this position statement forward from start to finish.

Brian

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 20, 2021, at 7:07 AM, Roz Shirack <rozshirack7@gmail.com> wrote:

Attached is a statement from South Central Association of Neighbors for the Feb 22 Council agenda item 5. c. Our Salem Vision.

Thank you,
Roz Shirack for
Lorrie Walker, President SCAN Board

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "SCAN Board" group.

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

To view this discussion on the web visit [https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/scan-board/CAKJUhw-](https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/scan-board/CAKJUhw-0E1hP6FK%3DbGpVBbHLoO1m0Ny%2BbQvj7%3DStAX4AVBaY-Q%40mail.gmail.com)

[0E1hP6FK%3DbGpVBbHLoO1m0Ny%2BbQvj7%3DStAX4AVBaY-Q%40mail.gmail.com](https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/scan-board/CAKJUhw-0E1hP6FK%3DbGpVBbHLoO1m0Ny%2BbQvj7%3DStAX4AVBaY-Q%40mail.gmail.com).

<Position Statement Readoption 2:19:21.docx>

From: [STEVEN ANDERSON](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Cc: [Michael Freitas](#)
Subject: Feb 22nd Council Meeting Testimony West Salem Neighborhood Association
Date: Monday, February 22, 2021 2:00:29 PM
Attachments: [City Council Testimony Our Salem 22 Feb 2021.pdf](#)

City of Salem Recorder:

Attached is testimony from the West Salem Neighborhood Association to be placed into the record and before Council today regarding Agenda Item 5.c. (21-52). Please confirm receipt of this material and its inclusion. Thank you.

Steven A. Anderson, West Salem Neighborhood Association Land Use Chair
andersonriskanalysis@comcast.net



February 22, 2021

TO: Mayor & City Council
FR: Steven A. Anderson, West Salem Neighborhood Association Land Use Chair
Michael Freitas, West Salem Neighborhood Association Chair
RE: Agenda Item 5.c. (21-52) Our Salem Vision

The West Salem Neighborhood Association (WSNA) wishes to extend a thank you to Eunice Kim and the Our Salem team for their hard work and efforts to-date. We are seeking clarification from City Council. The action tonight proposes that Council “Accept the Our Salem Vision”. **Just what does this mean? Does the next phase become a quasi-judicial process? Please explain for the record. Here is why.**

Many of the suggestions from the WSNA are not part of this draft vision comprehensive plan map. We have been told that the current map is:

- A 30,000-foot look and more detail will come in the next phase
- Those suggestions we made can be included later
- The map and supporting materials have already been made for presentation and cannot be changed now to include your input

Clarification is requested on:

1. Can this draft vision comprehensive plan map be adjusted (*e.g.*, addition, deletions, etc.) after Council’s vote tonight?
2. Will no new map be forthcoming in the next phase?
3. Will it be only the development of supporting goals and policies to affirm this comprehensive plan map?
4. Do we, the West Salem Neighborhood Association, get further say in how the final comprehensive plan map looks for our community as promised?
5. Can we talk with our elected representatives (City Councilors) after Council’s vote tonight, or will it now be deemed *ex parte* communications per quasi-judicial rules?

What Staff presented does not meet the Our Salem Vision Statement and Goals as written specifically for West Salem (See 21-52 Attachment 1). We have three pages of page-by-page notes where adjustments are needed to fulfill the Our Salem Vision Statement along with previous promises of “we will deal with that later”.

The draft vision comprehensive map **is not** how we envision West Salem to look like into the future. A few examples for the record:

- Our request for natural area designation East of Marine Drive (preservation of native plants and environments, 400 plus year-old habitats, and Carbon Sequestration lands) has not been included.

- Our suggestion for other multi-family areas for West Salem are not there.
- 10 acres of multi-family land along Marine Drive removed in an oversight and told it could be added later, but not now as it would mess up inventory numbers in the report; it needs to wait.
- The removal of the historical industrial area in Edgewater District is unacceptable. Its impact includes loss of living wage jobs, it may violate state land use laws, needs more than the verbal offerings from staff that this is ok.
- Removing Craft Industrial from Edgewater District violates promises made by the Department Director and Assistant Director to community leaders when the community worked together with the city to rezone this area.
- The placement of three Neighborhood Hubs within a mile of one another does not have the economic supply chain within West Salem to support them.
- Attachment 3 Sensitivity Analysis has a January 2021 completion date. We have not seen this until last Thursday. Are its economic assumptions consistent with other economic assumptions within Our Salem? Not confirmed. Even its authors report several times **“NOTE: Due to the way the model inputs are structured, it is not clear if this was actually what was tested. We are not showing the results of this test”**. Suspicious.

We were promised that we could make changes in developing a final comprehensive plan map, so it reflects what the community envisions West Salem to look like into the future. We want to be able to work hand-in-hand on this with Eunice and her team to construct a final comprehensive plan map for Council approval later this year. What we have now is a good foundation, but no way a **final** comprehensive plan map for consideration by Council.

- We seek affirmation that we can adjust the draft comprehensive plan map as promised.
- We seek affirmation that we can talk with our City Councilors on this matter. That this will not be precluded as ex parte communication.
- We desire to talk with Councilor Lewis on traffic issues and current modeling. He is the city representative in such matters.
- We desire to talk with our new City Councilor, Councilor Stapleton, to have her well versed in community issues.
- We do not wish to be in a position of disputations in the future as we proceed to a public hearing on this matter when much of this can be solved in the next phase if allowed.
- We desire to work cooperative to shape the vision for West Salem; not be told that this is what staff’s opinion and summary of input is and that is what it is; period.

The Our Salem Vision tonight talks of community engagement and neighborhood association inclusion. Please provide clarification for the record in your proceedings tonight for:

1. Can the draft comprehensive plan map be adjusted, left open for modification, moving forward?
2. Can we talk with our elected representatives so they can represent the voice of our community?
3. Or, are we now subjugated to bureaucratic expediency in this final phase of Our Salem?

Thank you.

Steven A. Anderson, WSNA Land Use Chair
Michael Freitas, WSNA Chair