

**From:** [Gregg Lambert](#)  
**Sent:** Friday, November 19, 2021 2:27 PM  
**To:** [SalemCAP](#)  
**Subject:** Bul [REDACTED] third world [REDACTED] hole climate nonsense

---

This is all garbage, the whole pretense of man made climate change illustrates the hubris of the globalist elitist tyrants who want to subjugate humanity by any means necessary. You [REDACTED] should all burn in Hell for promulgating this entire false, specious, misanthropic dogma.

**From:** [noreply@cityofsalem.net](mailto:noreply@cityofsalem.net) on behalf of  
[Salemcitycouncil@felinefamily.org](mailto:Salemcitycouncil@felinefamily.org)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 23, 2021 1:18 AM  
**To:** [SalemCAP](#)  
**Subject:** Contact Climate Action Plan Project Team  
**Attachments:** ATT00001.bin

---

Your Name	Michael Robinson
Your Email	Salemcitycouncil@felinefamily.org
Your Phone	9719153668
Message	I am writing to express my whole-hearted disapproval of the SCAP. Stopping new natural gas hookups will increase energy costs for new home buyers at a time people are already struggling. Natural gas is by far the least expensive way to heat a home. Eliminating this as an option for homeowners will hurt the low income families the hardest. I urge you amend the SCAP accordingly.

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 11/23/2021.

**From:** [Sue Donnelly](#)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 23, 2021 5:53 PM  
**To:** [SalemCAP](#)  
**Subject:** Climate Action Plan

---

I have noticed increased traffic on Aumsville Highway due to Fed Ex, Amazon, DPSST and other corporate buildings. Finding a convenient mode off transportation for employees would help reduce single car traffic. There are other pockets around the city that have similar high volume traffic. Our current bus schedule and system is not viable.  
S. Donnelly

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Ase and Paul Blake](#)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 23, 2021 7:14 PM  
**To:** [SalemCAP](#)  
**Subject:** Comment on Salem's Climate Action Plan - Require Salem Electric to provide much better support for solar energy

---

Re: Page 210, Appendix 8, EN27 - "Create a 'Solar Salem' with ETO, PGE and Salem Electric...."

Salem should require Salem Electric to do a much better job of supporting and promoting solar energy. I would like to point out that in 2019 Salem Electric backed off its support of solar energy very substantially.

1) Salem Electric changed the "true-up" process for banked usage from annually to monthly.

That sounds like a trivial change, but in fact it greatly increases the cost of electricity for homeowners with solar panels. We have had solar panels since March, 2018. We were happy with the original Salem Electric solar power program because it let us bank power credits during the high production months of summer and use them during the high usage months of winter. But, in 2019 Salem Electric introduced a new program that changed the 'true-up' process for banked usage from annually to monthly for persons with newly installed solar panels. That change took away that benefit and made solar power much less worthwhile. For us, it would have increased our net cost of electricity for a year (our house is all-electric except for water heating) from \$190.61 to \$369.52 (a 94% increase)!

2) Further evidence of Salem Electric's failing support for solar power lies in its greatly reduced rebates for new solar power installations. In 2018 we received \$3300 from Salem Electric for our 7800 watt system. In 2019 Salem Electric was paying a maximum of only \$1500 for new residential solar power installations, a 55% drop!

Sincerely,

Paul A. Blake, MD, MPH

1725 Snowbird Drive NW  
Salem, OR 97304-2051  
503-363-4348  
[ahbpab@gmail.com](mailto:ahbpab@gmail.com)

**From:** [noreply@cityofsalem.net](mailto:noreply@cityofsalem.net) on behalf of [woodrat2@hotmail.com](mailto:woodrat2@hotmail.com)  
**Sent:** Friday, November 26, 2021 11:55 PM  
**To:** [SalemCAP](#)  
**Subject:** Contact Climate Action Plan Project Team  
**Attachments:** ATT00001.bin

---

Your Name	TOM LANCEFIELD
Your Email	woodrat2@hotmail.com
Your Phone	9712186459
Message	<p>My first reaction when reading through the possible additional steps under "Scenario 2" in the original draft of the Executive Summary was, some of these measures would be grounds for armed rebellion. I'm referring to the proposal to remove all fossil-fuel-derived natural gas systems in the built environment. It also proposed halting the entry of non-resident internal combustion (i.c.) engine traffic, as well as i.c. heavy trucking. How would such vehicular controls be achieved - by stationing inspectors on all major roads? The revised draft executive summary omits mentioning any such specific measures under Scenario 2. They are moved into Appendix 8, where they are somewhat buried among the 180 proposed measures that the city could consider. Potentially banning internal combustion vehicles within city limits appears in Proposal #E37. These drastic remedies make me glad that I won't be around to see their adoption. Such measures may indeed be necessary to sharply reduce GHG emissions. But I conclude that this municipal climate action plan is simply too ambitious.</p>

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 11/26/2021.

**From:** [Robert Romanek](mailto:Robert.Romanek)  
**Sent:** Monday, November 29, 2021 11:57 AM  
**To:** [Robert Romanek](mailto:Robert.Romanek)  
**Subject:** FW: Question on list of short-term strategies

---

**From:** Phil Carver <[philiphcarver@gmail.com](mailto:philiphcarver@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 24, 2021 1:33 PM  
**To:** Patricia Farrell <[PFarrell@cityofsalem.net](mailto:PFarrell@cityofsalem.net)>  
**Cc:** Clair Clark <[clairclark86@gmail.com](mailto:clairclark86@gmail.com)>; Janet Lorenzen <[jlorenze@willamette.edu](mailto:jlorenze@willamette.edu)>; Jim Scheppke <[jscheppke@comcast.net](mailto:jscheppke@comcast.net)>; Bob Cortright <[23cort@gmail.com](mailto:23cort@gmail.com)>; Laurie Dougherty <[lauriedougherty@gmail.com](mailto:lauriedougherty@gmail.com)>; Ray Quisenberry <[rayquisenberry@centurylink.net](mailto:rayquisenberry@centurylink.net)>; Sarah Deumling <[sdeumling@gmail.com](mailto:sdeumling@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** Question on list of short-term strategies

Hi Patricia

Thank you for dedication to producing the Draft Final Climate Action Plan. As a whole we at 350 Salem are very pleased with this draft. We are especially pleased with the strong emphasis on equity in the draft. We deeply appreciate that almost all of the potential strategies that are controversial are still in the complete strategy list of 183. We understand and appreciate that staff are reluctant to propose near-term implementation of controversial strategies. For all of these except one, we are considering withholding our concerns from our comments to the City Council before the Dec. 6 meeting.

We do have one large outstanding concern: Strategy TL42  
*(Reform the City's system development charges (SDCs) by 1) exempting development in walkable mixed-use neighborhoods in close-in areas (in and around downtown) and development within 1/4 mile walking distance of the core transit network from SDCs, and 2) setting SDCs for individual areas that reflect the actual cost of providing infrastructure needed to serve each area.)*  
is not among the strategies for short-term implementation. We are genuinely perplexed by this omission.

Based on our discussions with you and other City staff in August and September we understood that staff were generally supportive of this strategy. We're not aware of any concerns raised to the TF or Council that would suggest delaying this important action. While substantive, this strategy should not be controversial.

It is fundamentally inequitable to assess standard SDCs on residential developments in the areas listed in TL42. These developments have very little effect on the need for new infrastructure. Basically, they do not cause the projects that are funded by SDCs. Developments outside these areas are why these projects are needed.

More importantly, this strategy is key for achieving the City's goals for greenhouse gas emission reductions. The following points do not seem to be in dispute:

1. Transportation emissions form the majority of the city's sector-based (non-consumption) GHG emissions.
2. To substantially reduce these emissions requires that the majority of new residential development be placed in these TL42 areas where intra-city car use is not necessary.
3. It is not sufficient to just zone these areas for dense development, the City needs to provide substantial incentives.
4. The only other substantial incentive in the short-term strategies is to exempt these areas from parking requirements.

5. If the majority of residential developments are in these areas, the need for projects funded by SDCs will be substantially reduced.

So 350 Salem respectfully inquires about the lack of TL42 in the short-term strategy list. Rather than responding by email, it would be more helpful for mutual understanding to have a brief telephone conversation.

I suggest that you and I schedule this conversation as soon as possible. I am generally available except Tuesday and Thursday mornings.

Thanks again for generally great CAP.

We all at 350 Salem wish you, your family and your colleagues a truly wonderful Thanksgiving holiday.

Warmly,

Phil Carver, Co-coordinator  
350 Salem Oregon  
503-562-9878

**From:** [RODNEY R STUBBS](#)  
**To:** [citycouncil](#)  
**Subject:** Climate change hoax  
**Date:** Monday, November 29, 2021 3:15:32 PM

---

No global warming then or now! Grow up Mayor Bennett.  
<https://www.statesmanjournal.com/story/life/2018/12/22/salem-oregon-weather-snow-christmas-willamette-river-ice-flows-history/2333449002/>

Thank you for the courtesy