

From: [Aileen Kaye](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: "No" for Tax dollars for possible flights from Salem
Date: Sunday, January 8, 2023 2:37:54 PM

Dear Mayor Hoy and members of the Salem City Council,

I urge a "no" vote on using tax dollars to fund adding some air service at the Salem airport.

Facts I would like to know:

1. How much money will Brent DeHart make if this project goes through?
2. I thought Brent DeHart kept saying on his previous radio show that this would be privately funded. Is this a bait and switch?
3. When eating at The Flight Deck, I see raptors and other species of birds. I think the area is a migratory pathway for birds; not sure. Has an EIS been done?
4. How much will the round trip fare be to Los Angeles, Phoenix, and Las Vegas?
5. This type of project has been attempted at least twice in Salem and failed. Why do the promoters feel they will get enough customers this time?
6. How can the City afford to spend millions of dollars on this when we need services for the homeless?
7. I can't envision people flying to Salem from the three cities in question. I do think there will be some interest in Salem residents flying to Las Vegas, but not vice versa. The Chamber thinks tourists will come here, but I don't agree.

Thank you for your consideration.

Aileen Kaye
January 8, 2023

From: [Alice LaViolette](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Vote No on Resolution 2023-2
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 11:07:48 AM

Council Members -

I urge you to vote "NO" on Resolution #2023-2 at the City Council meeting tonight. Please do not approve the transfer over 2.3 million dollars from our city budget to fund this project. Salem is within easy driving distance of PDX airport and there is a reliable shuttle service from our airport to PDX.

This is not the economic climate to start such an ambitious project that comes with no guaranties. You don't know which airlines might be interested and there is no contract commitment that they will have to service the airport for a specific length of time. The proposed plan includes funding for 8 additional full time employees to service only 8 flights per week for one year and possibly/hopefully 12 flights per week for the next two years. This is not a project that it economically feasible and has no way of supporting itself.

If you feel there is an extra 2.3 million in the city budget, please consider earmarking it for a new branch library in Salem. That would generate a real return-on-investment which will benefit all residents for years.

Please vote NO

-Alice LaViolette
Ward 1



January 9, 2023

Mayor Hoy and Councilors:

My name is Anthony Veliz, President of izo Public Relations & Marketing located in Woodburn, OR. I also serve on the Board of Directors for Travel Salem.

I am writing this letter in full support of your commitment to smart economic development and considering funding this evening to support minimum required airport terminal upgrades and operations. Commercial air service would be very beneficial to our region and for the tourism industry, the economy in general, and the community at large. The ability for business, government and leisure travels to utilize the air service would be huge.

From a practical standpoint, this would save thousands of trips to and from other airports in Oregon. Being from Woodburn, I would most definitely look to leaving from Salem for business travel versus heading to Portland.

Salem and the region has needed commercial air service for a long time now. My hope is you will agree and approve the Scope of Work.

Gracias,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Anthony Veliz'. The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Anthony Veliz
President

From: [Barbara](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Resolution 2023-2
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 1:09:54 PM

Dear Mayor Hoy and Salem City Council,

I strongly urge you to oppose funding for commercial air service in Salem. Why would any airline contract for commercial services in Salem: air service in Salem has failed every time it has been tried because airline occupancy fell short and was not profitable for the airlines. This alone should be enough reason to not proceed with this proposal. However, if there are businesses that would profit from air service, then they should fund the proposal, not the public who either don't use commercial air services and/or can't afford tax increases to line the pockets of the businesses.

In addition, the consequences of an airport expansion (including parking space, terminal capacity, reduction of clean air, noise pollution) also include blockage of bird and wildlife migration routes, loss of food and shelter for the birds and wildlife and harm to the recovery of threatened and endangered species. In this time of global climate change and an increasing rate of plant and animal extinctions, the last thing Earth needs is another ecological wasteland and environmental devastation at enormous financial cost to Salem citizens over a long time. .

Salem cannot afford to spend millions of dollars on this proposal when we need shelter and mental health services for our citizens. Please vote no on this proposal.

Thank You,
Barbara Fuller
January 9, 2023

From: [William Hughes](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Public money for Salem airport
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 11:06:52 AM

Dear Salem City Council,

I've been a home owner and taxpayer in Salem since 1980.

I am adamantly opposed to using public funds for the airport expansion for several reasons.

If financially viable, the business community should fund it. Asking for public funds speaks otherwise.

Claims of financial and environmental benefits from flights to Burbank and Las Vegas by undisclosed airlines cannot be supported.

Salem has many more important places to invest in our community.

It seems possible that many airport expansion supporters will make money even if the project fails.

Please reject spending general fund money for the airport expansion.

Sincerely

Bill Hughes

From: [Corrine Loomis Dietz](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: budget concerns for Salem
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 1:31:12 PM

Dear City Councilors

As a Salem resident and tax payer since 1980 I am **opposed** to our tax \$ being transferred from the city's general fund to pay for operational and capital costs, including airport staffing and renovation, according to the agenda."

Here are talking points:

This was supposed to be privately funded as originally planned, (according to the chamber of commerce who is pushing this project). Now it appears it will be funded by the general fund which is..... taxpayer dollars.

the City cannot afford to spend millions of taxpayer dollars on this when we need services for the homeless? When the citizens of Salem were recently surveyed, their biggest concern was homelessness. Not having an airport.

Plus, the flights planned are only to go to Reno, Las Vegas, LA and Phoenix.

Subsidizing Salem air service does not pass a "climate lens" test. Airline travel is the most carbon emitting form of transportation by far.

Please consider my comments as you vote on this important matter!!!!

Respectfully,

Corrine Loomis Dietz
2010 Nebraska Ave NE
Salem, OR 97301

t

From: [Cindy Kimball](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Please vote to oppose the expansion of Salem airport
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 12:54:54 PM

Dear Mayor Hoy and Salem city council,

I am writing in opposition to your proposed idea to take 2.4 million dollars from the general fund and divert it to expand the Salem airport for commercial service.

I have lived in Salem long enough to remember the past few times this has been attempted and failed. If I remember correctly, the recent citizen surveys showed that our community is more concerned about our homeless situation and the lack of affordable housing. Can you really justify spending 2.4 million of **our taxpayer dollars** on a project that will benefit only those who can afford to fly? It seems to me this is a misguided use of our money.

I remember reading that this project was going to be funded by private donations. Now it appears the working poor will fund a project for the wealthy so they can fly to Las Vegas or Phoenix for a vacation. Our city is facing a budget deficit. We do not have money to waste on a project such as this.

I fly often to visit my family out of state and I have no trouble driving 50-60 minutes to PDX to catch a plane.

What about our commitment to reducing our cities' carbon pollution? Does this fall in line with our commitment? I would rather see those dollars go towards funding more electric bus transportation in our city, or a trolley of some kind or better bike lanes. Or sheltering the homeless and building more affordable housing.

Please vote NO on this misguided proposal.

Thank you for your service to our city.

Sincerely,

Cindy Kimball
1260 21st Street NE
Salem, OR 97301

From: [Diane Chavez](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: No commercial air service in salem
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 12:23:53 PM

Dear Mayor and City Council members;

I opposed commercial air service in Salem, OR. I own a house and pay taxes in ward one in Salem. My son and his family also own a house nearby. I do not want the noise and air pollution associated with commercial air travel in Salem, even if it were to cost nothing.

I would prefer to see investments in better, expanded land travel to Portland. In fact I would like to see better land travel options up and down the west coast. I moved to Salem to be closer to my grandkids and to reduce my carbon footprint. I only fly as a last resort and when I do I try to fly nonstop, both as a convenience and to reduce carbon associated with take offs. I would like to leave my grandkids a bit of a remaining carbon budget for their future. This means I am much more likely to fly from Portland than Salem on the rare occasions that I do fly.

There are many other things I would prefer to see Salem spend my tax dollars on. This includes better bike paths and sidewalks, better homeless services, replacement of the old water pipes serving my house and so on.

Please reconsider this questionable investment in a time of climate crisis and say no to commercial air service to Salem.

Thank you,
Diane Chavez

From: [Evan West](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Salem Airport Service, 1/9/23 Council Agenda Item 5b
Date: Saturday, January 7, 2023 5:38:50 PM

To Whom It May Concern:

I'm writing to express a position somewhere between support and opposition regarding the subject matter. I hope that the City Council *will* carefully consider the possibility of using General Funds to make the Salem airport terminal ready for commercial use.

Whether or not commercial air service is ready to resume this year needs to be the question evaluated.

Salem is growing, and is projected to continue growing. A part of our total wellbeing is our transportation infrastructure. As the city grows, we need to take steps to ensure that business and economic opportunity can meet the same pace of residential growth. In order for this to happen, our city needs to be more accessible than it is currently. We need to either invest in infrastructure to bring about the return of commercial air service, or we need to explore how the same funding can be used to create a better bus network to connect us to Eugene or Portland. Perhaps two million dollars could create two more daily departures of the Amtrak Cascades train?

Regardless of the eventual solution, one item of certainty is that we have to take steps to reduce the number of personal vehicles being driven between Salem and Portland every day. I expect that many of my friends, neighbors, and fellow citizens have expressed to you the belief that Salem is too close to Eugene and Portland. If we can drive to those airports, why do we need one in our own town? We still may not need an airport. That question might be better served to receive further exploration, rather than complete approval at this moment. However, every possible step should be taken to ensure that the answer to our problems is not "take your personal car on the highway to Portland or Eugene." That response will not serve climate goals, that response will not attract business. It is the wrong attitude entirely.

Using funds to make our terminal and airport ready for commercial service is not blanketly irresponsible. It is an investment in our future. I ask the City Council to carefully consider whether or not this investment needs to be rushed through, so that air service can resume this year. It may be wise to instead dedicate further exploration to the topic, and it would be greatly appreciated if greater transparency can be provided to the citizens of Salem (i.e. what airline is interested and which routes will be flown?)

Outright opposition ignores the growth that we need to see in our transportation infrastructure. Blind support is unwise. Please conditionally approve this funding, contingent on exploration of economic benefit and the ways in which air travel can serve (or adversely impact) our greater transportation needs.

Thank you.

Evan West

--

Evan West, M.A.

He/Him/His

970-980-1445

evanwest714@gmail.com

From: [Helen Caswell](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: A bad idea for Salem
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 12:12:23 PM

Dear Mayor Hoy and City Councilors,

Thank you for your service to Salem.

I am writing to ask that you NOT approve the City's general funds to finance an inequitable private interest that hopes for air service here, with zero assurance of return on the investment. This project will drain the city, a terrible idea and not something we can afford.

Most Salem people cannot pay for air flights anywhere at all - meaning the City would use income from the least affluent to finance the travel of the most. That seems offensive to me.

Air service is also inconsistent with the City's interest in a green future.

There is nothing in this proposal that benefits the average Salem person or our city. It is a very poor, inequitable idea.

Sincerely,
Helen Caswell

From: [Jim Scheppke](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: 1/9/23 Testimony of 350 Salem OR on Agenda Items 5a and 5b (UPDATE)
Date: Sunday, January 8, 2023 10:31:11 PM

Dear Mayor and City Council:

Please accept this update to the 350 Salem OR petition opposing commercial air service in Salem with these additional signatures:

77. Sarah Acosta
78. Michelle Achee
79. James Aiken
80. Robert Plata
81. Justin Castillo
82. Sean Nikas
83. Wes Bouche
84. Joe Tilman
85. Kathleen Moynihan
86. Alan Holland
87. Ellen Stevens

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jim Scheppke <jscheppke@comcast.net>
Subject: 1/9/23 Testimony of 350 Salem OR on Agenda Items 5a and 5b
Date: January 6, 2023 at 11:32:17 AM PST
To: City Recorder <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Cc: Salem City Council <Citycouncil@cityofsalem.net>

Dear Mayor and City Council:

On behalf of 350 Salem OR, I submit the following petition opposing commercial air service in Salem signed by 76 Salem residents:

Petition Opposing Costly and Polluting Commercial Air Service in Salem

A group of well-heeled business interests is trying to convince the Salem City Council to spend millions of taxpayer dollars to subsidize the resumption of commercial air service in Salem.

This is not the first time Salem has tried this. United Airlines pulled out of Salem in 1980 after failing to sell enough tickets. The same thing happened with Delta Airlines in 2008 and again with a smaller airline in

2011. Salem is a three-time loser, so why can't we learn from that?

Commercial air service is not needed here. Salem is only 75-90 minutes away from the Portland International Airport. An airport shuttle service makes 17 departures a day at a reasonable cost.

Initially there would only be, at most, four flights a week from Salem to destinations in California and Nevada. But to accommodate this, the City would need to hire 9 FTE staff at a cost of \$1.3 million per year and make minimum improvements to the small Salem terminal costing nearly \$1.9 million.

The City estimates total annual cost of \$2.37 million in Year 1 for four to eight flights per week. By Year 6, even assuming 16 flights per week, the subsidy would still be \$721,000 per year. The cost would have to be borne by homeowners with their property taxes and by renters with increased rent costs.

Commercial air service in Salem does not pass an "equity lens" test. 32% of persons in US households with income under \$40,000 have never taken a commercial airline flight (that would be about 40% of Salem residents). 92% of persons in US households with incomes over \$80,000 (about 28% of people in Salem) are occasional or frequent flyers. It is not equitable for lower and middle income Salem residents who may never fly or seldom fly to have to subsidize occasional and frequent flyers.

Commercial air service in Salem does not pass a "climate lens" test. Airline travel is the most carbon emitting form of transportation by far. For example, two people traveling from Portland to San Francisco would be responsible for emitting 116 kg per person of carbon traveling by plane, 70 kg by car and 28 kg by train or bus. When most transportation by car or bus is electrified in the coming years the difference will be even greater.

The Salem City Council has set a goal of cutting our carbon emissions in half by 2035 and reaching "net zero" emissions by 2050. If they are serious about reaching these goals, and about not placing an inequitable burden on taxpayers and renters, they will reject the plan for commercial air service in Salem.

Comments	
1. Jim Scheppke	<i>Salem already has a structural deficit problem that this plan would only worsen. It is fiscally irresponsible.</i>
2. Tamra Hart	
3. Michael Hughes	
4. Teresa Joslin	<i>Airline travel is the most carbon-emitting form of</i>

transportation. Commercial air service in Salem is a waste of tax payer money.

-
- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| 5. Jennifer Sprague | |
| 6. Lisa Novak | |
| 7. Diane Chavez | <i>I would rather not have the noise and air pollution associated with planes flying over my neighborhood. The money would be better spent on better public transit to Portland as well as Southern Oregon and the entire west coast.</i> |
| 8. Joseph Novak | |
| 9. Les Margosian | <i>An unbelievably foolish project. As ably described in 350Salem article it was tried tree times in past and never worked. The idea is a splendid example of Babbitry as the main objective is to puff-up Salem's image as a burg important enough to be served by commercial airlines. Also, as pointed out by article, the estimated costs are absurd: I'd love to see our City staff do a cost benefit analysis with their own current budget figures. Finally, yet another example of how ridiculous staff's proposals/recommendations are, Council will enthusiastically endorse them!</i> |
| 10. Norman Baxter | <i>A waste of money and environmentally destructive.</i> |
| 11. Susann Kaltwasser | |
| 12. Jo Ann Leadingham | |
| 13. Philip Carver | |
| 14. Spencer Woolley | |
| 15. Sarah Deumling | |
| 16. Meg Hummon | |
| 17. Laurie Dougherty | |
| 18. Pedro Cabrera | |
| 19. Roberta Cade | |
| 20. Justin Perkins | |
| 21. Zachary Aldrich | |
| 22. Kim Davis | |
| 23. Michelle Achee | |
| 24. Shanon Nabors | |
| 25. Rachael Spada | |
| 26. Marissa Theve | <i>We need to consider connecting our 3 largest cities with more reliable transit first. I would much rather go to PDX in an hourly bus than increase the environmental injustice to folks living near McNary Field. The City is failing to consider all reasonable alternatives.</i> |
| 27. Erika Guzman | |
| 28. Benjamin Dochoda | |
-

29.	Thomas Kent	
30.	Christopher Simmons	
31.	Adam Dillon	
32.	Alex Korsunsky	<i>Why should public money subsidize rich people burning carbon? Use the money for train or bike or bus infrastructure instead.</i>
33.	Katherine Clark	
34.	Natalie Thamert	
35.	Vita Solis-Romano	
36.	Grant Boro	
37.	Claudia Burton	
38.	Brian Hines	<i>I'm tired of what Greta Thunberg calls the "blah, blah, blah" approach to fighting climate change: lots of talk, very little action. Salem needs to stop talking about reducing our greenhouse gas pollution and actually DO something about this.</i>
39.	Nicole Rodgers	
40.	Timothy Hulscher	
41.	Larry Sipe	
42.	Ricardo Rojas	
43.	Logan Johnson	<i>As a resident of a neighborhood close to the airport, the last thing I want is more, and bigger, flights overhead constantly. It pollutes both our environment and our noise, and the 6 million dollar bill will be footed by us to give private enterprise the profits. If you want to improve transit in Salem, and Oregon in general, then start putting money into something actually useful like our bus lines and our railways.</i>
44.	Kameron Monk	
45.	Elizabeth Henderson	
46.	Cheryl Hummon	
47.	Kayleen Warner	
48.	Christine Chute	
49.	Emily Standish	
50.	Mark Wigg	
51.	Michael Medlock	
52.	Walter Perry	
53.	Benigno Chavez	
54.	James Ciaramitaro	<i>Too few people will use it; while the whole community will be taxed for it.</i>
55.	Barbara Ray	
56.	Peter Bergel	
57.	Sandra Oliver-Poore	
58.	Claudia Howells	
59.	Melody Foster	
60.	Mary Ann Baclawski	

61. Cynthia Jones	
62. Jerry Turner	
63. Donald Davis	<i>There is not enough demand for an airport in salem. And one that only operates one day a week and with enormous subsidies is not going to be effective long term. The opportunity cost is too high.</i>
64. Clifford Eiffler-Rodriguez	
65. Mary Neuendorf	
66. Robert Gonzalez	
67. Mary Nikas	
68. Desta Moore	
69. John Macmillan	
70. Nadene LeCheminant	
71. Brett Aldrich	
72. Beth Sell	<i>I would like money and efforts to go towards social and justice related causes that will benefit more of the areas citizens.</i>
73. Frances Loberg	
74. Bonnie Heppner	
75. Laura Heppner	
76. Judy Rankin	<i>Airlines do not want to expand to areas that cannot support their air service. Salem does not have the population to sustain a regional airline.</i>

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

From: [Jim Scheppke](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Cc: [citycouncil](#)
Subject: 1/9/23 Testimony of 350 Salem OR on Agenda Items 5a and 5b
Date: Friday, January 6, 2023 11:32:48 AM

Dear Mayor and City Council:

On behalf of 350 Salem OR, I submit the following petition opposing commercial air service in Salem signed by 76 Salem residents:

Petition Opposing Costly and Polluting Commercial Air Service in Salem

A group of well-heeled business interests is trying to convince the Salem City Council to spend millions of taxpayer dollars to subsidize the resumption of commercial air service in Salem.

This is not the first time Salem has tried this. United Airlines pulled out of Salem in 1980 after failing to sell enough tickets. The same thing happened with Delta Airlines in 2008 and again with a smaller airline in 2011. Salem is a three-time loser, so why can't we learn from that?

Commercial air service is not needed here. Salem is only 75-90 minutes away from the Portland International Airport. An airport shuttle service makes 17 departures a day at a reasonable cost.

Initially there would only be, at most, four flights a week from Salem to destinations in California and Nevada. But to accommodate this, the City would need to hire 9 FTE staff at a cost of \$1.3 million per year and make minimum improvements to the small Salem terminal costing nearly \$1.9 million.

The City estimates total annual cost of \$2.37 million in Year 1 for four to eight flights per week. By Year 6, even assuming 16 flights per week, the subsidy would still be \$721,000 per year. The cost would have to be borne by homeowners with their property taxes and by renters with increased rent costs.

Commercial air service in Salem does not pass an "equity lens" test. 32% of persons in US households with income under \$40,000 have never taken a commercial airline flight (that would be about 40% of Salem residents). 92% of persons in US households with incomes over \$80,000 (about 28% of people in Salem) are occasional or frequent flyers. It is not equitable for lower and middle income Salem residents who may never fly or seldom fly to have to subsidize occasional and frequent flyers.

Commercial air service in Salem does not pass a "climate lens" test. Airline travel is the most carbon emitting form of transportation by far. For example, two people traveling from Portland to San Francisco would be responsible for emitting 116 kg per person of carbon traveling by plane, 70 kg by car and 28 kg by train or bus. When most transportation by car or bus is electrified in the coming years the difference will be even greater.

The Salem City Council has set a goal of cutting our carbon emissions in half by 2035 and reaching "net zero" emissions by 2050. If they are serious about reaching these goals, and about not placing an inequitable burden on taxpayers and renters, they will reject the plan for commercial air service in Salem.

Comments	
1. Jim Schepke	<i>Salem already has a structural deficit problem that this plan would only worsen. It is fiscally irresponsible.</i>
2. Tamra Hart	
3. Michael Hughes	
4. Teresa Joslin	<i>Airline travel is the most carbon-emitting form of transportation. Commercial air service in Salem is a waste of tax payer money.</i>
5. Jennifer Sprague	
6. Lisa Novak	
7. Diane Chavez	<i>I would rather not have the noise and air pollution associated with planes flying over my neighborhood. The money would be better spent on better public transit to Portland as well as Southern Oregon and the entire west coast.</i>
8. Joseph Novak	
9. Les Margosian	<i>An unbelievably foolish project. As ably described in 350Salem article it was tried tree times in past and never worked. The idea is a splendid example of Babbitry as the main objective is to puff-up Salem's image as a burg important enough to be served by commercial airlines. Also, as pointed out by article, the estimated costs are absurd: I'd love to see our City staff do a cost benefit analysis with their own current budget figures. Finally, yet another example of how ridiculous staff's proposals/recommendations are, Council will enthusiastically endorse them!</i>
10. Norman Baxter	<i>A waste of money and environmentally destructive.</i>
11. Susann Kaltwasser	
12. Jo Ann Leadingham	
13. Philip Carver	
14. Spencer Woolley	
15. Sarah Deumling	
16. Meg Hummon	
17. Laurie Dougherty	

18.	Pedro Cabrera	
19.	Roberta Cade	
20.	Justin Perkins	
21.	Zachary Aldrich	
22.	Kim Davis	
23.	Michelle Achee	
24.	Shanon Nabors	
25.	Rachael Spada	
26.	Marissa Theve	<i>We need to consider connecting our 3 largest cities with more reliable transit first. I would much rather go to PDX in an hourly bus than increase the environmental injustice to folks living near McNary Field. The City is failing to consider all reasonable alternatives.</i>
27.	Erika Guzman	
28.	Benjamin Dochoda	
29.	Thomas Kent	
30.	Christopher Simmons	
31.	Adam Dillon	
32.	Alex Korsunsky	<i>Why should public money subsidize rich people burning carbon? Use the money for train or bike or bus infrastructure instead.</i>
33.	Katherine Clark	
34.	Natalie Thamert	
35.	Vita Solis-Romano	
36.	Grant Boro	
37.	Claudia Burton	
38.	Brian Hines	<i>I'm tired of what Greta Thunberg calls the "blah, blah, blah" approach to fighting climate change: lots of talk, very little action. Salem needs to stop talking about reducing our greenhouse gas pollution and actually DO something about this.</i>
39.	Nicole Rodgers	
40.	Timothy Hulscher	
41.	Larry Sipe	
42.	Ricardo Rojas	
43.	Logan Johnson	<i>As a resident of a neighborhood close to the airport, the last thing I want is more, and bigger, flights overhead constantly. It pollutes both our environment and our noise, and the 6 million dollar bill will be footed by us to give private enterprise the profits. If you want to improve transit in Salem, and Oregon in general, then start putting money into something actually useful like our bus lines and our railways.</i>
44.	Kameron Monk	
45.	Elizabeth Henderson	
46.	Cheryl Hummon	

47.	Kayleen Warner	
48.	Christine Chute	
49.	Emily Standish	
50.	Mark Wigg	
51.	Michael Medlock	
52.	Walter Perry	
53.	Benigno Chavez	
54.	James Ciaramitaro	<i>Too few people will use it; while the whole community will be taxed for it.</i>
55.	Barbara Ray	
56.	Peter Bergel	
57.	Sandra Oliver-Poore	
58.	Claudia Howells	
59.	Melody Foster	
60.	Mary Ann Baclawski	
61.	Cynthia Jones	
62.	Jerry Turner	
63.	Donald Davis	<i>There is not enough demand for an airport in salem. And one that only operates one day a week and with enormous subsidies is not going to be effective long term. The opportunity cost is too high.</i>
64.	Clifford Eiffler-Rodriguez	
65.	Mary Neuendorf	
66.	Robert Gonzalez	
67.	Mary Nikas	
68.	Desta Moore	
69.	John Macmillan	
70.	Nadene LeCheminant	
71.	Brett Aldrich	
72.	Beth Sell	<i>I would like money and efforts to go towards social and justice related causes that will benefit more of the areas citizens.</i>
73.	Frances Loberg	
74.	Bonnie Heppner	
75.	Laura Heppner	
76.	Judy Rankin	<i>Airlines do not want to expand to areas that cannot support their air service. Salem does not have the population to sustain a regional airline.</i>

From: [Jeff Schumacher](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Opposition to airport costs
Date: Friday, January 6, 2023 8:50:54 AM

Councilor Nishioka, Mayor Hoy, and fellow Councilors,

I'm writing to express my opposition to the City of Salem allocating any general fund money to the planned improvements at the airport. A few years ago, when I was the chair of the SCAN neighborhood association, I sat in on a presentation from someone with the Fly Salem lobbying group. I'm a bit skeptical by nature but even I was floored by the fanciful benefits being pushed during this presentation.

The question I asked then, which I'm still asking today, is why are you - Fly Salem - coming to public meetings to talk about the airport when the business case is so strong for an airline flying out of Salem? When a business case is good, that business doesn't need public money.

Meanwhile, the 95% or more of us who don't fly regularly still have a mile-long list of "Safer Crossings" yet to be funded. We still don't have adequate library facilities across our city. And we still don't have a mobile crisis unit that could take some strain off our police force and perhaps make a real difference in improving our public spaces.

This situation reminds me of a sports team which tries to hold a city hostage for a new stadium. Don't fall for the sales pitch! Either let the team fund its own stadium or let the team leave, it really is that simple. And in this case, either let the airlines pay for any needed upgrades or let them fly out of another city. Improving our airport for a few frequent travelers will not make Salem better, and if you do approve this general fund money for the airport you are depriving everyone of actual needed improvements.

Thank you,
Jeff Schumacher
1945 W Nob Hill St. SE
Salem, OR 97302

From: [Kim Davis](#)
To: [citycouncil](#); [CityRecorder](#); [Chris Hoy](#)
Subject: Airport Commercial Air Service
Date: Sunday, January 8, 2023 2:32:20 PM

Dear Mayor and City Council members,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to any plan to expand the Salem Airport services to include commercial flights.

The economic, social and environmental justice issues inherent in such a plan cannot be ignored or overlooked. This proposal, to utilize taxpayer dollars to fund a convenience for a minority of residents and visitors is deeply troubling. To increase the air and noise pollution in an area already overburdened with poor air quality and excessive noise emissions will impact those residents, primarily low- and middle- income working families, negatively. The decision-making process itself appears to be undemocratic as a small handful of persons advocating for their personal conveniences are promoting public expenditures that do not serve our community as a whole. Our Salem community has many, highly visible needs that warrant significant investments. Traveler convenience is not one of them.

To promote increased air travel at a time in our collective history when air traffic emissions have been clearly linked to worsening global warming and climate changes, is ludicrous. Cities around the world are reducing and replacing air travel with options that produce less greenhouse gas emissions. Our community needs improved, more affordable public transportation and would welcome improved express transit services to Portland and Eugene cities and airports.

We have a shuttle service in place now to travel to a great airport with commercial flights within 90 minutes. We do not need to waste our precious taxpayer funds on luxuries and conveniences.

Thank you..
Kim Davis

From: [Keith Moes](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: FW: Air service to Salem
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 11:24:12 AM

From: Keith Moes
Sent: Monday, January 9, 2023 11:19 AM
To: citycouncil@cityofsalem.net
Subject: Air service to Salem

Mayor & Council,

I am in favor of air service coming to Salem. It would be a great benefit to the region.

Keith Moes
Director of Maintenance
Salem Air Center, Inc.
3300 25th Street SE
Salem, Oregon 97302
keith@salemaircenter.com

From: [Karen Sjogren](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Proposed improvements at the Salem airport to allow commercial flights
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 1:17:47 AM

The following is my written testimony on this topic: I have read and entirely agree with the comments made by [350.org](#) and the excellent detailed analysis by Phil Carver, both of which give reasons for opposing this expenditure of money. There are so many other city needs going unfulfilled that this money should be spent on that would serve a broader segment of the population. We need another park ranger and code enforcers for other areas as well. We need to have my branch library open more hours. The flight plan also goes right over my neighborhood so would create more noise. And I am horrified that the city would get rid of ground transportation from the airport to PDX. I just paid 140 dollars each way to get to PDX from my home. Most people can't afford this, nor can many drive to PDX. Please delete this previously failed pipe dream from your planned development for Salem.

From: [Kayleen Warner](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Airport Expansion Opposition Letter
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 12:33:50 PM

Thank you for your dedication to our community

I am sharing my opposition to airport expansion in Salem. Funding from the general fund seems off target to me, when there are so many needs for the city leaders to address. In addition to unsheltered people and the issues this brings to our businesses, economy and tourism, the city is in dire need of general funds to maintain infrastructure such as sidewalks. Throughout neighborhoods in Salem, cracked and broken sidewalks reduce the walkability of our city and create safety hazards for all ages.

Spending money on an airport expansion without a transparent unbiased study showing how all citizens in Salem would benefit is a waste of taxpayer dollars. I fly frequently, and see no reason to have commercial air service in Salem when PDX is only just over an hour away. Expanding shuttle service to PDX or working to increase public transportation would benefit the whole community and not just a few.

Airlines are having more and more issues just maintaining the current routes they fly, do they really want to expand to Salem when they have cut service to other communities such as Fresno, CA among others.

Please unpack the facts, and direct staff to give unbiased transparent details of the proposed expansion. Once you do I think you will see that this proposal is a bad idea. Better yet, put this on the ballot and let the citizens of Salem decide if this makes sense for their community. In reviewing the results of the 2022 Community Satisfaction Survey I did not find any mention of the community wanting an expanded airport, however fewer than three in ten residents are satisfied with services related to housing, homelessness, code enforcement or justice. Clearly this points out what is needed in our city and where the priorities should be for spending.

I will end by stating It is a clear conflict of interest that the chair of the Fly Salem committee will directly benefit from an expansion and is working on negotiating with airlines.

Kayleen Warner

From: [Lorie Fontaine](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Opposition to Salem Airport Expansion
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 9:41:46 AM

Dear Mayor and City Council,

Thank you for your dedication to our community. I join 350 Salem in opposing expansion of the Salem Airport. I believe our community is much better served by supporting infrastructure for public safety, building community and livability rather than subsidizing wealthier citizens' air travel convenience, which is also a risky business proposition.

It is difficult to message change to a sustainable future, but we owe it to every living being to commit now to a livable planet.

Thank you,
Lorie Fontaine

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Lucy Hitchcock](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Salem City Airport upgrade
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 1:09:45 PM

To the Salem City Council

Please do not use Salem's General Fund to upgrade Salem's airport for commercial air service. If there are available funds, use them to accelerate implementation of Salem's Climate Action Plan not to add more fossil fuel burning to our atmosphere. The shuttle service to Portland and Eugene is convenient and all that is needed.

A decision to spend a million dollars a year of our city funds for such a project should come before the city's voters for input in a ballot measure with clear mention of the pluses and minuses. How many residents even know you are considering this expenditure tonight? Or what its effects might be.

Sincerely,

Rev. Dr. Lucy Hitchcock
1715 John Muir Circle SE
Salem, OR 97302

From: margosian2004@yahoo.com
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Written testimony: Airport Agenda Item
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 1:36:45 PM

As requested by Tami Carpenter;

Babbitt on Steroids

Recent discussion and proposals regarding Salem International Airport reminds me of the classic American novel "Babbitt" written in the 1920's by Sinclair Lewis (for which, incidentally, he won the Nobel prize in literature) whose protagonist, Babbitt exemplified a mindless, senseless species of civic boosterism.

The Salem Airport, expanded in a manner making commercial airline service possible, is simply not feasible or desirable.

Several issues come to mind which I urge Council and staff to carefully consider:

First, commercial air service to our city just doesn't work. It's been tried several times and every time after a brief while failed miserably. Rather than bringing glory to our small town it was a costly embarrassment.

Second, has staff carefully studied the case of Eugene which for years had substantial traffic through its municipal airport only to see this activity rapidly and significantly dwindle in recent years.

Third, the very large budgetary commitment required is alarming and I have yet to see anything resembling a cost-benefit justification.

Fourth and most importantly it's hard to imagine assigning a higher priority to this project, even if funds were available, than to critical needs in the areas of public health, infrastructure and homelessness. Please also imagine the impact of the proposed airport enhancement costs which I understand to be around \$10 million if they were devoted instead to making Salem a more beautiful, livable town.

Finally, I'm really curious about the source of these proposals and what possible financial motivation prompts them.

Les Margosian

Ward 8

Salem, Oregon

Third, the very large budgetary commitment required is alarming and I have yet to see anything resembling a cost-benefit justification.

Fourth and most importantly its hard to imagine assigning a higher priority to this project, even if funds were available, than critical needs in the areas of public health,

infrastructure and homelessness. Please also imagine the impact of the proposed airport enhancement c

From: [Laura Sauter](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Vote on Airport
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 12:53:16 PM

While I am not unilaterally opposed to the expansion of the Salem Airport, I do oppose the proposal currently before the board, and urge a "NO" vote for the following reasons:

Originally the airport expansion was supposed to be privately funded according to the chamber of commerce. Now it appears it will be funded by the general fund and taxpayer dollars. The City of Salem cannot afford to spend millions of taxpayer dollars on airport expansion when we have thousands of homeless, drug-addicted, mentally ill people camping on our city streets. A recent survey showed that the biggest concern for citizens of Salem was homelessness, not the lack of an airport. Our police department is also severely underfunded. A recent study found that the City of Salem would require the hiring of 60 more police officers to adequately deal with public safety. The city council approved 20 positions. I am much more concerned with public safety in our city than I am with our lack of a large enough airport.

Currently, the planned destinations from Salem Airport are to Reno, Las Vegas, LA and Phoenix. With the exception of LAX, none of these are major flight hubs. It seems foolish and short-sighted not to include Seattle and the Bay Area as destinations. Has a survey been done to find out what the most popular destinations might be?

Another concern I have is flight paths. Currently many flights take off and land while passing over heavily populated residential areas in NE Salem. I oppose any expansion of the airport that would increase air traffic over these neighborhoods, for both quality of life and safety reasons: noise and pollution, not to mention the very real possibility of a plane crashing into a populated area. I have never understood why the Salem Airport does not require planes to fly either directly south or directly east while taking off and landing, instead of flying over residential neighborhoods.

I believe the airport expansion proposal has come up for a vote several times and been rejected by the voters. While I would love to be able to take a flight from Salem to the Bay Area, where I fly several times a year, I think the proposal, as it currently stands, has many flaws and I urge the council to reject it.

Sincerely,
Laura Sauter
1145 16 St. NE
Salem, OR 97301

From: [michaeldeblasi](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Passenger air service in Salem
Date: Friday, January 6, 2023 10:23:49 AM

Please add these comments to others regarding the City Council's deliberation on a staff recommendation to spend \$2.366 million in General Funds to make minimal improvements to the Salem airport terminal and to hire 9 FTE employees.

Commercial passenger air service is not necessary, worse for our environment and does not solve the larger problem of traffic congestion between Salem and Portland, including PDX.

If Salem and the State really wants to improve access to air travel, we should build an efficient and reliable commuter rail system connecting Salem and Portland and cities in between. The additional benefits will be an overall reduction of cars on the highways between the cities, reduction of fossil fuels emissions, reduced maintenance of existing highways and elimination of capacity increases.

Expanded commercial air service in Salem is not necessary and is a waste of money. I urge you to deny this recommendation.

Mike

From: [Mary Louise VanNatta](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: FW: Air service in Salem
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 1:45:14 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Salem Councilors:

Please support air service in Salem. I strongly believe it would be a significant step forward in bringing jobs and more prosperity to our city. It will also make our lives easier as citizens. I have multiple stories as to how air service in Salem would improve our travel and business experience.

You may hear loud voices from people who neither travel nor have a business. Please carefully weigh our interest in keeping Salem vibrant for the next generation.



**Mary Louise VanNatta, APR,
Fellow PRSA**

CEO | VanNatta Public Relations

p: 503-585-8254 x305

e: mlvg@prsalem.com

PO Box 135
Salem, OR 97308

www.PRSalem.com

From: [Phil Carver](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Cc: [Laurie Dougherty](#)
Subject: Comments on 1/92023 Council Meeting Agenda Item 5.b. 23-15
Date: Friday, January 6, 2023 2:17:26 PM

Comments from 350 Salem OR

RE: Staff proposed capital investments at airport

Jan 6, 2023

Philip Carver, Ph.D.

Co-coordinator

It is shocking that none of the staff reports on making capital improvements at the airport to enable commercial air service reveal the name of the airline. Nor does it nail down what flights they would provide. There is a mention of eight flights per week in the “Revenue and Expense Projections” but it says this is “unconfirmed by airline.” What? We know nothing about what we would be buying for \$2.366 million in requested budget appropriation and more millions in the future?

We were told in October that unless Salem was ready to go for commercial service in June, the unnamed airline would take their business elsewhere. And yet the project update indicates that in the best case, service could not begin until September. The US-TSA says it would take them six months to hire staff and gear up to provide their services. There is nothing in the staff report about why September would not be too late. Nor does it reveal any direct negotiations between the unnamed airline and City staff.

It is a complete violation of the public trust for the Council to be asked to commit to commercial air service that will cost millions of dollars without a signed lease agreement from the unnamed airline. Even that agreement would not guarantee continued lease payments given the volatile nature of the airline industry.

The staff proposal displays an appalling naivety. Commercial service has failed three times in the past. If anything, the economics of airline service are worse than in the past. Nothing has changed to improve the prospects for commercial service (see the economic analysis below).

The economic benefits to the residents of Salem from the types of air service discussed would be trivial. Improving shuttle service to PDX would have more benefits at far less cost (see discussion below).

Salem has a structural deficit in the General Fund. We can’t afford Mobile Crisis

Response. We can't afford to operate our one branch library more than 19 hours a week in West Salem. We can't afford to develop our undeveloped parks. We can't afford proper Code Enforcement. How can we possibly afford to subsidize some unknown number of flights per week from the Salem airport (to who knows where) at a cost of many millions?

The Council should instruct the staff to contact the airline and negotiate a lease agreement for the Council to review. Even then, 350 Salem will oppose the shocking waste of scarce general fund revenue.

Salem 350 OR strongly opposes the proposal to subsidize the start-up of commercial air service at the Salem Airport in 2023 for the following reasons:

- 1. Air service has failed every time it has been tried since United Airlines service ceased in 1980.** Delta Airlines service failed after 16 months in 2008 and Seaport Airlines service failed in 2011 after three months. In each case airline occupancy fell short of that needed to make the service profitable for the airlines.[\[1\]](#)
- 2. Air service would require a minimum of nearly \$1.9 million in improvements to the terminal building.** Even with these minimal improvements the terminal would not be able to accommodate all incoming and outgoing passengers for arriving flights at one time.[\[2\]](#)
- 3. Air service operations would need to be heavily subsidized by property taxpayers.** City staff estimates having to hire roughly 9.0 FTE to staff initial service at four to eight flights per week at a net cost of nearly \$4 million over the next five years.[\[3\]](#)
- 4. Air service subsidies would be required for at least the next two decades.** Even assuming the service grows to 16 flights per week, City staff estimates the subsidy of \$1.1 million would be required in year 20.[\[4\]](#)
- 5. Air service does not pass an “equity lens” test.** 32% of persons in US households with income under \$40,000 have never taken a commercial airline flight (that income group is about 40% of Salem residents). 92% of persons in US households with incomes over \$80,000 (about 28% of people in Salem are in this income group) are occasional or frequent flyers. It is not equitable for lower and middle income Salem residents to subsidize higher income flyers. [\[5\]](#)
- 6. Subsidizing Salem air service does not pass a “climate lens” test.**

Airline travel is the most carbon emitting form of transportation by far. For example, two people traveling from Portland to San Francisco would be responsible for emitting 116 kg per person of carbon traveling by plane, 70 kg by car and 28 kg by train or bus.[6] As more transportation by car or bus is electrified the difference will grow. In contrast all low carbon air fuels face very serious technical challenges.

Sources

[1] <https://www.statesmanjournal.com/story/news/local/2022/12/20/commercial-air-service-flights-mcnary-field-airport-salem-oregon/69654624007/>

[2] <https://salem.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5986356&GUID=00C0302A-F822-4DF3-BE91-5B6D20F205CE>

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

[5] <https://www.statista.com/statistics/316376/air-travel-frequency-us-by-income/#statisticContainer>

[6] <https://travelandclimate.org>

Economics of Salem Commercial Air Service

The Salem area does not have enough population to support commercial air service, particularly when Salem is less than an hour and a half drive from the Eugene and Portland airports.

The Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro Metropolitan Statistical Area has a population of 2.51 million (2021 footnote 1). The combined population of Lane, Douglas, Benton and Linn counties is 719,000. The combined population of Marion and Polk Counties is 436,000. The combined population of Washington, Columbia and Yamhill counties is 766,000 (this is included in the MSA value above) (all counties 2022 data footnote 2). Given the difficulty of getting from the westside of Portland to PDX at peak times, these population values indicate that commercial service at the Hillsboro airport would likely have more business than at the Salem airport. If there were to be a viable third commercial service in the Willamette Valley, it would likely be in Hillsboro.

Still, it is unlikely the Willamette Valley can support commercial service at three airports, particularly with the recent difficulty airlines have had in finding pilots. These are the U.S. areas that support three commercial airports: Chicago, IL, Miami, Tampa and Orlando in Florida; and the combined Washington DC/Baltimore, MD area (footnote 3).

The DC/Baltimore area and Chicago area populations are each just under 10 million. The three Florida cities are major tourist destinations. Providing very limited commercial air service in Salem will not turn the Willamette Valley into a major tourist destination.

Even if a carrier offers to provide service for two years under the plan of guaranteed income and a waiver of landing fees, they are unlikely to continue service when those subsidies end. Any guarantees of funding by airlines for capital improvements are suspect given the volatile nature of the airline industry.

Footnotes

1. <https://censusreporter.org/profiles/31000US38900-portland-vancouver-hillsboro-or-wa-metro-area/>
2. Oregon Blue Book, Secretary of State
3. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_cities_with_more_than_one_commercial_airport

Better Policy: Improved Shuttle Service to PDX

Salem is close enough to PDX that the vast majority of Salem air travelers' needs are best met there. PDX service will always be more frequent and extensive than at Salem. If the city wants to improve accessibility to air service, it should instead work to expand and improve shuttle service between Salem and PDX. Currently Groome Transport runs 17 shuttles per day that take 85 minutes to travel from McNary Field to PDX. The actual drive time in off-peak hours is 64 minutes, so there are opportunities to improve service by reducing travel times and providing additional shuttle runs. The city could also expand parking and provide improved shuttle waiting areas at the Salem airport. In addition, potential delays due to traffic congestion during peak hours can be reduced by working with ODOT to expand existing "bus on shoulder lanes" in Wilsonville along I-205.

Working with Groome or another private provider to improve shuttle service would be a much better investment of city funds and provide more benefits to many more Salem area air travelers than would subsidies to bring very limited commercial air service to Salem.

Instead, City staff propose to displace Groome from the Salem Airport. Even in the wildest fantasies of supporters of Salem air service it could never displace even the tiniest fraction of PDX airport use by Salem residents. The staff proposal is a disservice to Salem residents.

From: [Philip Ratcliff](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: 5.b. 23-15.
Date: Sunday, January 8, 2023 8:43:55 PM

This regards the transfer of assets for airport-related costs.

It is a complete violation of the public trust for the Council to be asked to commit to commercial air service that will cost millions of dollars without a signed lease agreement from the unnamed airline. Even that agreement would not guarantee continued lease payments given the volatile nature of the airline industry.

A commercial airport has been tried before in Salem, and failed each time. Don't repeat the failures of your predecessors.

Philip Ratcliff, Salem Ward 7

From: [Peter Raven](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Airport commercial air service
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 10:52:26 AM

Salem City Council:

I am writing to oppose the subsidy by the City of Salem of the "Airport commercial air service readiness project " for the following reasons:

1. The City can't afford this subsidy. Several years ago, a monthly "City Operations Fee" (originally \$8.00, raised to \$8.34 in 2022) to help address a serious crisis with the City budget. Since the fee is ongoing, I can only assume that the City still has a looming budget crisis.
2. Recent commercial air service attempts have failed, including Delta after 16 months in 2008 and Seaport after 3 months in 2011.
3. This is a perfect opportunity for the private sector to step up and fund the start-up of commercial air service in Salem. Many large and small airports are funded and operated by private interests around the world. But, this is unlikely to happen here because commercial air service in Salem will probably be a money-loser for many years to come.
4. It appears that City subsidies of this project would be required for at the a decade.

Please vote no regarding subsidizing this commercial air service readiness project.

Best,

Peter Uglesich
South Salem

From: [Ron Peters](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Commercial Air service
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 1:14:41 PM

Dear Mayor and Council:

I fully support Commercial Air Service in Salem.

We are the largest Capitol in the country that does NOT have Commercial Air Service.

Our local economy is larger than that of Bend/Redmond and the have commercial service.

The terror that is commuting to Portland, taking 4 1/2 hours to reach the airport and missing my flight.

Businesses in Salem would thrive on having a way to easily accommodate clients to the business without paying extra expenses for extended travel.

The opportunity to reduce carbon emissions by not having to drive to PDX, sit in traffic idling...

All, yes all the surrounding cities support Commercial Air Service in Salem...

Letters of support have come in from the Mid-Valley communities, as you have seen!

The cost to my bottom line would be greatly reduced.

Our Congressional delegation supports this endeavor and has sent you a letter starting as much!

Please, PLEASE, support Commercial Air Service in Salem..

It is the right, responsible and community minded thing to do.

Ron Peters
3040 Earhart St. S.
Salem 97302

From: [Ray Quisenberry](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Salem Airport Expansion. Agenda item 5b
Date: Sunday, January 8, 2023 7:46:18 PM

Dear Mayor and Councilors

I want to voice my opposition to the plan to expand the airport for commercial service. My reasons to oppose this range from the negative climate impact of encouraging more air travel, to the past history of several failed attempts, to our lack of other more needed infrastructure, and to the fact that the general fund is already stretched tighter than a drum. We don't actually have the money. But my main reason for opposition is that if we're going to cobble together funding sources, then let me suggest an actual need.

At 6:30: this morning, as I walked from my house in the Grant Neighborhood to buy a paper at Plaid Pantry on Broadway, I walked by a man huddled under a canopy to stay dry. As I continued on my way, I passed two more people in the dark, both wrapped in blankets to protect against the cold, and keeping their heads down as they walked slowly past. I make this walk in the dark of the morning frequently, and this is typical. Day or night, and especially if you live near downtown, you see too many of our fellow citizens that have fallen off the edge of life. I know we're working on the problem, but we are still failing far too many.

So instead of spending money on a vanity project for the well connected, let us instead make sure that everyone in our community has a place to call home, food to eat, and the services they need. Please, no airport expansion.

Thank you.

Ray Quisenberry
Ward 1

Sent from my iPad

From: [Roz Shirack](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Cc: [Linda Nishioka](#); [Vanessa Nordyke](#)
Subject: Salem Airport Service, 1/9/23 Council Agenda Item 5b
Date: Saturday, January 7, 2023 3:07:51 PM

Dear Mayor and City Council:

I oppose use of the General Fund to help fund Salem Airport improvements and the FTE needed to support scheduled commercial air service. That applies to using current 2023 FY GF as well as the proposed on-going GF subsidy. I believe providing commercial air service is a very low priority compared to the many City services that rely on the GF.

I also believe this is a waste of money, given the track record of at least three failed attempts to subsidize and offer revenue guarantees to airlines to provide air service in Salem. Even Delta Airline lasted only 1 year when they came into Salem Airport (2007-08) and offered a good daily flight to their hub in Salt Lake City. Two smaller airlines that came into Salem since then didn't last that long.

The Salem business community has made several offers of private revenue guarantees in the past to lure the two smaller airlines mentioned above, but apparently that was not good enough to keep the airlines in Salem. If the business community wants to make another try and hopefully leverage some FAA funds, I think that is fine. But please do not commit any GF to scheduled commercial air service, which will likely fail again.

Salem is too close to PDX (and Eugene) to support commercial air service. But I hope the Salem Airport or other locations remain hospitable to airport surface shuttles, such as Groome and other competitors.

Thank you, Roz Shirack

From: [Sean Nikas](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Salem City Council 1/9/2023 Meeting Agenda Items 5a & B
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 11:07:36 AM

Hello,

Please vote no on the airport expansion.

The expansion has significant costs but does not raise significant revenues to cover those costs making it a burden on other city services. Given Salem's current budget constraints it is fiscally irresponsible to spend millions on an airport expansion at this time.

Only the wealthiest members of our community would use the airport. This makes the airport expansion a wealth transfer from lower and middle income households to wealthy households.

The airport expansion will make it very difficult for Salem to meet it's carbon goals.

The most likely outcome is the the new flights will fail and the as yet unidentified airline will abandon Salem again. We are Charlie Brown trying to kick the football.

Sean Nikas - Salem Resident

☐ Sent via [Cloze](#)

From: [walter Perry](#)
To: [Linda Nishioka](#)
Cc: [CityRecorder](#); [Vanessa Nordyke](#)
Subject: Comment on Airport funding proposal
Date: Sunday, January 8, 2023 8:37:48 AM

Greetings Ms Nishioka

I am writing to suggest that you vote no on any proposal to use city money to improve the airport.

I have two reasons for this.

First the city budget is already overstretched . There are many more important projects that need funding. The homeless crisis is an obvious need that is well recognized by everyone.

Secondly, the airport will mainly benefit a small segment of Salem's population. Most people in Salem never fly anywhere. Those who do can easily go to Portland to catch a flight.

Finally increasing air traffic is totally inconsistent with Salem's climate change initiatives. There is no such thing as a carbon free airplane, and there probably never will be.

Thank you very much

Walter Perry

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of wsmaldon@willamette.edu
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Submission
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 11:22:47 AM
Attachments: [ATT00001.bin](#)

Your Name	William Smaldone
Your Email	wsmaldon@willamette.edu
Your Phone	5033618807
Street	430 21st Street SE
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97301
Message	<p>Dear Mayor and Councilors, I am writing to comment on Agenda Item 5.b. 23-15. Transfer of appropriations for Airport related Costs. I strongly oppose the use of any public subsidy to bring commercial airline service to Salem. My reasons taking this position are generally in line with those put forward by Salem 350.org and there is no need for me to repeat them in detail here. Instead, I'd like to stress a few issues. First, if the City of Salem is concerned about attracting visitors, new residents, or new businesses, improving Salem's quality of life for all residents will do a lot more to achieve that goal than bringing passenger air service to town. It makes the most sense to invest our scarce public resources to solve pressing local problems, especially regarding the needs of the homeless and poor. Housing the homeless and helping poor people stay housed should be the City's top priority. Substantial strides have been made recently to deal with this growing problem, e.g., the new Navigation Center being set up in Ward 2, but everyone knows that current programs address only a fraction of the problem. Pumping millions into Salem's airport will do nothing to address this and other pressing public needs (e.g., library expansion, the lack of staff in community services, undeveloped parks, and the mobile crisis response unit, to name a few). Second, passenger air service only intensifies the climate crisis. Air service to Salem will generate far more air (and noise!) pollution than individuals' commuting to the Portland Airport and the latter can be mitigated by enhanced regional efforts to improve bus and rail service in the I5 corridor. Promoting commercial air traffic only contradicts the larger aims of Salem's Climate Action Plan and therefore should be a non-starter. Finally, I have lived in Salem for over 30 years and served on the Council from 1999-2002. As everyone knows, this is one of many efforts by the local private sector to get the public to prop up a venture that, due to Salem's proximity to Portland, regularly has failed to pencil out. If the Salem business community really wants to have this service at Salem's airport, let it raise all the capital privately and absorb the risk. Given the needs of the larger community, the public should not be asked to absorb the losses that likely will occur. Sincerely Bill Smaldone</p>